

## Schedule of representations to consultation on Bournemouth, Dorset &amp; Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan – Consultation on land at Horton Heath (AS27)

February 2019

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
816674	British Horse Society	No	Yes	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective; Consistent with national policy	For Green Cottage Riding Centre, livery yard and Riding for the Disabled base BRs from Three Legged Cross along 7, 32, 30, 12 & 7 form the main 1 hour circular riders route for novice children and adults, and disabled on lead-reins. Heavy lorries crashing along unsurfaced tracks, between barbed wire fences will make this very dangerous, causing dust and air pollution. This common is the main recreational area for hundreds of walkers, cyclists, horseriders and children on ponies from all surrounding villages and Verwood Town.	AS27 should be omitted from the Mineral Sites Plan because raw sewage was, for years, dumped in puts all along the adjoining West side of BR32. On the East side, on AS08, EDDC held a public inquiry in 1980s to stop illegal BXM racing on site of nature conservation interest. Owner was ordered to remove concrete humps and return it to heathland, under article 4, but never complied with. He dug out large amounts of sand and gravel and lorries were followed to B'mth University site. Friends of the Earth named it in the press as a toxic waste site, with drums of chemicals with skull and crossbone signs, animal carcasses etc dumped in the hole but all covered in sand before EDDC inspection. This could cause the sand to be polluted and cause contamination to River Gane and other water sources.
1198327	British Horse Society					As BHS Access and Bridleways Officer for this area I am well aware of the two Bridleways E46/30 and E46/32 that straddle two boundaries of this site and if I understand correctly the plans another bridleway E46/12 will be used for vehicle access by possibly 80 trucks to the proposed site. I/we know that these bridleways are well used by many horse riders in the area as an important link between Three Legged Cross /Horton Heath (Common) and Holt Heath/Holt Forest and beyond as part of a circular route. There is great concern by horse riders that the close proximity of the site to the bridleways and the potential for horses to be spooked by loud noises, traffic and things unfamiliar to them. AS27 collectively has three bridleways which will all be affected due to their close proximity to this site which will potentially have a huge impact on the local network and combined with the increased lorry traffic on at least one of the bridleways in question (E46/12) which is accessed off the Horton Road/Burts Lane crossroads which currently has not got the best visibility for vehicles and the horse riders who keep their horses down Burts Lane (Holt Heath) and then throwing in a potential of 80 lorries turning into this bridleway with limited visibility is of concern for the safety of all users. Given the points above I/we wish to strongly object to this proposal/consultation.	
224313	Campaign to Protect Rural England					There are some serious disadvantages to this site which require further detailed examination. These are: Underlying AS27 is a layer of Broadstone clay. Should this be disturbed it could lead to significant hydrological effects on the European sites. In the Appropriate Assessment, the appendix on mitigation says, 'The development proposals must either mitigate these effects or reduce them to non-significant levels.' This is clearly an over-riding constraint.: Unless Horton Common SSSI can be protected the site should be omitted from the Plan. It is not just the Horton Common SSSI that is at risk and needs protection. AS27 is in close proximity to the River Crane SSSI. Any disturbance to the hydrology could cause acid water to drain down the slope towards the Crane. This would result in irreversible changes to the ecology of this chalk stream. The area includes many bridleways and footpaths. To either side of AS27 there are bridleways that will need diverting before the quarrying begins. As the extraction programme is	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>expected to last around 12 years and at any time will be taking place at some location in the 6.2 hectares, consideration should be given to long term diversion of the bridleways so users are protected from the 50-80 daily vehicle movements. The diversions should be through suitable attractive alternative routes. They should be agreed with local stables and/or members of the British Horse Society, local parishes and walking groups. This site is expected to be operational for 12 years. Working of the 6.2ha site and restoration should be phased so that habitat disruption is minimised and restoration is achieved as quickly as possible. The good quality semi-natural habitat in this area is fractured. An overarching master plan is required to re-establish meaningful links. Traffic. Between 50 -80 lorry movements per day are forecast. The cumulative impact of this proposal and the additional movements caused by the Core Strategy developments particularly waste transfer facilities at Woolsbridge will put the road system (a C road) under considerable stress. A traffic survey is urgently required and should consider the routes and possibly banning some of them where there are locally unacceptable impacts. If this site is included in the Plan, this should be conditioned.</p>	
1198398	Christchurch Angling club	Yes	Yes			<p>We do not know if it is necessary to include site AS27 within the plan. Christchurch Angling club own three fishing lakes that are situated directly along the run off route for ground water from this proposed site. These lakes are served by a watercourse that maintains their level and feeds through all three lakes. The extraction of material from the proposed site may affect the water course and our corresponding water levels and quality. Any contaminated water escaping the site and finding its way into our lakes will have a serious impact on wildlife and have serious financial impacts for the club. As an additional point once the material has been extracted the future use of the resulting hole in the ground will further affect water run off, and we are particularly concerned should the site be used for landfill.</p>	<p>Yes. Appropriate safeguards are needed to deal with contaminated water run off by way of filtration and monitoring of the site.</p>
233589	Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty					<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this additional site. The location is approximately 3 kilometres to the east of this AONB. As you may know, one of the key characteristics of this AONB is its tranquillity. The AONB Partnership is, therefore, very concerned that additional HGV traffic may, if this mineral site becomes operative, be routed through this AONB and therefore impact adversely on a key characteristic of the AONB. I note that there is a difference in the potential number of lorry movements identified on page 1 of the 'Site Information' and in criterion 25, page 8. However, I note that the comments in criterion C25 indicate that access is likely to be in easterly or south easterly directions from the site. If any access routes to and from the site could be restricted to those directions then this AONB would see that arrangement as seeking to avoid potential impacts on the AONB. There is one other matter which does not appear to be clarified in the Site Assessment document and that relates to where the extracted material would be sorted or processed. Again this AONB Partnership would be concerned if HGV movements into or through this AONB were to be increased. I hope these brief comments clarify the situation of this AONB Partnership in relation to this proposed site and the ways any potential objections could be avoided.</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
928912	Dorset Wildlife Trust	Yes	Yes	Unsound	Justified; Effective	<p>Dorset Wildlife Trust maintains its objection to the inclusion of this site in the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals Sites Plan. It is not justified because the sites already recommended with the plan provide more capacity than required during the plan period. Additionally a number of sites proposed for development in the Local Plan review will require prior extraction of minerals, and these will be prioritised over other sites in order to deliver the required housing on time. It is not effective because the need for much detailed survey information and the substantial mitigation measures required would make delivery of the site potentially too expensive to be deliverable. Dorset Wildlife Trust 's major objection to this site is that it will cause further fragmentation of the remaining areas of heathland of the once extensive Horton Common (areas all now designated as either SSSI or SNCI). Until 1980 this whole area including all of the AS27 site was heathland. It was ploughed immediately before it was due to be designated as a SSSI in a widely publicised case. Mineral extraction over this large area will prevent any connectivity between the remaining areas of good quality habitat during the lifetime of the extraction period, contrary to NPPF para 170d to establish coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and para 174b to promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species: and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. If gravel extraction were to be permitted there would be a need for substantial compensation for habitat loss during the works, including measures to extend and link the remaining areas of heathland/acid grassland habitat to comply with the above requirements of NPPF. As stated in the Site Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, the site is linked hydrologically to the International sites, and any disturbance of the Broadstone Clay layer below the sands and gravels risks affecting the hydrology of Horton Common SSSI. Detailed survey and assessment with robust mitigation measures will be required to ensure no adverse impacts on the hydrology of Horton Common, (and the adjacent parts of Horton Common SNCI). The adjacent area of Redman 's Hill received planning permission last year (3/17/0967/DCC) and is already being worked, adding to the area of biodiversity loss. There is an active sand martin colony on this site, and the Biodiversity Mitigation Plan which was conditioned as a part of the planning consent required measures to ensure the maintenance of the colony throughout the works and the creation of a further face for nesting in another part of the site. The site is only separated from the proposed AS27 site by a bridleway, and this much larger area of disturbance with many more lorries, and more noise over a longer period of time may well make it impossible to maintain this sand martin colony. If the site is taken forward, and planning permission granted it is essential that any machinery does not cause damage to or collapse of sand martins ' nests as a result of vibrations. Guidance of RSPB on sand martins and working quarries should be followed: <a href="https://www.rspb.org.uk/globalassets/downloads/join-and-donate/cemex-and-rspb-sand-martin-quarry-advice.pdf">https://www.rspb.org.uk/globalassets/downloads/join-and-donate/cemex-and-rspb-sand-martin-quarry-advice.pdf</a> . This is an important area for recreational activity, with much use of the adjacent and several nearby and bridleways by walkers and riders, as evidenced by the many responses to this consultation, and contacts to DWT by local people concerned about the application. There is likely to be considerable displacement of recreational activity if extraction goes ahead here, which could impact upon the Internationally designated heathland sites.</p>	<p>If, despite our objection, AS27 is taken forward as an allocation in the Minerals Sites Plan there will be a requirement for full Phase 1 habitat and species assessments, as well as detailed hydrological investigations to ensure no adverse impacts on the nearby designated sites. In addition we would suggest investigation into vibrations caused by machinery that might impact on nearby sand martin nests. In addition we would expect to see full restoration of the site to acid grassland as soon as possible following any sand and gravel extraction. However, the previous planning permission for extraction of sand on the nearby AS08 area in the same ownership (PA3/04/0833) in 2004 which damaged part of the Horton heath SNCI, required restoration to heathland by the end of 2006, and a cessation of motor cross activities on this site. Neither of these conditions have been adhered to, which gives little confidence that in any future successful planning application on the AS27 site, any such restoration would be effectively secured. Therefore the following conditions should be included in Policy wording for this site if allocated: Compliance with all conditions relating to previous planning applications for Horton Heath (including AS08) will be required before consideration of any planning application. Mineral extraction and restoration should be phased as at the Redman 's Hill Quarry site. The extraction period should be limited so that restoration to address some of the historic habitat loss can be undertaken as a priority. There should be no backfilling with waste to ensure the speediest possible restoration to acid grassland. Habitat heterogeneity can be encouraged by ensuring an uneven depth of extraction over the site. Some exposed vertical surfaces should be retained to create additional sand martin habitat and nesting sites for burrowing bees and wasps. Compensation for loss of habitat during site works should include extension and linkage of existing good quality habitat (SSSI and SNCIs). Restoration to acid grassland should include appropriate management and monitoring in perpetuity.</p>

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
197327	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Yes	Yes	Unsound	Effective	East Dorset recognizes Dorset's need for minerals such as sand and gravel. However, we have serious concerns about allocating this site based upon the currently available information. These concerns are a) hydrology b) transport. The concern about transport has two aspects i) access from the site to road C2 ii) cumulative impact on the C2. a) There is potential disruption of hydrological links to Horton Common SSSI. HRA states describes 'likely significant hydrological effect on the adjacent European sites of working this site. Mitigation against this effect is needed . . . ". It suggest that wording is added to a policy statement 'stating that the site will not be worked until this issue has been resolved.'. Given that resolution is needed it should not be left to the planning stage rather resolved now, before allocation. b) i) Access from the site to road C2. One of the maps shows a proposed access route. No details re given. This does not appear to be a combination of the eastern bridleway, lane and service lane to the solar farm. The implication is a new road but there is not enough information available for us to meaningfully comment on this, for example on the impact on users of the bridleways. b) ii) There is a concern about the increase volume of HGV traffic on the C2, especially the cumulative impact of developments in the area, such as the expansion of the Woolbridge Employment site, in particular the increase in HGV movements due to the proposed waste handling there. It has been stated at a previous consultation that once HGVs enter the national road network there is no control on where they go. This issue is a general one and not specific to this site, but here, like many other sites, some movements are appropriate, others less appropriate and yet others inappropriate. We would consider vehicles from the site travelling West through Horton Heath inappropriate. We suggest that planning permission should be granted conditional on agreed travel routes for HGVs in an area extending out from the site to the nearest trunk road.	
929000	East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Justified; Effective	Why did you erase my comments when I went back? I don't have time to be messed around like this. There are considerations of sustainability: poor choice of site adjacent to sites used for energy, waste and other aggregate uses, making this a cluster poor aftercare design and excessive pressure on roads not designed to take the kind of traffic this proposal will generate. With suitable mitigation written into the plan, I will happily withdraw my objection. I would be interested to know why, if this site is suitable for mineral abstraction, the adjacent solar farms were not considered before the solar arrays were installed, as required by the Government's minerals planning guidance. Why did you ask 2 opposite questions with 1 answer? It can't be sound and unsound! You are wasting my time.	Aftercare plan must be agreed before permission is granted; this should be stated (but not necessarily spelt out) by the site plan. The aftercare must enhance biodiversity or environmental sustainability; this is the only acceptable excuse for adopting this site. There must be a clear traffic plan and a suitable design for the junction with Horton Rd.
559931	Environment Agency					We can confirm that we have reviewed the site, and previously reviewed including groundwater and biodiversity information, and can offer the following comments. We have no objection in principle from a controlled waters perspective. We would highlight that the further hydrogeological risk assessments would be required if the site is included and subsequently brought forward. We have no in principle objections to the proposals, based on the ecology information, and that the site (if brought forward) will need to demonstrate how it would protect upon species such as reptiles, bats and birds.	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
928830	Halletec Environmental Ltd					<p>Geology and Reserves The estimated mineral reserve for AS27 is stated to be between 2.4 to 3.5 million tonnes from within what is a relatively small site area of 16.2ha for a resource of this size. Given the relatively small site footprint the reserve estimate appears to be unusually wide ranging. the proposed restoration is to a valley sloped down to a pond in the northeast corner. However, the existing topography of the site which is sloped from south to north coupled with the surrounding physical and statutory designatory constraints that exist, suggests that even the lower estimate may be optimistic. The Dorset County Council (DCC) Site Assessment notes that there would be no requirement for onsite processing. However, information in the public domain for the adjacent Redman 's Hill site located less than 20m to the east, indicates it was granted planning permission for mineral extraction as recently as 2018. Site investigation records for this site indicate that much of the sand resource is silty in nature and also includes, lignite. Either one of these two features would normally indicate that processing of the mineral deposit would be required if the saleable product is to be suitable for the typical range of construction uses. Accordingly, without processing the resource may not be capable of being worked in the most sustainable manner. Should processing be required the limited confines of the proposed allocation site would risk sterilising otherwise workable mineral by processing plant and associated infrastructure such as tailings lagoons etc. Alternatively, processing may be required off site for which no proposals have been put forward and would have separate and additional environmental impacts that so far appear not to have been considered. There is some evidence to indicate the possible presence of overlying river terrace deposits. However, it is not clear from the information published in the DCC site appraisal whether these are present and overlying the Poole Formation sands, and whether these materials are to be treated as a mineral resource or simply as overburden. If the latter, mineral safeguarding policies would normally apply on which no assessment has been provided for the proposal to allocate. Heritage Constraints This site has been identified to be in close proximity to a number of potential sensitive heritage sites, including no less than four Scheduled Monuments (SMs) located less than 500m from the site. The potential impact of the proposed mineral development on these features has previously been noted with particular concern raised to the setting of these nationally important heritage features. It is noted that Historic England has stated Quarrying impacts on topography and historic landform could have very significant impacts on the settings of the SMs and their inter-relationship within the landscape. The SMs here "prehistoric barrows and land boundary dikes - are all specifically landscape monuments", which have an intimate and highly significant relationship with the local topography; their relationship with the landform and their interrelationship. Given the acknowledged sensitivity of these features, and how such impacts might be capable of mitigation, there appears to be little evidence that these concerns have been suitably addressed for this site to be declared suitable for allocation at this stage. Environmental Constraints It is noted that there are a number of public rights of way immediately adjacent to the site and in the immediate vicinity. It is understood this issue was a material concern that may have led to the site having been rejected from an earlier consideration for allocation. The two areas of recently developed solar farm located on adjoining land should also be considered. During site preparation, extraction and restoration phases for working the site, there is likely to be significant potential for impact arising from dust on the effectiveness of the solar panels. As the prevailing wind will be from the west this risk may be increased. In addition, the recently submitted alternative access</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>route passes closer to the existing southern solar farm area than previously proposed, potentially leading to greater impacts of dust on the efficiency of the solar panels. The potential for hydrological impacts on the Horton Common SSSI and European designations has been highlighted by the Environment Agency and Dorset Wildlife Trust. However, it would appear the potential environmental risks to these assets may yet to be fully assessed. Accordingly, given these not insignificant environmental sensitivities, it may be premature to consider allocation of this site. Need for the mineral The current emerging MSP has identified sufficient resources of both river terrace and Poole Formation sands to support the identified needs of the Plan with approximately 3 years remaining at the end of the Plan period in 2033 which is 11 years in excess of the seven year period prescribed by the Government in the National Planning Policy Framework. Conclusions The estimated reserves cited in the DCC Site Assessment are unusually wide ranging for what is a relatively small site which implies the practicalities of physically working and restoring the site have yet to be resolved. The published information in the DCC Site Assessment together with publicly available information about at the mineral deposit and its quality, indicates that there may in fact be a need for processing of the mineral. Should that be the case the likely environmental consequences appear not to have been considered. DCC has previously expressed concern about the high level of public rights of way in the area, two of which run along two sides of the site. Quarrying will affect the topography and the historic landform which also has the potential to have significant impacts on the historic settings of the nearby Scheduled Monuments. The Mineral Planning Authority has previously concluded that it has concerns about the allocation of this site, due to the need for more detailed heritage work to inform the assessment including the potential for hydrological impacts. Consequently, DCC reached the decision to drop the site from the emerging Minerals Plan. Given the undoubted heritage, environmental sensitivities of this site and its setting coupled with the lack of geological qualitative supporting information, it would appear there currently remains insufficient evidence to demonstrate this site is compliant with sustainably policies or that there is a need for further mineral site allocations during the life of the emerging Minerals Local Plan. Accordingly, there would appear to be a need for further heritage impacts assessment work to be undertaken in order to determine if the working of minerals from this site is needed and would be sustainable.</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1198060	Hampshire County Council	Don't Know	Don't Know			Soft sand supply has already been identified as a potential issue in the near future by the South East mineral planning authorities, as a number of neighbouring authorities have a significant proportion of their soft sand resources located within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (West Berkshire and Surrey) or within the South Downs National Park (Hampshire and West Sussex), thus restricting the availability of soft sand resources in these areas. Within Hampshire, soft sand resources are scarce and concentrated in a small number of areas, in comparison to sharp sand and gravel resources which are much more prolific and spread out. As of the Local Aggregate Assessment (2017), sales of soft sand are improving in Hampshire, however the landbank remains well below NPPF requirement. The South East mineral planning authorities are currently working collectively to prepare a Position Statement. We therefore agree with your Overall Recommendations' (Sustainability Appraisal), that the proposed site; Land at Horton Heath could prove to be a valuable source of Poole Formation sand, especially as an exporter to neighbouring authorities and the wider South East, as has been the case in the past. Despite this, we understand that much of Dorset 's environment is highly protected and under many constraints such as environmental and landscape designations, water designations and tourism pressure. As minerals development has the potential to significantly affect sensitive receptors and tourism interests, we agree that this site should only be included in the Mineral Sites Plan if it can be demonstrated that the likely significant impacts can be mitigated. The following issues are of particular importance; managing traffic impacts, impacts on public health, safety and amenity, and, if the proposals go ahead, the restoration of the mineral working to ensure it is in keeping with the surrounding landscape and enhance biodiversity in the long term.	
1181888	Highways England					Thank you for providing Highways England with the opportunity to comment on the inclusion of omission site AS27 (Horton Heath) in the Minerals Sites Plan (MSP) as an allocated site for sand and gravel extraction. We note that site AS08 is not now being progressed. As you are aware, we are responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network which in this location comprises the A31 to the south of the proposed site. The initial indication is that site AS27 could generate in the order of 80 HGV movements a day, based on an estimated annual output of 200,000 tonnes, and could potentially be worked for up to 17 years. It is noted in the Consultation Document Development Guidelines and accompanying Site Assessment that an assessment of traffic impacts will be required to support any future planning application to bring the site into use. The site has the potential to impact on a number of A31 junctions, including potentially Ameysford, West Moors, Brocks Pine and Ashley Heath, some of which already experience capacity constraints at peak times. It will therefore be essential for the proposals to be supported by a robust transport assessment in line with the requirements of DfT Circular 02/2013, to identify the extent of the traffic impact on the strategic road network and any mitigation requirements.	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
233457	Historic England			Unsound	Justified; Consistent with national policy	<p>Summary Our comments are focused on the Archaeological Assessment report by Forum Heritage Services, dated December 2018 which forms part of the owner 's submission. In summary Historic England 's consider that this report under-assesses the potential impact of the proposed quarry development on the setting of the scheduled monuments in the vicinity, and that it also underestimates the potential archaeological implications of the proposed development on the site. As a consequence we do not feel the Plan with this allocation would be justified as it is not currently based on proportionate evidence; and as such one is unable to reasonably establish whether it is consistent with National Policy. We therefore recommend that further assessment should be undertaken before the proposal is taken forward, in order to clarify the potential impacts on archaeological heritage assets in and around the proposal site, and enable an informed decision to be made on the suitability of quarrying and, if it is acceptable, what form it should take and any accompanying mitigation and restoration that may be required. Historic England advice Significance of the affected heritage assets In general, archaeological remains in the lowland heath areas of Dorset and Hampshire tends to be dominated those of the Bronze Age remains, when the areas were occupied by farming communities. The most visible remains are the communities ' burial monuments, made in a variety of forms of circular round barrow ', the most common of which are bowl barrows. This applies to the area of the proposal site, where there are records of several Bronze Age bowl barrows and a section of a linear boundary feature known as cross-dyke, which are designated as scheduled monuments. The quarrying proposals would potentially affect the settings of the scheduled monuments in the area surrounding the proposal site. To the east of the proposal site are two scheduled monuments, one of which encompasses 5 barrows and a boundary dyke: Bowl barrow on Redman 's Hill 450m SW of Bridge Farm (National Heritage List no. 1018415) Bowl barrow cemetery and a cross dyke on Horton Common 800m south of Bridge Farm (National Heritage List no. 1018411) In the area of proposal site AS27, the Archaeological Assessment report (paras 4.13, 4.15) notes other sites representing undated trackways, irregular earthwork platforms and ditches. On the ridge to the west of the proposal site are two Bronze Age barrows: Bowl barrow 250m NE of Monmouth 's Ash Farm (National Heritage List no. 1016093) Bowl barrow 90m NE of Monmouth 's Ash Farm (National Heritage List no. 1016094) In this area, the Archaeological Assessment report (para 4.6 notes that the Dorset Historic Environment Record records an undated mound at David 's Cross which, given the presence of the barrows close by, may also represent a Bronze Age barrow... ' If this is a Bronze Age barrow, it would be a site of national importance and of equivalent significance to a scheduled monument (and therefore come within the scope of NPPF Footnote 63 which states that non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest, which are demonstrably of equivalent significance to scheduled monuments, should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets '. Barrows are a type of Bronze Age funerary monument that was once a distinctive feature of the heathland landscape of this area. Prehistoric barrows are an important historic element today 's multi-period landscapes, where they often occupy prominent locations and frequently form the earliest visible evidence of human occupation. Their considerable variation of form and longevity as a monument type provides important information on the diversity of beliefs and social organisations in early prehistoric society and on the landscape within which they were constructed. Most examples of prehistoric barrows, both nationally and regionally, date from the Bronze Age. Most have been reduced or levelled by later cultivation, or enveloped by forestry</p>	



Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>or built development, and those barrows that survive in good condition and within a rural landscape setting are of especially high regional and national significance and public value. The cross dyke probably dates from the Mid-Late Bronze Age, although it may have been re-used later. It is likely to have served as a territorial boundary marker, probably demarcating land allotment within or between communities, although it may also have been used as a trackway or defensive earthwork. Cross dykes are one of the few monument types which illustrate how land was divided up in the prehistoric period and they are of considerable importance for any analysis of settlement and land use in the Bronze Age. Very few have survived to the present day and hence all well preserved examples are considered to be of national importance. The conjunction of a cross dyke with a barrow cemetery here at Horton Common is unusual and particularly significant. In the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), scheduled monuments are at the highest grade of designated heritage asset. Key aspects of the significance of the scheduled prehistoric barrows and the cross-dyke earthwork, which are particularly relevant to the proposal, are their close relationship with topography, landform and the surrounding landscape, and with each other. Potential impacts of the proposed allocation Potential physical impact on buried archaeological remains With regard to direct physical impacts of quarrying activity, there is very little existing information on the potential archaeological implications of quarrying on this site. The site has been subject to a walk-over survey as part of the recent Archaeological Assessment, and some archaeological features noted (mentioned above). However no measured survey, geophysical survey or archaeological trial trenching has been undertaken. The existing archaeological evidence indicates that Bronze Age funerary activity was spread across the area here, and suggests that contemporary settlement was situated nearby. The Archaeological Assessment report regards potential for unrecorded archaeological features or further Bronze Age remains as 'relatively limited' or low (paras 5.19, 6.3), despite the fact that monuments from this period represent the bulk of the archaeological sites in this area, and indicate an active presence during the period. However, in view of the type of landscape here and the lack of archaeological investigation and recording, it cannot be assumed that Bronze Age or other prehistoric remains are absent from the site. Archaeological sites in this kind of landscape can be difficult to identify without detailed investigation, especially for the kinds of human activity likely to have taken place here in the prehistoric period, which might leave traces in the form of flint tools or flint-working debris, or burning, pits, post-holes and ritual deposits etc. Also significant are sites containing palaeoenvironmental and geoarchaeological evidence of changes in the local landscape as a result of human activity, but again methodical investigation is usually required in order to identify potential sources of such evidence. The presence of the barrows indicates that contemporary Bronze Age settlement was situated nearby. The location of the accompanying settlement sites occupied by barrow communities is often unknown, as the sites are usually only found by archaeological survey and investigation. It is generally assumed that the communities lived on lower ground. However, this depends on the local topography and drainage, and allowance also needs to be made for dispersal of community activity, including ritual and funerary activity, across the landscape. Here for instance, the ridge and hilltop around Monmouth Ash and St David 's Cross are a good candidate for further sites of funerary activity. However, the presence of the single barrow on Redman 's Hill, and the barrow cemetery and cross dyke on the lower land to the east of the proposal site, shows that Bronze Age funerary activity was not limited to the higher ground and indicates that there is potential for Bronze Age activity,</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>including settlement, in the area between these barrow groups, including the site of the proposed quarry AS27. Thus there is potential for remains of further Bronze Age activity to survive in the area of the site. Any sites in the area containing archaeological or palaeoenvironmental evidence of human occupation during the prehistoric period, especially the Bronze Age, would be highly significant both for their own intrinsic interest and for their potential contribution to an understanding of the archaeological and environmental context of the neighbouring scheduled monuments in their landscape setting. Importantly, any archaeological sites here would also have their own setting and associative value in relation to the scheduled barrows, thereby enhancing their heritage significance. Additionally, any significant Bronze Age remains discovered on the site site (e.g. relating to settlement or funerary sites) are likely to be of national importance and come within the scope of NPPF Footnote 63, referred to above. Further assessment of potential impact on buried archaeological remains The potential presence of archaeological remains on the proposed extraction site, and the consequent need for mitigation through amendments to site layout or post-extraction site restoration, or through archaeological investigation and recording, could have a very significant effect on the potential for quarrying in the area. For instance, the cost of archaeological mitigation can affect the viability of commercial extraction, or if the archaeological remains are of such high significance that in situ preservation is required, this could prevent quarrying of the site. Any significant Bronze Age funerary or settlement remains discovered on the site could be of national importance and subject to the policies for designated heritage assets, with a presumption for preservation in situ . In areas where waterlogged archaeological remains are present, the potential impacts of quarrying on drainage and groundwater levels, and thus on the preservation of the remains, needs to be taken into account. It is therefore essential that the allocation site is properly assessed, in order to inform the principle of mineral extraction. With regard to assessment of physical impacts on heritage assets, the Archaeological Assessment report recommends only limited 'sampling' by geophysical survey of the proposal site (para 6.3). However, as there is potential for archaeological remains in the proposal site, and the presence of archaeological remains could have a significant effect on the potential for quarrying, we would expect the site to be subject to field evaluation through survey and ground investigation (including measured earthwork survey, geophysical survey and archaeological trial trenching), in order to identify and investigate any below-ground archaeological remains present within the affected areas. An initial desk assessment has been undertaken (the Archaeological Assessment report), which adequately summarises the existing information. If the site is to be carried forward as a potential mineral extraction site, we consider it essential that staged field evaluation is undertaken beforehand. For further advice on archaeological assessment and mitigation, we refer you to the local authority advisor on archaeological matters, Steve Wallis, Senior Archaeologist at Dorset County Council. Heritage setting considerations The primary heritage concern here is the proposed impact of the quarry development on the setting and significance of the Scheduled Monuments in the surrounding area. The setting of a heritage asset defined as: The surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral. ' (NPPF Annex 2); PPS 5 Practice Guide para. 113). All heritage assets have a topographical presence and a setting, including those consisting primarily of</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>buried archaeological deposits. Assessment of impact on setting for planning purposes should take account of the whole of an asset 's setting, irrespective of current public accessibility. NPPF and HE setting guidance are clear on this point: The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting. This will vary over time and according to circumstances. ' (NPPF Planning Practice Guidance: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment , What is the setting of a heritage asset and how should it be taken into account? ' para. 013; Historic England, The setting of heritage assets (Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 ) This is relevant to heritage assets and their surroundings which, for reasons of ownership or land use, are not at present readily accessible to the public (as is the case with the barrow east of Monmouth Ash, and perhaps other monuments here at Horton Heath). Impacts of development proposals on all areas of an asset 's setting need to be taken into account. Also relevant to the proposal is that impacts on setting are not limited to visual impacts alone. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which an asset is experienced in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust, smells and activity in the vicinity. Importantly for the present proposal, setting is also influenced by our understanding of the historic or archaeological context of the asset and the relationship or association between historic places (see comments below on associative value). The implications of cumulative change also need to be taken into account when assessing proposals which may affect the setting of a heritage asset. Here, this would include consideration of the solar farm development lying between the site and the barrow cemetery and cross dyke to the east. Associative value Any evidence of prehistoric land use found within the proposal site, especially during the period of the Bronze Age barrows and cross dyke, would be highly significant for an understanding of the archaeological and environmental context of the monuments in their setting. In addition to their intrinsic archaeological interest, the scheduled monuments and any other archaeological sites or remains surviving within and around the site will have ' associative value '. Associative value derives from significant inter-relationships or associations between heritage assets. It is linked to (but not limited to) visual association, and contributes to the setting, context and significance of a heritage asset. It also increases the sensitivity of those assets to developments which impact on their associative relationships. The associative relationships most relevant to the present development proposal are the physical and visual relationship between the various barrows and the cross dyke, and between these and any other significant places in the historic landscape. The surviving landform of the proposal site forms a key part of the associative link, increasing its sensitivity to development. Importantly, any archaeological sites identified within the proposal site would also have an associative relationship with the nearby scheduled monuments, thereby increasing the sensitivity of the site to quarry development. Potential impact of the proposed development on the settings of heritage assets The Archaeological Assessment report provides an assessment of potential impact of the proposed development on the setting of the scheduled monuments near the proposal site. It assesses that the proposed quarry would not result in changes that would affect the settings of designated heritage assets. However, in our view many of the key arguments presented in the report do not withstand close scrutiny, and we do not think that the report 's assessment is sound. In our view the report does not provide a sufficiently thorough assessment, or sufficient illustrative coverage of the potential visual impact of the proposed</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>quarry (e.g. through the use of a ZTV map and photomontages) to support its claim that there would be no impact. Views of and from the barrows around the proposal site, are only selectively assessed in the study. The Monmouth 's Ash barrow was not visited and the potentially important views from this site were not properly assessed. The settings of the scheduled monuments on the east side of the proposal site are not properly assessed, and there is lack of assessment of the associative and visual relationships between the monuments on the east and west sides of the site, and the potential impact of the proposed quarry on them. We also consider that the significance of the context and relationship of the monuments to the local topography and landform is too narrowly interpreted in the Archaeological Assessment report, and that this aspect is consequently under-assessed. The small size of some barrows is cited as lessening their contribution to the appearance of the landscape, and thereby lessening their significance in landscape terms, but again this is partial and selective: their significance as viewpoints needs fuller assessment. These points are discussed in more detail below. The relationship of prehistoric barrows to their local landscape and topography is a key factor of their heritage significance. They combined a funerary and ritual function with that of territorial marker, and are often prominently sited on features such as hills, ridges and river valley terraces. The two barrows east of Monmouth Ash, for instance, stand on a prominent ridge between the broad vale to the west, and the low-lying heathlands to the east. The barrows on the lower ground to the east lie in positions that give them a local prominence by virtue of their siting within the plateau or on the edge of the valley of the River Crane. The cross dyke similarly lies in a locally prominent position on a low spur. Barrows were designed to be seen and to serve both as landmarks and as viewpoints for the surrounding landscape. In heritage setting terminology, these sites incorporate primary intentional ' or designed ' views to and from the surrounding landscape, their location being carefully chosen to be clearly visible from the surrounding area and at the same time providing views across their surroundings. The topographical relationships of these monuments to their surroundings can still be appreciated. Their associative relationships with the landscape and with each other are key factors of their heritage significance. The barrows and the cross dyke would have overlooked lands grazed by the local Bronze Age communities, serving as ceremonial and territorial markers. Local variations or features in the topography are likely to have been significant to the builders of the barrows, influencing their size and position and their relationship and intervisibility with particular places in the local landscape, including other barrows and sites in the surrounding area. The conjunction of the barrow cemetery with the cross dyke boundary earthwork reflects their territorial significance. It is significant that the larger barrow on the ridge at Monmouth's Ash, and the Horton Heat cross dyke were both used in later centuries to mark the course of parish boundaries " a graphic illustration of their significance as local landmarks over several millennia, and of their important relationship with other elements of the historic landscape dating from later periods. The historic landform containing the scheduled monuments provides more than a simple visual context. Whilst visual setting is clearly important, the wider perceptions and experience of the surroundings, and the potential archaeological interest or evidential value ' embodied in these surroundings and in the associative relationships between heritage assets, are also important to the setting and heritage significance of the affected monument. The Archaeological Assessment report (para. 5.13) acknowledges that changes to historic landform can be harmful to the significance of heritage assets, but contends that the site of the proposed quarry does not contribute to the</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>significance of the Monmouth's Ash barrow and that the proposed quarry would not 'obscure' views across the landscape to the other barrows or monuments. We are not persuaded by these claims for several reasons: they are not supported by illustrative evidence (e.g. ZTV map, photomontages etc.); the assessment is partial (views from the Monmouth's Ash barrow were not obtained), and does not consider the settings of all the monuments potentially in view; the report's arguments are too narrow, failing to recognise the full contribution of the historic landform to the visual setting and associative relationships that also contribute to setting; the assessment that the quarry would not 'obscure views' [from Monmouth's Ash barrow to other barrows] fails to address the impact of the quarry in detracting from views across the landscape. Contrary to the claim of the Archaeological Assessment report that 'the proposals will not result a change to the current situation' and thus have no impact on the settings of the scheduled monuments in the area (para 6.4), we consider that there would be a significant difference, physically as well as visually, between the positive contribution made by the present landform which forms an essential part of the setting of the monuments, and the potentially significantly harmful impact that the proposed quarry and the post-extraction quarry void would have on the settings and significance of the affected heritage assets. Screening by vegetation We also consider that the report places too much reliance on screening by vegetation, which here is either open birch woodland (to the west of the site around the scheduled barrow north of David 's Cross) or hedges and trees cited as obscuring views of the scheduled barrow near Monmouth Ash (Archaeological Assessment report paras 5.7, 5.11, 5.13). However, the vegetation should be considered as relatively transient in terms of the settings of prehistoric monuments in the landscape; the key factor is the historic landform. Despite the changes in the surface vegetation of the area over the last four millennia, from Bronze Age farmland to heathland, to modern enclosed farmland, the landform has survived. Moreover, trees and hedges are subject to seasonal variation, and are without leaves for most of the year, which much reduces their screening effect. They are also subject to natural loss and management activities such as felling and cutting. Also it is not clear whether the vegetation in question is within the control of the applicant. Some of it at least would appear not to be, and so the continued presence of the vegetation, and any screening it may offer, cannot be guaranteed by the applicant. For these various reasons we do not consider that significant weight should be given to the claims that views will be screened by vegetation. Further work for the assessment of impact on the settings of heritage assets As outlined above, we do not consider that the Archaeological Assessment report provides sufficient assessment of potential impacts on settings of heritage assets, or sufficient illustrative coverage of the visual settings of assets, or of the potential visual impact of the proposed quarry, to support its claims that the proposed quarry would have no impact on the settings of designated heritage assets. We consider that these potential impacts require fuller assessment. A basic issue for assessment of impact on the setting of heritage assets is the extent and degree of visibility of the development. Lack of tall upstanding structures does not mean that the quarry will not be visible. As with solar arrays (for which ZTV analysis is standard) the proposed development here would be visible both from close quarters and from the rising ground to the west. Within the 'visual envelope' certain views will be especially significant to the setting and significance of the heritage assets under assessment. In visual terms, views of the prehistoric barrows (and the cross dyke) from the immediate and surrounding landscape, and views from these sites into their surroundings, are essential to an appreciation and</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>understanding of the monuments, and a key aspect of their heritage significance and public value. (Views here should be understood as dynamic views moving through the landscape, and sensitive to subtle variations in topography and viewpoints.) For significant new development such as this, we would generally expect proposals to be supported by information in the form of ZTV maps, photographs of representative views, and photomontages depicting the appearance of the proposed development from selected viewpoints, and showing affected heritage assets in conjunction with the proposed development. Viewpoint locations will depend on the ZTV, the nature of the heritage assets, and their position relative to the development. We therefore recommend: ZTV map(s) should be provided to indicate the extent of visibility of the proposed quarrying. This would be informative in its own right and provide the necessary context for the selection of photographic viewpoints and for discussion of visual impacts in the text. photographs should be provided from several viewpoints within or around the site, to illustrate the visual impacts of the development in views from any of the surrounding monuments in view, along with views from third points where the development is seen in conjunction with the scheduled monuments. photomontages should be provided from selected viewpoints (based on the results of the above ZTV and viewpoint analysis), depicting the form of the proposed development in its operational and post-restoration phases. With regard to views and viewpoints, it is important that views looking east from the two barrows on the ridge east of Monmouth Ash Farm are properly assessed, to investigate the visibility of the proposed development and its potential impact on the understanding and appreciation of the relationship of the barrow(s) to the surrounding landscape, including the proposal site, and to the Bronze Age barrows and cross dyke to the east. Similarly, potential views of and from the barrow cemetery and cross dyke should be assessed. The report states (para 5.11) that these were not assessed due to the intervening solar farm. However, we do not consider that this is a justifiable reason, as the solar farm is a temporary development whereas the proposed quarry would be a permanent feature in the landscape. Historic England position Historic England acknowledges the importance of adequate supplies of minerals and the priority given in planning policy to strategic mineral extraction. We support the allocation of new sites provided extraction can be achieved without harm to important heritage assets. With regard to potential archaeological impact, the Archaeological Assessment report regards potential for unrecorded archaeological features or further Bronze Age remains as 'relatively limited' or low. However, in our view there has been insufficient assessment of the site to support this claim, and in view of the presence of several Bronze Age sites nearby, we consider that there is a higher potential for archaeological sites within the proposal site, potentially including remains of national importance. With regard to impact on the settings of heritage assets, the proposed quarry would remove a section of historic landform and landscape that is significant for the heritage settings of scheduled monuments in the adjacent area, and therefore harm setting and significance of the monuments. This would be a permanent effect, as there is currently no proposal for reinstatement of the quarried area to existing ground levels. The cumulative impact of the quarrying also needs to be considered in combination with the nearby solar farm, as together they would represent an extensive area of modern development within the settings of the designated heritage assets, and in a sensitive Dorset Heathland landscape. Although the precise level of impact and harm is not possible to determine at present, due to the shortcomings of the present heritage assessment noted above, it is already clear that the harm to the</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>settings of heritage assets, and to buried archaeological remains could be very significant, and certainly significant enough to be an important material planning consideration, where the conservation of heritage significance and avoidance of harm should be given great weight. Relevant NPPF policies include those relating to the historic environment in paragraphs 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 196, 197, 199, 200. We do not consider that the present proposal satisfies the requirements of NPPF paragraph 189 regarding the need for sufficient information to understand the potential impact on the significance of affected heritage assets. The present documentation in support of the proposal does not adequately address the potential impact of the development on the scheduled monuments around the site, and there is a lack of information and assessment of the potential archaeological implications of quarry development on the proposal site itself. As a result there is a risk of underestimating the potential harm to designated and non-designated heritage assets, and of undue harm being caused to heritage assets. It has not been demonstrated that the mineral extraction could be achieved without undue harm to heritage assets. The lack of sufficient information means that one is unable to properly assess the proposal, or avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset 's conservation and any aspect of the proposal, as required by NPPF para.190. Recommendation Historic England is unable to support the proposal as it presently stands. We therefore recommend that before a decision is taken in relation to this suggested additional allocation for quarrying development, a fuller assessment as suggested above should be undertaken of the potential impact of the proposed development, both in relation to ground impacts on archaeological remains and in relation to impacts on the settings of the surrounding scheduled monuments and any other archaeological sites that may exist in the site. With the lack of information it cannot be assumed that extraction could be undertaken here without significant harm to heritage assets. As such the proposal as it stands is contrary to national planning policy, as summarised above, including NPPF policies in paragraphs 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 196, 197, 199, 200. If, after appropriate evaluation, it is found that there are no significant archaeological implications for quarrying on the site, then it might be possible to design a quarrying scheme which mitigates the harmful impacts on the settings of the surrounding scheduled assets through an extraction and restoration scheme which reinstates the site to existing contour levels within a clearly defined timescale. We hope our comments will assist you in taking an appropriate position regarding this potential site.</p>	
221963	Holt Parish Council					Thank you for notifying us of this consultation. Members have discussed the proposal and wish to submit their concerns regarding traffic movements to and from the site and how this will impact on Holt Parish. Members would be interested to view the traffic management scheme if possible please.	
483068	Resident	Yes	No	Sound	Positively prepared	It would appear that it has the advantage of not damaging the local environment, relative to its benefit	No
814085	Resident					I was very saddened to receive this email. Verwood is a wonderful community and has already received unwelcomed plans to extract minerals to the east of the town in the forest from Hampshire. The area that you have chosen is a peaceful location used by many walkers, cyclist and riders it will also add to noisy and heavy vehicles on our roads here. . The wildlife and locals have in recent times been much disturbed by the building of large solar farms here. This is a place for deer, foxes and badgers, lizards, owls and buzzards. A the moment it's still special please don't take more away from the Verwood residents. We still don't have an upper school for our children, a swimming pool or out of hours emergency heath	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						care such as a local hospital or GP services. There are few shops, limited parking in the centre and not buses in the evenings making visiting our hospitals in Bournemouth or Poole impossible in the evening. If you want Verwood to continue to be a happy place to live in, please don't plague us with more mineral sites on all sides. This is our home, I sometimes think planners just don't consider people to be import. Please try to fight this for us, we really don't want it.	
1196218	Resident						
1196466	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know			no I do not. This is an important area for wildlife and the mitigation and restoration plans will not adequately compensate for the disturbance to the habitats. There will be unpredictable effects on the hydrology of the area and on species who rely on migrating between adjacent habitats, due to the mosaic nature of the ecology of this area. It is a particularly important area for reptiles.	probably
1196536	Resident	Yes	No	Sound	Consistent with national policy	No on the basis criterion 1 will have an impact on properties reliant on the water table for supplies And 19 on the basis that none of the local roads are capable of coping with the sddiadditittraffuc from thus and the waste site development on the Horton Road.	The considerations should be updated to reflect the impact of this and the waste development on the HirtHo Road to the locals, especially the impact of the ecoligeacol damage and resulting deterioration in air quality due to tge number of large diesel lorries seeking access to the A31/A338.
1196563	Resident	No	Don't Know			I believe that this Mineral site will be devastating to wildlife. I ride my horse along these bridle paths, the wildlife that it will effect is terrible, badgers, fox's, deer and all the birds and reptiles that we see on our pleasurable and very peaceful hacks is of great concern. My other concern is that the bridle paths them selves near to the site will be to dangerous for horse and rider to use. This will affect many horse riders in the surrounding areas of Wimborne, Verwood Three Cross Woodlands etc due to this. We, as horse riders all try to avoid having to go on the roads if we possibly can due to risking our lives with some particular drivers !! If this work goes ahead, not only will it be fatal for the wild life it could also be fatal to a horse rider !	This site should not go ahead!!
1196593	Resident					My objections are as follows: I live locally in Three Legged Cross. The site will have a detrimental effect for users of bridleways in the area of the site, including myself. I use the paths for cycling and dog walking. Currently it is very quiet and peaceful. Having heavy machinery and lorries working there would pose a danger to those using these paths. My second objection is the fact that the roads in the area could not cope with the additional traffic. The Horton Road simply cannot accommodate up to 80 lorry movements a day. If a lorry movement is a lorry going in and the same lorry coming out, it is really 160 movements. The works out at a lorry every three minutes during an eight hour day. None of the routes from the site would be suitable, eg via Horton, West Moors, Three Legged Cross, Ashley Heath or Verwood. If the proposal does go ahead it should be on a much reduced scale, with a restriction of 20 lorries per day. I hope these points will be taken into consideration.	
1196671	Resident	No	Don't Know	Unsound	Justified	I live on the Horton Road and currently experience a lot of noise and air pollution from the large amount of traffic using this road. It is a "C" class road and in a very poor state of repair as it was never intended for such a large amount of traffic and such a high percentage of HGV's. This increases significantly from March to October due to the influx of tourists to this area as there are numerous caravan parks, B&B's, sited along this road. With the soon to be built extension to the industrial estate at Woolsbridge and the household recycling centre this just adds	Restrictions of the number of vehicles to a very low level and working hours could be a consideration however the fact that this will be ongoing for 17 years would prolong this negative experience for the local residents.



Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						to the congestion and air pollution. This road is therefore unsuitable for the proposed 80 lorries/160 vehicle movements per day. This tally does not include staff working at the site and other vehicles movements for equipment etc. House values for properties in the vicinity will plummet and air quality will seriously suffer.	
1196860	Resident	Yes	Yes	Unsound	Positively prepared	<p>I am not qualified to comment on the soundness of the exact location and effect on local amenities and natural resources and habitat as i do not live in the vicinity of the proposed site itself. However, i am qualified to comment on the extremely detrimental knock-on effect that the inclusion of this site will have on the local transport infrastructure. As a resident of Horton Road close to the Ashley Heath interchange i am all too aware of the increasing traffic congestion and extreme noise pollution caused by large volumes of industrial and heavy traffic rumbling down a road that was never intended to carry such weights. From Three Legged Cross to Ashley Heath, Horton Road is essentially a residential road and is not designed to endure the constant stream of inappropriate traffic. The road is not in good condition and can only deteriorate further which in itself generates noise and physical shuddering of properties alongside the road. At the risk of seeming to be 'NIMBYISH' about this it is not unreasonable for residents to complain about the loss of quality of living which has been exacerbated by the ever growing industrial parks/delivery hubs that have developed since home owners moved into what they imagined to be a rural backwater. One example of the problems experienced are transporter lorries carrying mobile homes which are far too wide to fit into their designated lane, with no escort vehicles, causing all oncoming traffic to observe and react by stopping half on the kerb to allow passage. And when two large lorries come head on- tail backs ensue until they have sorted themselves out. Notwithstanding the obvious expansion of the Woolsbridge industrial estate - and the inevitability of yet more lorries travelling up and down Horton Road, the prospect of a significant number of sand lorries every day is appalling and extremely damaging. Only last week we were witness to a fatality right outside my property, the latest of an increasing number of r.t.a.s along the road - which demonstrates just one aspect of the increasing traffic flow and hazards that have to be managed by local drivers along the road. I was made aware recently that there had been a plan once upon a time to divert the industrial traffic to a new exit point onto the A31 at Azalea Roundabout; might this plan, which obviously didn't see the light of day, be resurrected to provide a fit-for-purpose channel for industrial traffic thus allowing Horton Road to revert to its original usage patterns? There is some acknowledgement of potential traffic congestion in the Plan, but this seems to be more of a nod than a real intention to consider this a meaningful drawback. Ref point 17 in overall summary: Lorries travelling from the site to the A31 will pass through Three Legged Cross and Ashley Heath and could have an impact. Let me assure you that this deserves more than the throwaway reference it appears to be: it is NOT a hypothetical outcome. It will happen and it will be extremely disruptive. Please do consider the impact of this very seriously.</p>	Yes - it needs to have a bespoke access to the A31 with a new road, which will also take other industrial traffic

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1195628	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound		No! I certainly do not think that AS27, land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan. As a regular user of the bridleways in the area affected by the proposed plan, I feel the impact on those accessing this beautiful area will be massive. I regularly meet walkers, cyclists and horse riders out exploring and cannot believe that the peace and tranquility, not to mention the landscape and wildlife, will be shattered and ruined by the proposed development. The site does not lend itself to safe and easy access for the large volume of heavy goods vehicles that will be used should the plan go ahead. In short, were the proposal accepted, it would exclude all other peaceful, recreational users and effectively deny access to the bridleways and footpaths currently in use in the area. Put the countryside first and reject the plan, please.	
1196219	Resident	No	Don't Know	Unsound	Justified	Absolutely not! This area has so many aspects that should be considered. Scientific interest, Green Belt, impact on local schools and roads, the access to the site, local residence...The list is endless. Because this may benefit the councils, the usual regulations for planning have been forgotten!! We can't cough without having planning permission refused, yet a 400 acre site can be extracted for 17 + years ... Really?	It simply should not be included!
1196273	Resident	Don't Know	No	Unsound	Justified	No. I regularly cycle, walk, and run on the bridleways and footpaths surrounding the site. I am very familiar with the site, and object to its inclusion on the grounds of aesthetic, environmental and traffic concerns. Aesthetic: The site AS27 is a valuable leisure resource. The adjacent site AS08 is already an historic quarry, which has been mismanaged and not restored to any natural or valuable habitat. In short, it is a mess and a very poor precedent. I am strongly opposed to seeing further areas of unspoiled landscape going the same way. Environmental: Water, air and noise pollution, destruction of habitat. Traffic: The road junction at Clump Hill is already dangerous, and the Horton Road is inadequate to carry an additional 50-80 heavy trucks every day. The road traffic accident statistics for this road are already tragic reading, and can only worsen with additional traffic.	n/a. The site should not be included in the plan.
1196423	Resident	Don't Know	Yes	Unsound	Justified; Effective; Consistent with national policy	I regularly ride my horse along the bridleways surrounding this land. Allowing the quarry to operate as planned will make the bridleways unsafe as the heavy machinery noise and traffic will pose a risk to horses and their riders. During my rides I encounter deer and other wildlife that will also be threatened by the disruptive nature of the machinery and extraction process. I did not see any reference in the consultation guidelines for handling noise levels. This is inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework - Section 11, paragraphs 109 and 123 - as well as technical guidance from the Planning Practice Guideline -- paragraphs 19-22 in the Minerals chapter. Sound from the heath carries far across the valley encompassing farms, heathland, homes and businesses.	Yes absolutely.
1196420	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know			I don't wish this land to be included as it will have an enormous impact on the amount of traffic on the Horton Road, and will cause what is already a hazardous junction at Clump Hill to be a death trap for sure! I use many bridleways in the vicinity and these will be directly effected by the works so limiting their availability. It is such a beautiful area, peaceful, and awash with wildlife such as deer, woodpeckers, buzzards etc and it would be a tragedy so see this eliminated.	
1196548	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Sound	Consistent with national policy	I use the bridleways that will act as boundary to the intended site weekly. It is an area full of much wildlife, buzzards, dears, foxes and amphibians. Bridleways will be unsafe to use with large plant and lorries moving about the site. We are in an area of a minimal bridleway network and I for one, do not feel safe riding on the increasingly busy local road network so seek to ride off road/along bridleways as	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						much as possible. The local road network is also not suitable for the proposed approx 80'per days lorries moving around the area.	
1196575	Resident	No	No	Unsound		The Horton Rd now is already a very busy road, really not a road, but a large lane, not intended for a lot of traffic certainly not suitable for the heavy traffic that already uses the road, from the ever growing business park estate, which is right by the proposed site for sand removal. I have lived here for 15 years and the traffic has more than tripled in that time, which is not good, we already have extra movements from the new St Ives House nursing home, and with the added traffic from Moors Valley Country Park and weekly car boots, cannot get in and out of our roads onto the Horton Rd very easily. The road has been repaired in places, but still needs attention in places, this will be in vain with the 80 odd lorries churning up the road, and from what I hear 80 lorries is being very conservative. Now the nitty gritty this is a Residential AREA, lots of farms, listed houses, dense residential housing, many elderly people. It will effect our way of life, spoil our countryside, and at worse lower our house prices, which is not what we want, who wants to live near a sand extraction plant, with the dust, noise and pollution of the air, we want fresh air to breathe. So NO we do not want this to happen here. This is my declaration of a No.	
1196638	Resident	No	Yes	Unsound	Justified	I strongly object to the inclusion of land at Horton Heath in the Mineral Sites Plan. Horton Heath has already been subjected to a large Solar Farm, and an adjacent smaller scale quarry, with impacts on wildlife and human enjoyment of the area. The land that is left should remain as it is for the benefit of wildlife and the local population. The site proposed is surrounded by Rights of Way, which are used regularly on a daily basis for walking, running, cycling and horse riding. The proposed quarry site would have a severe negative impact on such use, also severely restricting access to suitable land for human recreation. Close to the site are historic buildings, monuments, and homes that currently draw drinking water from a well. There is a very great risk that the local hydrology will be destroyed by the activities of the quarry, and damage caused to the historic buildings and monuments, as well as to wildlife, and onwards to the River Crane. The quarry activities within what is a farming and residential area will create huge amounts of dust and other air pollution, and noise. The existing Solar Farm is adjacent to the proposed site and the settling dust will surely reduce the effectiveness of this 'green' source of energy. I live close to the site and believe the proposal will impact on my families health and wellbeing due to the air and noise pollution. There is no mention in the proposal of where the quarried sand and gravel will be processed. If the Processing Plant is to be on-site, the extra land used for this and its inherent extra noise and air pollution really will make the area hell for residents. If the sand and gravel is to be processed off-site this leads to another issue. The proposal is for 80 lorries a day, 160 vehicle movements. Horton Road is a C class lane, not even a B class road. Horton Road is already subject to overuse by a wide range of vehicles, including HGV's, which becomes worse as you approach Three Legged Cross. This will only get worse with the extension to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate and proposed Recycling Plant. Nearer to the proposed site there is planning for a mobile home park for 59 units, further adding to the daily congestion. These 160 quarry lorry daily movements are bad enough, but if they are travelling to an off-site processing plant, the constant filth from the lorries on the road, caused by the water draining from the extracted sand and gravel will cause dirty, mud encrusted roads, spray and very	The current quarry at Redmans Hill, adjacent to the proposed site with the same access is restricted to 7 vehicles a day, between 0800-1300. Any inclusion of this site would need to follow that same restriction.

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>dangerous road conditions for the current road users, which includes a large number of cyclist who daily enjoy the routes around this area. Having previously lived near to a quarry I know just how bad the road conditions will be. The road surface will be contaminated to Three Legged Cross and beyond, making the roundabouts especially dangerous. The proposed access to the site from Horton Road is currently single track, being a supposed temporary access for construction of the solar farm, which has not been reinstated. To widen this would mean further damage to the environment, hedgerows, trees etc. The access point is on a derestricted section of C class lane, near to Clump Hill, and lorries waiting to turn into the access, and lorries pulling out laden will cause a very real risk to other road users, as currently all vehicles driving on this section of Horton Road do so at speeds between 50-80mph. The proposal, if included on the Mineral Sites Plan will also cause an unfair reduction of property values for residents in the area.</p>	
1196724	Resident	No	Yes	Unsound	Consistent with national policy	<p>I don 't think that land at Horton Heath should be included. My and my family have lived in this area for 18 years! we have done endless walks, biking, exploring... please don 't destroy peace, wildlife and landscape. it will have a huge impact on our lives. It 's bad as it is with the volume of cars and lorries roaring day and night. 80 lorries a day?! shocking.</p>	
929068	Resident	Don't Know	No	Unsound	Justified	<p>No I do not think A S27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included in the Mineral Sites Plan. My Reasons are as follows;- 80 lorries per day = 160 journeys. The Horton Road just cannot sustain this amount of traffic. If there is an accident (and there often is) the road is closed and there is nowhere else to go without at least a 10 mile detour. The surrounding area is also unable to accommodate the impact of this amount of heavy lorry traffic. During road works we are grid locked and I repeat no viable alternative route. If there was a fire, serious illness or accident then the emergency vehicles would be impeded by the increased traffic and we, as rural residents could be prevented from emergency care. 80 Lorries per day. Is that 7 days a week or just the working week? Local residents who rely on well water could have their supply affected. The dust from the extraction process would have a detrimental affect on the environment and the wildlife and grazing stock animals. Noise would affect everyone in the surrounding area. Without buildings there would be no buffer to prevent noise carrying over long distances. Public rights of way would be affected by air quality, disruption by sound and the loss of wildlife to the surrounding area. Local SSI would be effected by pollution, noise and possibly water levels. Local monuments risk damage through vibration as do those residents in the immediate vicinity. The 'right to roam' would be curtailed</p>	<p>N/A as this site should not be granted permission. Should it go ahead then serious monitoring should take place and restrictions on operating hours should enforced and the number of days a week it can be operated should be curtailed.</p>

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						where lorries cross rights of way. Many residents are unaware of this planning application as only a handful of residents received notification. I am sure if this plan were made completely known to the wider public then the uproar would be staggering.	
1197053	Resident	Yes	Yes			I have no qualification to comment on the technical legality of this proposal. However, as a long-standing resident and retired Traffic Police Officer, I feel qualified to comment on the impact of extra LGV traffic for sure. In the 18 years I have lived at Three Legged Cross the traffic volume has increased hugely and there have been no significant improvements to the road infrastructure at all, aside from a footpath to West Moors on a short section of the B3072. The proposed relief road for Three Legged Cross was never implemented. The expansion of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate has meant a huge increase in LGV traffic on the C2 (Horton/Ringwood Road) and B3072. It is already dangerous to walk on the footpaths due to the close proximity to pedestrians of LGV parts, like mirrors. Such vehicles have no flexibility of course due to the narrow lane widths, so they travel close to the kerb. The noise and vibration from existing LGV traffic is considerable in adjacent dwellings like ours. General traffic has also increased, partly due to Moors Valley, the expansion of Verwood and the car boot sale. There are recent land developments near Woolsbridge Industrial Estate and Three Legged Cross that further reduce green space and will add to the traffic stress. The structure of the roads needs to be properly assessed as to suitability to cope with massive LGV traffic, as the surface condition is currently worse than ever. These roads were never designed with current, let alone the proposed level, of LGV traffic. The quarry vehicles could have max permissible weights of 26-32 tonnes each. I assume that by 80 movements per day, it actually means 2x80=160, as the vehicles would have to travel in and out? That is 20 movements per hour in the working day or 1 every 3 minutes! The extra diesel pollution, noise and vibration is unacceptable on roads lined with dwellings on all routes to the A-31. Aggregate LGVs are dirty machines and shed water, sand and stones on the roads, increasing the risk of damage to other vehicles. My experience suggests that many drivers of these vehicles are paid by the load and therefore tend to be under time pressure, which means that speeding and phone use while driving are common and cause obvious safety issues. The void caused by extraction will have to be restored and assurances will be needed that it will not be used for landfill waste. The suggestion in the supporting documents that no significant dust or pollution will result seems hard to believe. Site dust carried by prevailing winds will fall in Three Legged Cross and Verwood and an open scar will shed dust in strong winds, regardless of mechanical extraction. The loss of any green land is a serious issue and although the proposed site is 1km from most residences in the area, it is next to an SSSI and bridleways. It is very difficult to imagine that the degree of exploitation of the site will have no significant impact on the ecosystem	If the site was to be used I think there would have to be investment in the road infrastructure to mitigate the impact on road users and residents on the proposed routes to the A-31, none of which are suitable for this level of LGV traffic. The C2 and B3072 would effectively be a no-go area for pedestrians and cyclists with no safe routes that separate them from the LGVs that will pass every few minutes. What alternative routes will be offered? Ideally the construction of a relief road (Three Legged Cross to A-31) would take the worst of this traffic away from many residences and perhaps funding this should be a condition for those who will gain commercial benefit by extracting materials from the site. Reinforcement of the underlying road structures may be needed in places and at the very least, maintenance and resurfacing would have to be much more vigorous than it is at present. Vehicles used must have the very highest levels of emission control and road-friendly suspension and there must be a binding agreement on the maximum number of movements per day. There would need to be a clear agreement against use of the site for landfill. The impact on property values along the access routes and the ease of selling such properties, would need a proper assessment and residents should be compensated. Would I have bought my house knowing that a 30 tonne LGV laden with sand would be passing every few minutes? I probably not!

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						land profile, drainage, contaminants etc. It appears that there will also be an impact on the historic landscape, which is undesirable.	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1009040	Resident	Don't Know	Yes	Unsound	Justified	<p>This site should be deleted from the Plan for the following reasons: It will have an impact on wildlife and destroy habitats in a rural area which needs protection not destruction. This site is reasonably close to residences and two large communities and offers valuable recreational opportunities due to the many footpaths and bridleways surrounding it, which are well used. This must not be compromised. Extraction will generate both noise and pollution which is unacceptable in this quiet, rural locality. Addition of this number of HGVs to the surrounding roads is intrusive, damaging, dangerous and could be extortionately costly. Horton Road is a C class highway which was not designed or constructed to carry large numbers of heavy lorries. With the estimated 160 HGV movements expected from this site plus those already happening from the current industrial sites and forecast expansion (including a proposed waste disposal facility) the level of heavy traffic will be intolerable and unsustainable. This road is narrow (only 14 ft in places) has no cycle lanes and no footpath on either one or both sides for the majority of its length. As well as serving the residential areas of Ashley Heath, Three Legged Cross, Verwood and villages to the north, it carries hundreds of thousands of visitors each year to Moors Valley Country Park (a nationally recognised leisure facility) and many caravan sites. The road has already become dangerous due to the current volume of traffic with may accidents, including fatalities. The junction with the A31 is regularly congested with stationary and crawling vehicles producing unacceptably high levels of pollution, noise and inconvenience. Heavy lorries thundering along this road every 4 minutes or less will make the lives of residents, especially those adjoining the highway, intolerable. If more traffic is permitted to use the road the cost and disruption caused by repairs and maintenance will be very high and will be borne by Dorset Council (ie the rate/tax payers). The entry/exit of slow moving HGVs onto this road at Clump Farm is dangerous and should not even be considered. Suggesting HGVs could travel via the village of West Moors is outrageous. Dust and fumes generated by the proposal will cause high levels of pollution in both the rural and residential areas, especially particulates which are now known to be very injurious to health. We must not promote schemes which cause any impact on our health. There are so many factors influencing the selection of this site which are not yet properly qualified that it is absurd to include it. All of the important parameters, hydrology (as it affects the nearby SSSI and residents taking water from a well), natural environment, transport issues and landscape, to mention just a few, have not been assessed and any one alone could present insurmountable practical or financial obstacles to development of this site. It is unacceptable to include it in the Plan with so many unanswered questions. To include it in the Plan and leave it till the detailed Planning stage to resolve all the issues is a waste of time and resources.</p>	<p>In the supporting documents there are statements that indicate that there are good transport links to the A31 including a route through the village of West Moors (section 15 on page 12 of Sustainable Appraisal of AS27, and Criterion C25 on page 8 of Site Assessment). This is patently not so and the comments must be replaced with a statement which refers to the difficult and potentially huge financial transport issues which would have to be resolved.</p>
1012222	Resident	No	Don't Know	Unsound	Justified	<p>The site is near SSSI so presume reptiles e.t.c are in the area or do outsiders having houses built for them in OUR AREAS come before our WILDLIFE? Horton road is already building more factories (all the trees cut down and an eye sore) and there is even talk of a Bulk Waste the area CANNOT take ANY MORE traffic. Horton Road is already a cut through for traffic from other areas and with the pollution from all these extra items that East Dorset is throwing at us locals the area will be filled with dust and fumes. We who live and pay rates in the area should decide on what happens not outsiders.</p>	<p>It is a ridiculous idea so leave alone, and why is Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole getting their hands on East Dorset land?</p>

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1195638	Resident	Don't Know	Yes	Unsound	Effective	<p>I wish to object to the application to add this site to the County 's Mineral Sites Plan Criteria C25 - Are the access proposals acceptable “ Once on the C2 there are good links   I strongly disagree with this throw away comment on the proposal. The quickest physical review of the road structures used to access this site would show that they are not fit for purpose. The 5 mile long route leading to the proposed site along the Horton Road (leading into the Ringwood Road through Three legged Cross and reappearing as the Horton Road) has many homes and residential streets directly accessing the road. There is particular concern for motorists emerging from Woolsbridge Road who have a restricted view of traffic driving from the East. Lorry drivers on tight schedules are more likely to be unprepared for those creeping forward for a better view. There are 3 speed cameras on the route which reinforces how dangerous this route is considered to be. In addition the mobile speed camera unit is often used at other positions along the route. ( The latest fatality occurring over the week end of 5 January 2019.) A speed camera cannot be installed unless there is concern for safety supported by historical data on traffic incidents. The tolerance level for the number of large lorries using the C2 must already be close to or exceeding its optimum. Particular with the current extension the Woolsbridge industrial park. Adding at least a further 80 large lorry movements a day would unacceptably raise the risk of death or serious injury to car passengers, the many cyclists (with no cycle paths available along the whole route) and pedestrians/dog walkers who access the countryside via the numerous access points, including the very busy Moors Valley Country park . The road measures a mere 20 feet at the junction with Ashley Park rather than the more normal 24 feet. The narrowness of the road and adjacent pavement (with no band of grass between the path and the road) makes walking along here quite harrowing at this moment in time, without adding further large lorries to the traffic flow. I understand that the signs restricting overtaking near the St Ives Care home are only there as the road is too narrow for the more conventional double white lines. The alternative route via West Moors also has a speed camera, again demonstrating the potential dangers associated with increasing the traffic flow through this small village. Finally, I fail to see that there could be any practical actions that could be introduced to mitigate the concerns with accessing this site along a series of C ' class roads. I would hope the Council would exercise its duty of care to those using its roads and take a more robust look at the implications of proceeding with this proposal which will introduce a significant increase in traffic to an already busy and dangerous road. As a result I do not understand how it is possible that this site could be considered as a late addition to the potential Mineral sites Plans for the County.</p>	



Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1196491	Resident	Don't Know	Yes	Unsound		<p>No. I do not think AS27 should be included in the MPA plan. There are a number of reasons why it should not be included and I cover the main ones below</p> <p><b>Traffic</b> The transit of very large lorries (8 wheel vehicles, capacity 20 tonnes) will cause many traffic problems, delays and contribute to an increase in accidents. The Horton Road and the roads from the Three Legged Cross roundabout to Verwood and West Moors, are completely unsuitable for the volume of traffic proposed. The proposal indicates that there will be 80 lorry movements per day which is one lorry every 6 minutes. This is a totally unacceptable level. Already, Horton Road is very busy and will become more so with the re-cycling centre being constructed at the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate coming into operation. Clump Hill crossroads is already an accident blackspot and will see a lot more traffic accessing the quarry site. The proposal seems to suggest that the track that was used (temporarily) to access the solar farm during its construction, will be used by the quarry HGV 's. This track is unsuitable for this purpose and anyway was going to be reinstated as agricultural land after the solar farm had been built. In addition, the HGVs will probably be carrying wet sand and gravel and, having traversed gravel tracks, will be covered in mud. This will be transferred to the public roads causing further traffic hazards.</p> <p><b>Environment and Amenity</b> The area is in the middle of a Green Belt area. It is bounded by several public footpaths and public bridleways. Many local people enjoy walking, cycling and horse riding through what is beautiful countryside with an abundance of all kinds of wildlife, including some rare species. Their enjoyment will be ruined by the noise, vibration and dust pollution of heavy machinery working nearby. Horses will be spooked by the closeness of large vehicles and machinery. Local horse riders will be forced to ride in other locations, using local unsuitable public roads to get there and this will add to traffic hazards. Originally, the area was going to be restored to its former heathland state, which would have enhanced the amenity. The proposal suggests reinstatement (after 17 years) will not seek to fill the void, but simply cover the workings with topsoil. This will completely alter the topography and render future restoration to heathland impossible. There are also a number of listed buildings and ancient burial sites which would be affected by the works. The destruction of this beautiful countryside and replacement by an industrial landscape, in a Green Belt area, would be a travesty and should not be permitted.</p> <p><b>Hydrology</b> This could be a major problem. The MPA initially identified this as a significant issue because the proposed site is adjacent to two SSSIs and the River Crane. The volume of the proposed extraction and the contours of the ground may cause adverse effects, including contamination, to private wells, watercourses and the delicate balance of the water table in the SSSIs. At present, in wet weather, some of bridleways and footpaths become muddy and waterlogged and this would be made worse by the quarrying.</p>	<p>The site should not be included in the plan. AS27 was not included in the initial MSP which has had several hearings and investigations. The site was added for consideration at the last moment (Dec 2018) and there is insufficient time to conduct full consultation with local people who were not previously involved with the draft MSP.</p>
1196594	Resident	Don't Know				<p>we believe that the proposal should offer guarantees on the following issues, namely;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Avoidance/mitigation proposals to validate the water( hydrological) impact on local waterways/ streams to ensure both drinking water quality/ bio-disk discharge to waterways are unaffected.</li> <li>2 compliance with Dorset heathlands SAC/SPA requirements and maintain the significant environmental contribution as a premier area of natural habitat and ornithological interest, particularly on bird migration pathways.</li> <li>3 detailed proposals on both noise and dust control impacting the area of Horton Heath, both on site and the transportation systems arriving/departing from the site.</li> <li>4 Maintenance of public and animal bridleways and interactive control policies to safe guard public use.</li> </ol>	<p>Control measures and detailed discussions on the local area/ impact should be addressed to all parties within 2 KM and restrictions placed to guarantee minimal impact to local residences and Dorset environment in general. The quarry should have limited daily visits and no weekend access.</p>

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1197196	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know			I am opposed to the use of this site. I use this area frequently for horse riding. This proposal would effectively mean the area would be unsuitable for horses and would impact on availability of suitable off road riding. The area is a home for wildlife and provides a green open space for residents to enjoy. The loss of this site would be detrimental to the walkers and riders who currently use it and would create an irreversible lose of habitat for wildlife Further the local road infrastructure is not suited to such an increase in heavy traffic. It would diminish air quality, increase noise pollution, cause congestion and present a hazard to other road users. The proximity of the site to the local community is such that the disruption and subsequent loss of the site for recreational use would have a significant negative impact.	
1197025	Resident					I would very much like to inform you of my horror at the thought of the proposed plan of mineral extraction at the Horton Road site. I am not qualified to comment on the actual detail as regards to the site of such a project, but I am qualified as a resident of Ashley Park, Ashley Heath to comment on the envisaged huge increase in heavy traffic that such a project would bring to a residential neighbourhood. The traffic is already excessive in the Summer months, and indeed all the time, and the amount of accidents that occur on sadly too frequent a basis, is proof of this. The proposed increase of up to 80 lorries a day on top of this is too dangerous to contemplate. The environment is going to suffer with this extra pollution and I really do ask that these other factors will be considered as a total disadvantage to the whole scheme for we local residents. Thank you for your considration.	
815040	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Justified	I can only think of disadvantages of allocating AS27 in the Mineral Sites Plan: Horton Road is a Cat C road which cannot take an extra 160 heavy goods vehicles on a daily basis, ie damage to road surface, too narrow There are 2x mini roundabouts in 3X which would mean extra hold ups for other local traffic There are bus stops which are also used for school buses to stop and let children on/off which then have to cross the road there's already more traffic coming onto Horton Road because of a new park home site with 59 homes on it there is going to be an extension to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate with a recycling sorting plant, which will mean a number of extra lorries using Horton Road there are already a number of extra lorries on the road due to red sand extraction on Redman's Hill Noise and air pollution from the actual extraction and the extra lorry traffic - DUST being a real worry!! undoubtedly there will be debris falling onto the roads this is a green belt area with mainly rural properties and farms, and a holiday area (Moors Valley and lots of campsites!) where people come to relax, retire or just to enjoy the countryside. It would really affect the number of tourists wanting to come to Three Legged Cross and therefore local businesses would suffer There are several SSSI areas around the proposed site, which the development would affect the local fauna and flora Digging in this area is likely to affect the hydrology. There are so many farms around that depend on wells for their water supply to water their animals/cattle. The site would really affect the public access to footpaths/bridleways which are extensively used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. I even come across birdwatchers sometimes, who have told me that they have seen rare species around that area. In recent years we have already seen 3 big solar farms installed around Three Legged Cross due to the proximity to the Mannington Substation. Although being green energy, they still have a big impact on local wildlife and our beautiful landscape! The only advantage to the inclusion of this site would be to the landowner, who is going to make a lot of money here. When they tell us that after the 12-17 years of extraction the land will be made to	Yes, what changes exactly, needs to be reviewed in due course!

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						look like a valley again, I really cannot take this seriously, as the site AS08 which has been dug out already, has not been made "good" at all. I know it is being used to do clay pigeon shooting and off road 4X4 driving, but doesn't exactly make it good for the local wildlife! As a community we are also outraged that this plan has been kept very quiet by local councils. It also seems that there is a conflict of interest, as the council wants this sand/gravel extraction to take place (pressure from Central Government) and also has the final decision on whether planning is given. This does not sit well with local people. We need a lot more information and professional opinions from Traffic and Highway consultant, wildlife experts to name but a few! There is also worry that the site would then be used for landfill or burying inert waste, as that is what usually happens after digging up land.	
1149698	Resident					If I understand this correctly you and your colleagues are now suggesting that you add a mineral sand site to this area. As you all know the Horton Road is already seriously overused through Woolsbridge Industrial; Estate, Moors Valley, a very large Car Boot Sale and other industrial estates. Despite this, in an effort to increase income, permission was given to considerably increase the size of the Industrial estate despite their previously being permission very much to the contrary. Then your department decided that this estate would be the perfect place to house Waste Transfer. Now it appears you believe that Horton Heath is the best location to provide sand. Surely this will mean even more lorries on roads that are undoubtedly unfit for the current proposals let alone even more! I have to ask the question 'Is there nowhere else than this area to satisfy your department 's needs?' '. As this area is the opposite end of the county to Dorchester does this perhaps explain the complete lack of concern for the many people who are being more and more affected by your decisions? We are, of course, very near to Hampshire, actually having a Hampshire postcode. Perhaps our best option is to enquire as to whether we can come fully under Hampshire control. I look forward to your very early response.	
1195583	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Justified; Effective	We would be concerned as to the impact on biodiversity to the area including Horton heath, notably but not only regarding species and plants and the natural heathland. This would include concern as to the impact of the quarrying and associated additional traffic to both Horton Common, but also the other nearby SSSI sites, and also deeply concerned as to the potential consequences to the water table, following the removal of the sand and gravel as proposed. Also concerned as to the loss or prejudice to use of the nearby bridleways. We would also be greatly concerned as to the impact to the C2 Horton Road and other narrow roads and lanes in the area. It is our belief that the Horton Road has reached it's "maximum tolerance level". It is already a dangerous route, very narrow in places, only 20 feet wide at the junction with Ashley Park, with no band of grass between the path and the road, making walking already extremely harrowing and dangerous with the existing volume of traffic, and in particular the existing reality of many HGVs including those carrying wide mobile homes, and sometimes fully fuelled military vehicles. The plan fails to consider the cumulative effect of the now agreed use of the extended Woolsbridge industrial estate together with the "existing maximum tolerance level". The plan is also in excess of the already agreed existing minerals plan, from which one must conclude that the existing plan already included sufficient sand. So it would appear that this extra site is simply not needed or necessary. Moors Valley Park is a jewel in Dorset's crown and is justifiably promoted to the country as Dorset's number 1 tourist attraction. The impact of the plans proposed 80 lorry movements a day is totally at odds and prejudicial to the continued use and popularity of the park.	Wedo not think that the site can be justifiably allocated

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1195650	Resident	No	No	Unsound	Justified	As an off road cyclist I should like to draw attention to the following. Dorset roads are not really suitable for cycling. Therefore, I cycle on the many bridleways. Surrounding AS27 are 2 main circular rides. One goes SW via Remedy Oak to Queens Copse/Holt Heath/Ferndown Forest. The other, goes NE via Verwood/Ringwood Forest/ New Forest. Having dozens of lorries using the tracks will put cyclists in danger. The crossroads at Clump Hill is very dangerous even today without the additional vehicles.	If sand is required then a suggestion would be to extract it from Bournemouth Bay. This would have the following benefits: 1) It's free 2) Dredging costs offset by 1 above 3) Little/no visual impact 4) Lower seabed to offset any sea rises from global warming 5) If dredged in groves/troughs would provide better waves for surfers - at no cost 6) Deeper channels would allow large ships to enter Poole docks post Brexit
1196491	Resident	Don't Know	Yes	Unsound		The AS27 site should not be included in the Mineral Sites Plan. There are numerous reasons listed in this consultation document mainly concerning the impact on traffic on roads unsuitable for HGVs and the adverse impact on the countryside environment and amenity. My concern is that the Inspector may consider that impact assessments are required followed by mitigations to 'solve' the issues raised and consequently decide to include the site in the plan. Local people do not want to go down the mitigation path, it will not 'solve' our concerns. Mitigating the traffic impact would mean substantially widening and improving the rural roads. We do not want to convert our rural environment into an urban/industrial landscape. Such action would be hugely expensive since the roads are close to private housing and enormously disruptive "causing many of the noise, dust, vibration etc problems we are seeking to avoid. Mitigating the quarry impact on bridle ways, wildlife, visual impact, hydrology etc will not be satisfactory and we will still have an industrial facility in the middle of a Green Belt area. Therefore, it should be concluded that mitigation actions will not be practical or affordable and consequently the AS27 site (like the AS08 site) should not be included in the MSP.	
1197142	Resident	Yes	Yes	Unsound	Effective	The Council is concerned that this site has been selected, with potential impacts on landscape, ecology and transport, largely having not been assessed. The site adjoins the significant site of Monmouth 's ash, and is also in close proximity to designated sites. Extraction could impact on these designations and have an adverse impact on the landscape. Access close to the site is poor and there are concerns about vehicles using rural roads to travel south to Wimborne and the conurbation.	Prior to allocation of the site, the Minerals Planning Authority should be satisfied as to the potential impacts of development and that these can be mitigated, rather than leaving everything to the development principles.
1197201	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound		My wife and I are extremely concerned and must register our objections to this proposal for a number of reasons as blasted below. The Horton Road which is the main access to the site is a 'C' class road and is over-used at this time with the amount of traffic and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV's) movements on it. It would be totally dangerous to increase its use with more HGV's, there being an estimated 80 extra movements per day on these roads. The pavement that exists is dangerous, with no space for expansion, in that wing mirrors from HGV's overhang these and therefore pedestrians are at great risk of being hit by these. There is a great risk of pollution from the plant which would likely have an adverse affect on the numerous SSSI areas local to the proposed site. There is also concern with regards to the level of the water, which would create problems as this would be increased. Many roads in the area are restricted by weight limits. The demographics of the area are such that there are many elderly people who's health and safety would be greatly affected by any increase in traffic. The carbon footprint would be huge due to the increase in HGV traffic.	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1197258	Resident	No	Yes	Unsound		No, it should not be included in the Mineral Sites Plan. My comments are as follows: 1. The proposed sand and gravel quarry is within the Green Belt and should not therefore be considered for industrial use. 2. Up until the late 1970 's it was I have been informed part of the Dorset open Heathland, and was destroyed by ploughing and turned into fenced poor quality grassland. Had this heath destruction not occurred then it is highly unlikely that any consideration would now be given to quarrying. 3. The documentation indicates that the proposed area be turned into a shallow valley after the quarrying has exhausted the sand and gravel reserves. This will change the landscape completely and mean that any prospect of returning the land to heath land at any time in the future would be irrevocably lost. 4. In order to operate a quarry much permanent infrastructure will need to be built on the green belt land. Some examples could include. Site offices Staff welfare Vehicle washing facilities Water supply Waste water disposal including sewage Vehicle weighbridge Electricity supply Solid waste disposal Roads Car parking Fuel storage for off road vehicle use (e.g. excavators) 5. The nearby solar farm has enabled, and continues to enable, the electricity supply industry to reduce its carbon footprint by using renewable energy. This in itself is a very laudable aim though whether its efficiency will be impaired with the dust generated from the proposed quarry could be a concern of the solar farm management company. The reduction in carbon footprint will be negated in part or more by powered equipment and HGV 's using fossil fuel (Diesel) to extract and move the quarry contents. Since the proposed site is expected to be in operation for a between 12-17 years has the requirement to make the extraction eco-friendly by the use of electrically operated equipment, including vehicles been considered? If this is not practical at the outset then will this become a planning condition requirement later when the technology is expected to become widely available? 6. Vehicular access to the quarry is to be to the Horton Road. This road is very congested at certain times of the day especially at the eastern exit to the A31 roundabout at Ashley Heath. [It was considerably worsened due to the removal of the third exit lane for some inexplicable reason some 2 or 3 years ago]. Other routes leaving east from the proposed site are via Verwood, St Ives or West Moors. HGV 's turning west will need to navigate the narrow Twisting lanes at Wigbeth before entering Horton or turning into Woodlands. The impacts of this additional heavy traffic I will leave to other interested parties to comment upon. In view of the concerns and comments expressed above I wish to object to this proposal in the strongest possible way.	Yes. No consideration during excavation work of noise or dust has been considered Appendix 1.
1197289	Resident	No	Yes	Unsound		This will cause a lot of noise and dust pollution, also it will affect the local wildlife, Badgers, Foxes Hares, Deer Rabbits, Mice and Newts, also the Owls and Birds. This area has a water problem due to there being mainly clay and sand, I feel this will be made worse by the lowering of the high land adjacent to us. This is also going to affect the Footpaths and Bridleways as the lorries will be using and crossing them which will make it dangerous to life and limb. The Horton road is also not suitable for the amount of heavy vehicles which will be using it per day from the site.	Appendix 1 has not considered the effect of noise and dust from the site. The extracting alone will cause noise pollution let alone the noise from the 80 lorry journeys a day to and from the site. The dust pollution alone will cause problems for everyone around them especially those with allergy and lung complaints. Also it will affect the Solar farm next to the site. who make a generous donation every year to the local community.

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1197344	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Justified	<p>This site should not be considered. It is wholly inappropriate. Living on the Horton Rd I am fully aware, as are many that the road is: Not suitable for such large HGV 's, especially in areas where the road narrows, cars clip each other regularly, horse riders and cyclists use this narrow road. Not suitable for such large volumes of HGV 's in addition to the existing high volume of HGV 's and traffic that use this road already from the surrounding industrial estates. The residents quality of life should not be reduced by the continuous stream of these HGV 's on a residential road, if it was 80 lorries a day, being 160 journeys, over a 24hr period that is one every 10 minutes. If it was for a 10 hour working day that would be one every 4 minutes. Way too much HGV traffic on this classification of road that already has high volumes of HGV traffic. This volume of traffic will create bottlenecks where they inevitably pass each other. Further reducing residents quality of life, reducing their quality social and family time due to increased commute times. should these HGV 's have an accident or break down on this road it would potentially cause major obstructions, tailbacks and potential delays for the emergency services travelling to and from other incidents. The continuous and repetitive nature of these journeys and the impact of the excavation on the site will in the immediate local area increase air and noise pollution and affect the local habitats, life 's, migration, hunting and feeding of many local animals, including birds, birds of prey, bees, insects, badgers, rabbits, hares, deer, foxes to name but a few. The sound of on-site industrial machinery will be cause for concern for all local wildlife and again affect their life 's, as well as that of the residents. The excavation will in affect, probably reduce and maybe exhaust or eliminate the water table for local residents who rely on natural wells to feed their livestock, animals and supply their homes. Potentially devastating neighbouring household incomes and sources of water. Areas of local historic and scientific interest will be at risk including listed buildings. The affects on local footpaths and bridelways and those that use them will be devastating and affect the health, wellbeing and enjoyment of an ever increasing local population, some of whom maybe suffering from obesity issues that need to get out and enjoy nature.</p>	
1197361	Resident	Yes	Yes	Unsound		<p>As someone who has lived locally for over 60 years I have regularly cycled in the area on the bridelways and therefore feel the site AS27 is a valuable leisure resource. To use this site for mineral extraction would be detrimental and the environmental impact would be totally inappropriate with the number of truck movements.</p>	I hope it will not be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1197514	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Justified	<p>This site should not be considered. Adequate attempts have not been made to notify or engage with residents who will be affected by this new proposal. A significant number of residents are retired or elderly without access to a computer nor are they likely to visit libraries. I am a resident of the area and am acutely aware of the ramifications to quality of life, road safety, environmental impact &amp; potential for consequential loss for residents. This site should not be considered because; The roads are not suitable for such large HGV 's, particularly on the numerous blind bends and narrower sections. Cars often 'clip' each other. The road is also used by horse riders and cyclists. Not suitable for such large volumes of HGV 's in addition to the existing high volume of HGV 's and traffic that use this road already from the surrounding industrial estates. Large HGV vehicles entering the road from any access point will do so slowly, particularly when fully laden. A visit to the location will demonstrate this is likely to be inherently dangerous to other road users who may be forced to break heavily to avoid slow moving HGVs ' accessing the road. Assuming a restriction of a 10-hour working window and using the 80 vehicles already highlighted would mean 160 journeys per day entering and leaving the site. This equates to one HGV every 4 minutes. It is difficult to see how this volume of traffic would not be anything other than untenable. Given planning has already been consented for a waste disposal centre near Woolsbridge Industrial Estate any further development along the Horton Road is likely to exacerbate safety risks. Any site will impact upon the immediate environment. Including: Limiting the use of footpaths and bridleways Increased noise pollution Risk air pollution in an area with a significant elderly population Reduction in the local water table due to prolonged excavation, with an effect on residents using natural wells &amp; springs to water livestock Impact on wildlife such as newts and birds of prey on the nominated site 7. Other residents will be disadvantaged: Use of immediate countryside for enjoyment Daily noise pollution Reduction in air quality due to dust, with respiratory risk to young and elderly Risk to property values due to increase in traffic and road noise Environ</p>	Impossible to say without visibility of; The environmental impact assessment Risk assessment for infrastructure Plan of mitigation activity
1197640	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective; Consistent with national policy	<p>I feel very strongly that AS27 Land at Horton Heath should not be included in the Mineral Sites Plan. The increased number of the HGVs on an already overused, totally unsuitable rural C Class road is of serious concern. The access to the proposed site from the main road has extremely poor visibility and increased HGV use is only going to result in more a congestion on an already very busy road not to mention the likelihood of more serious accidents. The vibrations due to this increased HGV use will cause structural damage to the many old buildings along this road some of which are Listed. The levels of air and noise pollution this would cause, would be detrimental not only to delicate ecosystems but will greatly impact on the health of local residents. The heathland is home to wide and diverse wildlife including reptiles. These areas of outstanding natural beauty need to be preserved not destroyed. This also raises concerns regarding disturbance to the water table this site would produce in an area that is already wet and boggy and would also impact on the farms and dwellings that rely on well water. The daily crossing of footpaths and bridleways by HGVs will impact greatly on walkers,ramblers, horseriders, cyclists and residents alike. Not to mention disturbance to sites of ancient and historical interest which include bowl barrows, the Monmouth Ash, Tumuli, earthworks and burial ground possibly from the Bronze Age I refer to the Archaeological Assessment by Bob Edwards of Forum Heritage Services Dec 2018 in relation to Horton Heath AS27.</p>	The AS27 site should not be included in the Mineral Sites Plan and was only added at the very last moment leaving local residents uninformed and with very short notice to register opposition.

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1197654	Resident	Yes	Yes	Unsound		No I think it shouldn't be included because: The volume of traffic proposed passes through rural roads with an insufficient infrastructure. The Impact of extra traffic in the Three Legged Cross, Ashley Heath and West Moors will gridlock an already stressed of road system Heavy Goods Lorries will be passing a school crossing in West Moors Road Lanes not wide enough for 2 large lorries to pass safely Lorries too wide to pass through Three Legged Cross without their mirrors overhanging pavements Horton Road is already dangerous with many recorded accidents with 2 fatalities within 5 years Access to care homes will be compromised by the extra volume of traffic of lorries and site employees causing difficulty for ambulance access to the 3 care homes near by and schools. Dangerous debris will be a feature of large lorry movements.	The minimum changes that should be made are that operational hours be restricted and the amount of traffic is seriously reduced in sympathy with other neighbouring site traffic.
1197682	Resident	Don't Know	No	Unsound	Consistent with national policy	ACCESS It is not clear whether the proposed access is to be from the junction of bridleway E46/12 with the Horton Road or whether it is proposed to use the new access to the east for which permission was granted as a temporary access during construction of the solar farm The existing access is from the junction of bridleway E46/12 with the Horton Road. This entrance is very narrow, has poor geometry and very poor visibility. It is on a blind summit of the Horton Road at a point which has been the scene of serious road traffic accidents over the years and is completely unsuitable for use by heavy vehicles. The access would be unsuitable on the grounds of road safety. SUSTAINABILITY The site is a nesting habitat for skylarks (UK conservation status RED), and cuckoos are heard in the immediate vicinity (UK conservation status RED). It is also a habitat for swifts (UK conservation status AMBER). Destruction of the habitat would be inevitable if quarrying were to take place. There is no suitable alternative land that could be used for mitigation. National policy is to protect the habitat of red and amber listed birds, so inclusion of this site would be inconsistent with national policy.	Any biodiversity survey would have to be undertaken at a suitable time of year, i.e. during May, and in suitable weather when skylarks, swifts and cuckoos are more likely to be present.
1197701	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective	No The volume of traffic proposed passes through rural roads with an insufficient infrastructure. The Impact of extra traffic in the Three Legged Cross, Ashley Heath and West Moors will gridlock an already stressed of road system Lots of schoolchildren in those areas and this will be detrimental to their health and wellbeing Heavy Goods Lorries will be passing a school crossing in West Moors Road Lanes not wide enough for 2 large lorries to pass safely Already problems with parking on roads and not being able to pass traffic - this will severely worsen the situation Lorries too wide to pass through Three Legged Cross without their mirrors overhanging pavements Horton Road is already dangerous with many recorded accidents Access to care homes will be compromised by the extra volume of traffic of lorries and site employees causing difficulty for ambulance access to the 3 care homes near by and schools. Dangerous debris will be a feature of large lorry movements.	No, it should not happen.
1197730	Resident	No	No	Unsound	Positively prepared; Effective	I do not think the Plan is sound because it does not include the enormous impact it has on the surrounding residents (not only the ones within the 500m distance limit). The site is totally unsuitable it affects traffic of 160 lorries with 32 ton weights of gravel one way and coming back. No one can tell us what will happen to the site afterwards nor was any thought given to wildlife and horseriders.	Yes it should be abandoned.
1197249	Resident	Don't Know	No	Unsound	Justified	I strongly disagree with this site being included in the Mineral Sites Plan. My main objection is the increase in HGV traffic. The Horton Road is already a very busy and very dangerous road. The Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is already being expanded which will increase the HGV traffic. There is already the Ashley Heath Industrial Estate, two Caravan Parks, two Camp Sites in use during the summer, the Moors Valley Country Park, the Car Boot Sale on a Sunday, the Banger Racing on a Sunday, the Wyvale Garden Centre and there is going to be a	



Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						Recycling Centre on the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. The road, which is designated a C road will not be able to cope with the increase in traffic. Whereas in some parts of the road it could be widened, in many parts, with residential properties being close to the road it would not be possible.	
1197264	Resident	Don't Know	No	Unsound	Justified	The creation of a gravel extraction site at AS27 would lead to an unacceptable increase in HGV traffic on the Horton Road. The road is already a busy and dangerous road with the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, soon to be expanded, plus the Ashley Heath Industrial Estate, the Garden Centre, the Caravan Parks, the Camp Sites, the Car Boot Sale, the Banger Racing and the soon to be recycling centre. I have only lived here for a couple of years and there have already been several fatal accidents on this road, the last one just last week. To increase the HGV traffic at the rate of 160 32 ton lorries, i.e. one every 3 minutes is just ridiculous.	
1197296	Resident	Don't Know	Yes	Unsound	Justified	The inclusion of site AS27 is unsound because it does not consider the impact that lorry movements would have on local road infrastructure. The main area of concern to me as a resident of Ashley Heath is that the Horton Road is totally unsuitable to cope with the projected 80 lorry movements per day. If we assume the working week will be five and a half days, then the impact on living standards in the area will be severely affected. It should also be remembered that significant increases in traffic numbers have occurred every year since development of the Woolsbridge Trading Estate was approved and local car boot sales were introduced. Heavy vehicles carrying sand and gravel are not only notorious for depositing loose material on the road, but also are of large capacity. Horton Road has already suffered from damage to its surface and break-up in many areas. A more worrying point about using the Horton Road is the fact that in some places the individual lane width is barely 3 metres wide (particularly at the intersection with Struan Gardens). This, combined with narrow footpaths (1.4 metres) in the residential areas, interrupted by telegraph poles positioned in the pavement, makes it extremely dangerous for pedestrians to risk walking along the road. Wide lorries travelling at the permitted 40 mph already pass near to pedestrians with inches to spare. It would only take the smallest of mistakes to have a pedestrian hit by a passing wing mirror if the frequency of HGV movements is increased by the sand lorries predicted in the plan. Another point of concern is the effect these sand and gravel lorries will have on the visitors to Moors Valley Country Park. This is a premier tourist attraction and brings in thousands of visitors and vehicles, which all have to gain access via one entrance off the Horton Road. Figures produced last year for 2017 indicated that the monthly throughput was nearly 20,000 vehicles month, with a peak in August 35,655 and an annual 470,000 movements per year. The number of visitors is between 750,000 and 1,000,000 with 50,000 of these arriving either on foot or on bicycles. Many of these are children, young adults, and parents seeking to enjoy the leisure facilities on offer. The direction of travel is both from west and east, and queues of traffic often block the Horton road at intersections and at the Pelican Crossing at the Castleman Trail crossover. The park is in use every day of the week, and all visitors have to cope with the heavy HGV traffic mixed in amongst them as they seek to gain entrance. Lorries carrying exceptional wide loads frequent the route causing mayhem, and the conflict between industrial use of the road and leisure use is already a major factor in degrading the environment, causing distress to local residents and increasing risk of injury to users of the road. The Horton Road is classed as a C road, Rural route. Changing it to become a commercial and industrial conduit is inappropriate and does not face	The duration of the extraction programme suggests that refilling will be the next proposal. This will extend the potential problem of heavy traffic flows, dust, noise and pollution causing damage to the local environment. The site should therefore be considered as unsuitable for development unless drastic infrastructure changes are made.

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						the fact that the road cannot be upgraded from a width point of view, nor made to cope with the heavy loads now being accepted without apparent concern. The solution is to build a new link from the back of the Woolsbridge estate to join the A31 at the Azalea roundabout. The present situation cannot continue.	
1197334	Resident	Yes	No	Unsound	Justified	I own horses at a stables close to the site. For 20 years I have been riding horses on trails around the site, however my safety would be dramatically compromised should this be used for mineral extraction. One of the current benefits of the trail is that it is quiet, with little to no traffic or disturbances that may spook a horse. Even the bravest of animals will be scared by the machinery and lorries needed for mineral extraction and therefore what was once a quiet, peaceful ride will become too dangerous to attempt, thus reducing the riding trails available in the area. The path is used by many riders and there are several stables in the local area that will be affected. At our stables, young children learn to ride and this trail provides a safe and enjoyable route to build their confidence. If the plans go ahead, this will no longer be possible and the riding options will be limited.	
1197358	Resident	Don't Know	Yes	Unsound	Justified	Re legal compliance. I do not believe that adequate attempts have been made to notify the residents who will be affected of this new proposal. Many if not most are elderly and may not have access to a computer nor are they likely to visit either Verwood or West Moors libraries as for the residents of Ashley Heath the Ringwood library is nearer. There is therefore no way for many of the residents to have been given any opportunity to find out about this proposal. I do not believe this site should be included for the following reasons:- The land proposed is home to a wide and diverse range of wildlife which will be displaced by the mining activities. The proposal will impact on the bridleways limiting use of the land by walkers and horse riders who would be subject to dust and noise coming from the site both from the activities themselves and from the heavy lorries used to transport sand and gravel from the site. The local road infrastructure is wholly unsuitable for the amount of traffic it is already subject to and the lorries would have to leave via the road through Went Moors, the road through Verwood both of which have schools and narrow roads or more likely via the Horton Road. The Horton Road is already subject not only to the general use by residents but by cars, vans and minibuses using the Country Park, the Car boot sale, the various camp sites and existing Industrial Estate as well as traffic heading for west Moors and Verwood and its Industrial Estate. It is my understanding that the Horton Road is a Category C road. In the summer months and school holidays it can already take several minutes to leave the side roads and enter the Horton Road. Planning permission has already been given to extend the Industrial Estate and we cannot know as yet what businesses will lease the new units and what impact they will have on the road system. I believe Permission has been given for a waste disposal unit in the Industrial Estate with again a large number of lorries to be expected to use the Horton Road on a daily basis. Permission has also been given for another sand and gravel extraction site which will also expect to use the same road infrastructure and now this! The Horton Road is unsuitable for road widening as it is in part made up of residents front gardens. Further up the road towards the Verwood crossroad there are drainage ditches that had to be re dug out in recent years to cope with large amounts of surface water. There have been numerous road accidents and several recent fatalities on the Horton Road due in part to the combination of large lorries and speeding vehicles and the fact the road has no street lighting at all. As you near the interchange the road rises in such a way as to limit a drivers view of oncoming traffic even in day light. Some of the existing large lorries leaving the Industrial Estate carry large pre	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						fabricated buildings that can overhang the middle of the road making oncoming cars pull right over so what is to happen with and ever growing number of large lorries?	
1197362	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know			My family has farmed at Horton Heath for over 60 years [ redacted ]. What remains of the Dorset historical Heath Land habitat will be irrevocably destroyed by this application. I am concerned that the existing water table will be altered such that the water supply via a well to my property will be lost or polluted and that my fields will require different quantities of water in the future. During quarrying I am concerned that there will be a great deal of dust created and noise that will have a detrimental effect on my property. The proposed HGV traffic movement of about 80 per day equates to about a heavy lorry movement to and from a C class country road every 6 minutes on average. The road is entirely unsuitable for this.	Appendix 1 does not consider the impact of noise or dust during quarrying.

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1197472	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know			<p>I would like to say that I am not opposed to change Solar Farm. - I made no comments on planning as although it spoils the view, it is not harmful to the community, in fact I recognise it is a valuable contribution to the environment. Redman 's Quarry - This is a small scale quarry. I felt the size of which would not be detrimental in any way to the community or myself. 4x4 meetings. I have never complained, it may be noisy at times but they are not held very often. Clay pigeon shoots. The same as the 4X4 meetings. As far as I am concerned the Heath is providing a venue for community enjoyment. I am aware that the council is only obliged to inform residents within 500m of the proposed site. I was under the impression that there should be a poster available for the public to view as well. When the initial late inclusion of AS08 and AS27 was into added to the plan, there was a notice at the gate near the main road for all to see and a notice for Redman 's quarry was posted opposite the bridleway to it, of which I have a photograph, a public notice was not posted after both sites were omitted then it was decided to include AS27. The letter we received, although dated 18 December, was not received until the end of that week, just before Christmas. With a busy two week holiday period for most, it has left us little time to prepare for this bombshell. In the Strategic Environmental Assessment 17 - To sustain the health and quality of life of the population. There are a small number of residences within 500m, the closest being 50m. It then go 's on to mention the communities of Verwood, Three Legged Cross and that they would be unlikely to experience any visual or noise impacts from working in the vicinity of the site. Do the small number of residences within 500m not matter? Because there are no comments, Secondary, cumulative or otherwise. Please bear in mind that most of those residences are farms and smallholdings, people will be working outside all day, seven days a week. I quote Monmouth Ash Farm is an historic Farmstead, the buildings of which may be regarded as non-designated heritage assets but this Farmstead does not benefit from public access and so was not visited as part of the fieldwork and so has not been fully assessed. However its location some distance from the proposed areas of extraction on lower ground to the south and west with a buffer of fields around it means that there will be no harm to the setting of the farmstead. I refer to the underlined. Access to the property is not a problem, we have many walkers visit the Ash tree whilst on holiday, in fact we have accommodated a school classroom visit. The site is advertised in local attraction publications. We have already established that there will be air and noise pollution, this will hamper enjoyment of viewing local history.8 " To protect and improve air quality and reduce the impacts of noise. Impacts on air quality expected to be negligible. Any impacts due to noise resulting from mineral working would be expected to be satisfactorily minimised through normal noise mitigation measures imposed at the planning application stage. I know for a fact from speaking too people who have experienced living next door to quarries that this is not the case, they have sympathised with our plight. There was also damage to the structure of their properties. There is a listed building in the vicinity and I believe that Monmouth Ash farm although not listed is of the same era, surely there is a danger of damage to all property in the immediate vicinity. Archaeological report " Forum Heritage Services I quote Monmouth Ash Farm is an historic Farmstead, the buildings of which may be regarded as non-designated heritage assets but this Farmstead does not benefit from public access and so was not visited as part of the fieldwork and so has not been fully assessed. However its location some distance from the proposed areas of extraction on lower ground to the south and west with a buffer of fields around it means that there will be no harm to the setting of the farmstead. I refer to the underlined. Access to the property is not a</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>problem, we have many walkers visit the Ash tree whilst on holiday, in fact we have accommodated a school classroom visit. The site is advertised in local attraction publications. We have already established that there will be air and noise pollution, this will hamper enjoyment of viewing local history. Hydrological assessment I have not seen that this has been completed and would like to request that they visit Monmouth Ash Farm if it has not already been completed. I have concerns because we have a lake and downhill from the direction of the quarry the run off water runs into it, there is a risk of contamination here. The lake is stocked and we have wildlife on it. More importantly we have neighbours who I also think should be consulted as they rely solely on well water for themselves and their livestock. There is a risk of contamination and indeed loss of water. I believe that some of these neighbours also have lakes. Risk of contamination of water for wildlife and possible damage to SSI areas in the vicinity Local Economy There are many local businesses within the holiday industry in the area. A large percentage of their visitors are walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Because of bridleways, footpaths, two of which will have HGV vehicles crossing and desirable scenery being compromised, they will suffer as a result. Afterall if people want to go walking etc as a past-time in the country, it is mainly because they are seeking a healthy lifestyle in pleasant surroundings. This will have knock on effect with local shops, pubs, etc losing business. Vehicular activity A large number of heavy goods vehicles already use the B3078, the additional traffic will surely further prejudice the free flow of traffic and conditions of general safety along this section of the C2 Horton Road at Clump Hill, a site with a poor collision record contrary to policy KS11 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Core Strategy adopted 2014 and saved policy CSIDE8 of the East Dorset Local Plan adopted 2002. The additional traffic from site AS27 will increase the already congested B3078 through the villages of Three Legged Cross and West Moors. They will pass a school, many homes and businesses. Increasing danger of accidents, air pollution, unacceptable noise, vibration will most certainly cause road and property damage. I refer to conditions set out in planning permission for Redman 's Quarry Traffic Generation No more than 14 HGV movements (one movement being either in or out of the site) per working day shall take place at the entrance of the site with Horton Road Road in association with the development the subject of this permission. Reason In the interests of highway safety and the amenity of the area in accordance with policy DM8 of the BDPMS and policies 12, 13 and 14 of the BDPWP. Future concerns should Site AS27 be planning permission be passed An application will be made for a processing plant which will further exasperate the air and noise pollution. An application will be made to use the site for landfill. An application will be made to extend area/timescale of extraction</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1197487	Resident	No	No	Unsound	Justified	<p>Including AS27 at Horton Heath in the Mineral Site plan has no advantage to myself or surrounding residence of the area. It should not be included within the plan. This plan has not been communicated to the people it will effect the most. Only people who live within 500 metres of the site received notification. Although these residents will be hugely impacted for several reasons. The fact that no consideration of the effects this Quarry would have for the locals, the public and business owners in the area is shocking and upsetting. Will the closing date of the 28th January be reviewed so locals with a right to know are fully informed in good time? The proposal simply states '80 lorry movements per day ' It is unclear from this if this is 40 lorries making collections and deliveries or 80 lorries which will make it 160 movements each day. This said, if it is 40 lorries or 80 lorries, the roads are not fit for this amount of movement suggested from Heavy Goods vehicles. The roads are narrow, 2 lorries struggle to pass each other with reasonable clearance. The road could be subjected to lorries passing each other every 6 minutes. Towns and villages feeding on to the Horton Road have restricted pavements for pedestrians and narrow roads, Lorry mirrors already overhang pavements when trying to pass through these towns making using the pavements a dangerous place to be. The roads are already in a poor state of repair, running 32 tonne lorries on them at an alarming number will add additional pressure to the infrastructure on the Horton Road and surrounding villages, these roads already can 't cope with the traffic that uses them daily. These lorries have twin wheel axles, they are well known for having aggregate and debris caught between the wheels. As the lorries reach speed, the debris caught between the wheels will come loose and contaminate road surfaces making them slippery, at worst larger objects will become dislodged and come away at speed towards other road users and possibly pedestrians. These towns were not built to have this kind of traffic running through them. Over the past 5 years 5 serious traffic incidents have been recorded on this stretch of road, one of which was fatal. The increased volume of traffic from lorries, employees of the site and plant movements is only going add to the amount of traffic using these roads, which in turn will increase the risk of accidents, near misses, fatalities. These Lorries would also pass St Marys First School in West Moors. At peak times children are crossing B3072 as parents use the memorial hall parking due to limited safe parking near the school. With 3 Care homes in Three legged cross, the volume of traffic will endanger residence lives with the time paramedics and ambulances can arrive on scene for emergency care. Horton Heath is quiet and undisturbed. The area attracts many ramblers, horse riders, dog walkers, cyclists and runners every day. These people come to enjoy the countryside and remove themselves from the usual industrial noise from daily life. A Quarry will bring noise pollution from many areas of the operation. Lorry movements, Machinery, Plant vehicles and the legislation of all these vehicles to be fitted with audible warnings when working on Quarry sites. Horton Heath will no longer be the breath-taking place it was. Residence will have to suffer the noise pollution constantly. Surrounding farm animals will be disturbed, the possibility of the noise having an impact on farmers breeding programmes. Animals are incredibly sensitive with the surrounding environments when breeding. The effect of the noise pollution could be detrimental to the local farmers. This will also affect the wild life in the area. An area that is currently affluent with rare wild life. The proposed noise pollution will see them all move on to areas that could be unsuitable and dangerous for them. Lorries, extraction of aggregate and plant machinery will all cause vibration when operating. Within close proximity of the extraction site and roads, are many historic buildings, Listed buildings, Sites of scientific interest, Ancient burial sites. With the vibration through</p>	<p>Onsite processing would not be allowed. Extension of the timescale prohibited. The size of the excavation and timescale to be greatly reduced Restoration of the site has to be put back to original state. Landfill on the grounds will never be considered Speed limits would need reviewing at access points throughout Horton Road Limited to 10 lorry movements per day between 9am &amp; 4pm Compensation for residence within direct proximity of the site. House prices, loss of business, Water supply.</p>

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						operations of a quarry all of these things are in great danger of being damaged beyond repair. The dust created for this quarry will be a health risk to many within close proximity. Not just when the sand is being excavated, 80 lorries will cause significant dust when arriving and leaving the site. There are 3 residential care homes very close to the site. In dry summer months the dust will travel. Are we to tell these residents to stay inside on dry days or risk their health and inhale the pollution in the air. The site is surrounded by farms, these residents are outside working the land 90% of the time. 17 years of dust inhalation is unacceptable. Horton Heath has many fresh water springs that many farms and residence rely on solely for their water supply. These houses and farms are using wells fed by natural spring water running throughout Horton heath. Excavating 40 acres of land may have an effect on farms water supplies. Contamination maybe unknown until its to late. The water maybe re-routed and no longer reach those relying on it. There is no mention of what the gaping hole will be used for once the extraction is completed. The proposed restoration states it will be a low-quality pasture and left as a valley. A proposal is not good enough. Does that leave it open for Landfill? Completely unacceptable within this landscape. Bridleways and pubic footpaths run through out Horton Heath. These attract many tourists who use local camping sites within the area. With the lorries crossing these bridleways and foot paths at 2 points. Will the tourists still come to the area? Will those businesses still operate as they once did through the summer months. To make the most of our country side people set out on foot with their families and animals. Would you make the most of your countryside if you 're in danger while out riding your horse or walking your dog? Not the countryside Dorset promises with 32 tonne lorries sharing your path.	
1197533	Resident	Don't Know	Yes	Unsound		No this should not be included in the plan. As a resident of West Moors for 20 years I have seen a marked increase in traffic through the village. The addition of a substantial increase in LGV traffic will only cause the current road structure to deteriorate even further. The existing routes through the village , Ashley Heath , Ringwood Road , Horton etc are poor at best and these vehicles will only exacerbate the problem. The potential for risk to life also increases. These vehicles have very little leeway on the narrow roads and the risks increase for public using the already narrow footpaths especially access roads to the A31. The Clump Hill crossroads is already an accident hotspot and the inclusion of these large vehicles would only make it worse. Our green belt is disappearing too quickly already with the loss of native flora and fauna , the pollution to air and water from the extraction and required machinery will only make this worse for the native wildlife.	This site was not included in the initial MSP and has been added without enough time for a proper considered consultation period.
1197667	Resident	No	Don't Know	Unsound	Positively prepared	Having read the previous comments about how this would affect the local area, wildlife, traffic etc., I agree with all the comments and see no need to repeat them. A huge concern of mine having had to pass a quarry site on a regular basis at a previous address was the dirt and intimidation of the lorries. The entrance/exit onto the road was a country narrow lane with an unrestricted speed limit as this is. The road surface in dry weather was dust/gravel and as you drove their were plumes of dust and gravel hitting your vehicle and spreading around, and in wet weather vehicles in both directions sprayed each other with filthy mud and dirt as well as the roadsides. It was a standing joke not to bother washing your car if you were going near the quarry. The other concern was the speed of the lorries through the lanes which could happen here due to their time constraints. They travel easily at 55 - 60 miles an hour and sit on your tail pushing you which is very intimidating and there are a lot of elderly drivers in the area. If they were	None that would make this acceptable.

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						oncoming you had to break and pull over as they never slowed due to their massive size. The other sad feature was the damage to the roadside hedges and verges. For a mile either side of the quarry the hedgerows were covered in mud and dust from road spray and dirt falling from the vehicles. I do not want this happening in Three Legged Cross. Mitigation for this can be the vehicles move through a water reserve to clean them. It doesn't work and can't be mitigated! This area is already seen as a poor relation to other villages like Verwood and West Moors. The village does not deserve the filth and mess this site will bring.	
1197752	Resident	No	Yes	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective; Consistent with national policy		
1197760	Resident	No	Yes	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective; Consistent with national policy		



Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1198019	Resident	Don't Know	No	Unsound	Positively prepared; Consistent with national policy	<p>St Leonards &amp; St Ives Parish Council consider the inclusion of site AS27 is unsound. We consider that the plan fails to adequately consider the full impact on the infrastructure and the effect of the additional volume and weight of the access traffic for this proposal on the numerous communities along its access route C2 Horton Road. It also underestimates the effect on the existing use of this area by the community, visitors to it and the potential impact on the water table and effects on nearby SSSI sites. The site information quotes a life expectancy of operation to be approximately 12 years but also states this could be longer if the entire reserve is extracted. This will then be followed by a long period of restoration work involving further numerous HGV movements bringing total period as an estimated 12-17 years. The vehicle movements quoted for the extraction alone at the estimate of 200,000 tonnes per annum are 80 lorry movements per day and hours of work for a typical quarry are anticipated to be 7am to 6pm weekdays and 7am to 1pm on Saturdays. The negative impact of this on our community and others on the access route will be significant. The table of listed likely significant effects LSE (Human Health item 8) quotes the possible cumulative impact with traffic in nearby settlements along the C2 Horton Road from lorries travelling to and from the A31 and the access route to the site. The only way that these effects could be mitigated would be to have significantly less vehicles accessing the site on a daily basis which would extend the period of extraction or make the cost unviable as would a more direct route from the A31. The Plan fails to consider the cumulative effect that the proposal to include AS27 will have with the general expansion of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate already agreed and the agreed inclusion of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate site for a Bulky Waste Transfer facility in the draft Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Waste Plan (currently with the Secretary of State) and must not be underestimated. The route to access the industrial estate is also the C2 Horton Road through Ashley Heath and other nearby settlements on the route. Vehicle movements for the bulky waste facility are estimated at a further 10 HGV 's per day alone. These concerns have already been highlighted in our response to the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Waste Plan. The Woolsbridge Industrial Estate has already commenced construction of a significant expansion which will exacerbate the traffic issue. The combined effect of all three proposals is significant and untenable. Any Transport assessment for site AS27 must include the combined vehicle numbers for all three factors otherwise the findings will be unsound. The plan needs to recognise the impact of all three. The plan fails to recognise that the C2 route is unsuitable for use for this site it was not designed for traffic of this volume or weight and already the basic structure of the road is breaking down and under constant repair. Complaints from residents of vibrations to their properties along the Horton Road due to existing HGV traffic have been significant and resulted in major repair work and traffic delays resulting in gridlock. The road is narrow in a number of places which results in normal traffic having to mount the verge or pavement (where present) to allow for passing. There is already conflict between the volume and type of traffic and cyclists and pedestrians on this route and the additional traffic will increase this. As already highlighted there are significant numbers of people particularly in good weather accessing Moors Valley and the Castleman Trail is heavily used as an excellent cycle route but this does mean that there is a high number accessing via the C2 route which has only one crossing at Ashley Heath. There have been several fatalities and other near misses without the additional traffic if this proceeds measures to mitigate further accidents and improve pedestrian and cyclist safety is essential. The Cultural Heritage of the site and its historical</p>	<p>Restoration of the site needs to be done in phased stages and not left until after extraction is complete to maximise the potential for biodiversity and the impact on the local community.</p>

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>landscape is also highlighted. Restoration of the site will also involve significant vehicle movements and have a further impact on the affected communities along its access route C2 for a further extended period. These figures should also be included to fully appreciate the adverse impact of the use of this site on the nearby communities. Biodiversity - We would stress the need to fully appreciate the impact of the quarrying and associated additional traffic on wildlife, flora and fauna on not just the Horton Common but the other nearby SSSI sites of Lions Hill, the Moors River, River Crane and other water sources which would be affected by a quarry on this site. The use of this site will severely impact on the linking wildlife corridors which are essential for the biodiversity of this area. If this site is included in the plan monitoring of the biodiversity must be continuous with measures to limit damage included. Restoration should be planned in stages to mitigate the impact on users of adjacent sites and damage to wildlife. Summary : In summary we feel that this proposal is unsound. The negative impact of this proposal on the character of the area must not be underestimated. The major priority concern is the impact and consequences of the sheer volume of the HGV traffic on a totally unsuitable route. It will have a seriously detrimental impact on the quality of life and will permanently damage the health and welfare of our 7,500 residents and those in the other affected communities en-route, a higher than average number of whom are elderly. There are a number of care homes along the route which will have to tolerate the noise, fumes and dust of this traffic. When the A31 becomes congested the C2 route become the escape route for traffic and navigation systems direct traffic to that route. The additional 210 homes on the Hospital site have further exacerbated this heavily used route making the C2 more popular and standing traffic more frequent. The effect of the resulting traffic will also affect the significant number of visitors to the Moors Valley Country Park (estimated August 2017 at between 750,000 and 1,000,000, 50,000 of these accessing the attraction by bicycles or on foot) via the C2. There is an existing issue over traffic and the difficulties of residents trying to use this route as can be seen from this short video clip <a href="https://youtu.be/278nWOqr5oc">https://youtu.be/278nWOqr5oc</a> . The commercial viability of this extremely popular attraction and other businesses in the area will be seriously jeopardised if this proposal proceeds. Any economic benefit must be weighed against the significant detrimental impact on the local community and tourism which is vital to the economic stability of this area and the wider area. This is a heavily used recreational space with its numerous trails and bridleways with only one proper crossing along the route. Of particular concern is due to the geography of the existing habitation there is insufficient space to improve the structure of the C2 to an acceptable level for this type and volume of traffic. The lack of width of the road, pavements and sheer weight of numbers will seriously conflict with the personal safety of other road users, cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders. The plan mentions the possible cumulative impacts of the use of this site and the already permitted quarry to the East and other nearby operations but it needs to also recognise the additional impact of the Waste proposal and Woolsbridge Industrial Estate expansion which are already further along in the planning process. Put simply C2 is not suitable for this type of usage and it is contrary to the Dorset Local Transport Plan 2011-2026.</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1198040	Resident	Don't Know				I am concerned about a number of issues that this development would bring up. There would be increased air pollution for the delicate ecosystems in the area. Increased road use for trucks - increasing pollution and particulates in the air, not to mention the risk of accidents. I know the road well and the turning to Clump Hill off the main road is between two hills. It is already a place with extremely poor visibility and having a lot of large, slow lorries coming out of there on a regular basis and using both lanes to make their turns is going to result in a lot more accidents as well as congesting the main road. I am also concerned about disturbance to the water tables - the area is already very wet and boggy in winter and increased water flowing down this hill and towards Dewlands Common will damage the land where the council has spent a lot of time and money resurfacing and repairing the erosion. The paths over this land are bridleways and not only footpaths. There is a large equestrian population in the area and we currently have some beautiful and safe off-road riding around these suggested sites. Closing these bridleways would have a massive detrimental impact on local businesses such as the riding schools and livery yards (of which there are many), and will drive the many leisure riders onto the roads - which will be busier and have many more large lorries and vehicles likely to frighten horses on them.	
1198058	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound		I do not think this land should be included in the Mineral Sites Plan. My reasons for this is the lack of assessment for the impact on local archaeology. You have stated that there are Monuments in the vicinity and have quoted Historic England stating that assessment needs to be undertaken. Surely it is logical that this assessment is done prior to approval otherwise you cannot understand the impact and possible loss of an archaeological site of importance.	I do not think it should be included without the proper assessments prior to consultation and the planning approval process otherwise you cannot possibly understand the impact in full and the whole picture.
1198084	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified	This plan was not revealed on legal searches when we moved into Three Legged Cross six months ago - It appears to have been slipped in deliberately with consultation only with those residents living within 500 m of the site, whereas it will impact local communities close-by and other interested parties such as cyclists, ramblers and sadly the local disability riding school. It also states that this mineral is in "shorter" supply, not short supply. Since the extraction is proposed on already diminishing rare heathland and will last 12 - 17 years with all the inherent impact of dust, dirt, noise and vibration on the local natural and human habitation, I do not feel that it is justified. I understand that a previous quarry on land owned by the applicant has not been restored and is used for unauthorised 4X4 trialling. The presence of the solar-farm on Horton Heath will also reflect/amplify the noise from the site down into the surrounding valleys - Recent evidence of this was when a hedge-cutter operating in the fields of the proposed site last November could be clearly heard a mile away in Three legged Cross. The eighty lorries per day (or even indeed 160 lorries, if this figure does not include return-journeys) will have to use Bridleway E46/30 to access the site, which will be churned up and disruptive to walkers and riders alike, especially since it crosses Bridleway E46/12, both of which are used by many riders (especially the local disability riding-stables at Three Legged Cross) and walkers to access Bridleway E46/32 alongside the proposed extraction-site. In addition, water contained in the sand will have to flow somewhere during extraction and it risks flooding downhill sections of these local bridleways. In addition, Bridleway E46/7 (adjacent to Bridleway E46/32) at the bottom of the hill that runs through a Site of Special Scientific Interest is already soggy in places and risks flooding. This combination of bridleways makes a delightful peaceful circular route for many horse-riders, cyclists and walkers encompassing woods, heathland, open fields and beautiful views, but they will all be affected by this proposed extraction. It would be useful for the	If permission is granted, I think that a financial bond should be paid in advance by the landowner to cover the costs of restoring this land in future to guarantee that it will happen.

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>Inspector to walk these bridleways to understand the objections. Having worked for a quarrying-company (Redlands) it is a fact that there is a high proportion of water contained in the sand. The lorries from the site will keep most of that water in the load going downhill on Bridleway E46/30 and the access-track until they reach the level C2 Horton Road. This busy road used as a rat-run between the A354 (Blandford - Salisbury road) and the A31/A338 will then be covered in sand and mucky water very close to the already dangerous Clump Hill crossroads on the brow of the hill. In addition, traffic overhangs the narrow C2 Horton Road between the two mini-roundabouts at Three Legged Cross and proves already dangerous to pedestrians, and this is before the additional traffic from the new waste-disposal site under construction next to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate.</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
224280	East Dorset Environmental Partnership		Yes	Unsound	Justified; Effective	<p>EDEP recognises Dorset 's need for minerals but maintains its objection to the inclusion of this omission site. EDEP considers that the inclusion of omission site AS27 would be unsound. It is Not justified: The sites recommended by DCC to be included in the Minerals Sites Plan more than meet minerals requirements for the Plan period. Most of the sites coming forward in the East Dorset Local Plan Review (to 2033) will require prior extraction of minerals (sand and gravel) before development can take place and this can be achieved without the problems relating to biodiversity, hydrology, historic landscape and PRoWs associated with AS27. The urgency for housing delivery will require mineral extraction on such sites to take place before some of the allocated extraction sites. and Not effective: There is huge uncertainty regarding deliverability of this potential allocation. The surveys required to investigate the problems identified in the SA would be costly; where mitigation is theoretically possible it may well prove too expensive to enable extraction to take place. Sustainability Appraisal We support the observations made in the SA but wish to add the following comments Objective 2 Biodiversity Birds . Planning conditions for the reworking of Redman 's Hill Quarry (PA 3/17/0967/DCC) included a BMP requirement to maintain the sand martin colony on site throughout the extraction process and a further face to be created in another part of the site. This quarry is only separated from AS27 by bridleway E46/32. The RSPB should advise if there is any possibility of maintaining this colony if there were yet further disturbance of the magnitude proposed (80 HGV movements daily plus all the digger work for at least 12 years, though possibly 17 years if the whole mineral reserve were to be extracted). It is essential that any passing machinery does not cause damage to nests through vibrations <a href="https://www.rspb.org.uk/globalassets/downloads/join-and-donate/cemex-and-rspb-sand-martin-quarry-advice.pdf">https://www.rspb.org.uk/globalassets/downloads/join-and-donate/cemex-and-rspb-sand-martin-quarry-advice.pdf</a> . Connectivity between the SNCIs and the SSSI would be compromised during the extraction period. Partial mitigation might be possible if the site were to be worked and restored in phases as with Redman 's Hill Quarry but there should also be compensation for loss of habitat during site works. This should include extension and linkage of existing good quality habitat (SSSI and SNCIs) to comply with the NPPF requirements 170d to establish coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and 174b to promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species: and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The history of Horton Heath including this site is one of despoilation. NPPF 170f requires remediation and mitigation in such circumstances. As noted in our response to the Minerals Sites consultation, Butterfly Conservation advise that the area is a stronghold for butterflies, supporting 4 priority species. Displacement of recreational activity here could impact on the Internationally designated heathlands in the area. Objective 4 Groundwater and Surface Water As well as potential disruption of hydrological links to Horton Common SSSI, changes to topography and drainage could affect housing in the valley to the north and north east, the lower slopes of bridleways E46/32 and E46/7, and the wetland habitats in the valley, resulting in acid heathland waters (typically pH5.5) feeding into the R Crane SSSI, a BAP habitat chalk stream. It is understood that the fishing lakes are still a commercial recreational enterprise. A deep roadside ditch along the valley section of Horton Way indicates significant current run-off. If this were to increase it would lead to flood risk of the houses and farms here and their single track access route. Increased depth of mud on the bridleways could be dangerous for horses, leading to problems with tendons and ligaments. Investigation will be required to</p>	<p>In the event that AS27 is taken forward as an allocation in the Minerals Sites Plan, we recommend i) the following should be added to the requirements for investigation, survey and mitigation identified in the Sustainability Appraisal road condition investigation and traffic survey for the entire C2 (to include modelling of in combination impact of expansion of Woolsbridge Industrial Estate and use for Waste Handling and the growth in housing in the West Moors and Verwood area); vibration that would be caused by passing machinery both within the proposed extraction site and on Bridleway E46/32 that might impact on sand martins ' nests. and ii) the following Conditions should be included in Policy: Full compliance with all conditions relating to all previous planning applications for Horton Heath including AS08, Redman 's Hill Quarry and the Solar Farm will be required prior to any consideration of a planning application. Extraction to a strictly controlled depth should be restricted to the plateau and not create a deep void to the NW of E46/32 nor impact on the steep slope at the northern end of the site. Habitat heterogeneity should be encouraged by ensuring the extraction depth is not uniform. There should be no backfilling with waste of any description. Restoration should be at the level of the completed extraction. Mineral extraction and the haul road should be limited to specified distances from PRoWs where the users will be at no risk from inhalation of particulates from dust or diesel or diesel fumes. To protect the interests of PRoW users and residents, noise levels must be restricted through vehicle specification and timing of operations. Mineral extraction and restoration should be phased as at the Redman 's Hill Quarry site. The extraction period should be limited so that restoration to address the historic habitat loss can be undertaken as a matter of priority. Compensation for loss of habitat during site works should include extension and linkage of existing good quality habitat (SSSI and SNCIs). Restoration of acid grassland should include in perpetuity appropriate management and monitoring. (Note this should preclude any soil enrichment or introduction of improved grassland species and cultivars). Some exposed surfaces should be retained to create additional sand martin habitat and nesting sites for burrowing bees and wasps. Bridleways should be maintained in good and safe condition throughout the extraction and restoration periods.</p>

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>determine the extent of the disruption to drainage patterns. These are unpredictable on heathland soils: even minor changes in N Verwood have been found to create significant problems on far gentler slopes than here. It would be essential to demonstrate that there would be no increase in the rate or volume of run-off and no change to the quality (including pH) of the water reaching downstream habitats, including the R Crane SSSI. There should be no increased risk to existing properties and no risk of problems relating to their insurance cover. The LLFA comment (p5 of the Site Assessment) confirms the need for a site specific strategy of surface water management. Objectives 6 and 9 Historic Environment and Landscape . Although not a designated landscape, the topography and historic landform are exceptional in this part of Dorset: even to the unqualified observer they are key to the setting of the Scheduled Monuments. It is the only high area within easy walking distance of Horton, Three Legged Cross and Verwood that offers such wonderful views and sense of place: spirits are uplifted as evidenced by the historic monuments. Other similar views were lost to plantation forestry 100 years ago and have not been restored. The Inspector will have appreciated during her visit how special this area is. The experience is far removed from the well frequented SANGs that are semi-urban in character and the popular Country Parks at Moors Valley and Avon Heath. EDEP considers that the proposal would be contrary to NPPF 180b which requires planning policies and decisions to identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason. It is evident from the latest aerial photography that there are no signs of restoration of AS08 or cessation of motor sport activities although planning conditions for PA3/04/0833 required this to be complete by the end of 2006, Indeed the damaged area appears to be far more extensive. [Aerial photo provided] Consequently, we have real concerns about compliance with planning conditions for any further mineral extraction or development on Horton Heath. Enforcement is essential and we recommend a prerequisite to ensure the developer/landowner meets the cost of any necessary enforcement action. As can be seen from recent aerial photographs, in combination with the solar farm that wraps around Redman 's Hill Quarry, the proposal would create unacceptable industrialisation of this unique area. While recognising the need for sand and gravel, this loss of a locally special and historic landscape that is so well used by horse riders, cyclists, runners and walkers from the nearby settlements would be unacceptable: it is also contrary to current advice on the health benefits of exercise in the natural environment and risks displacement of recreational activity onto the designated heathlands. [Aerial photo provided] (Bridleways marked green, footpaths pink) Objective 8 Noise. The proposed site lies between two well used bridleways E46/30 and E46/12 that are within sight of each other and meet at the southern tip of the triangular site. Noise from both extraction machinery and the HGVs transporting the minerals from the site would affect both bridleways and their users, and destroy the tranquillity and sense of place during operating hours. Objective 15 Traffic We disagree with the assessment regarding access to the C2. The impact on users of the bridleways would be unacceptable due to noise, dust from the unsurfaced track, vehicle emissions, and safety of horses and their riders in particular (see also comments under Objective 18 below). The C2 was not designed to take the volume of traffic it has to contend with now. We recommend detailed modelling to include in-combination projections for HGVs and light vehicles resulting from new development in Verwood and the expansion of Woolsbridge Industrial estate to include waste handling and transfer. There should be no increased HGV impact on Holt Heath</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>NNR. We have concerns about the construction of this C road and recommend detailed studies are undertaken to ensure its safety and integrity in the long term. Objective 18 Safe Access to Open Countryside Much of the surrounding land (including the solar farm) is mapped on Dorset Explorer as open access but is fenced off and inaccessible. There will be no means of monitoring the speed of HGVs or the dust that they throw up: even at speeds of &lt;10mph this can be significant on dry unsurfaced tracks. The risk of inhalation of particulates by people and horses must be avoided. Although spraying of haulage routes might seem to be a potential mitigation measure, drainage on the sandy surface of the bridleways is rapid. Spraying of these routes would be required several times per day in dry and windy weather: it would use significant volumes of water, at times when water companies and other users in the area would be striving to reduce consumption. Mains water would be alkaline and inappropriate to add to the acid heathland soils here in large volumes. Water bowsers would add to the on-site HGV movements. The 80 daily vehicle movements would be additional to the 14 (operating between 0800 and 1300 hours) that are required for the mineral extraction and inert landfill at Redman 's Hill Quarry (Planning Conditions 14 and 15). Planning consent for the latter included an alternative permissive path to the NW of Bridleway E46/32. EDEP considers that this is unlikely to afford adequate protection from noise, dust or diesel emissions for the bridleway users " walkers, runners, cyclists and horse riders. This path would take them even closer to the working at the new site so they would be sandwiched in a narrow corridor between extraction machinery and HGVs. At the southern end of the proposed site, E46/32 joins E46/30 which then continues to the C2. The short distance that would be free of traffic if the Solar Farm access onto the C2 were used is relatively inconsequential for bridleway users and more beneficial to the HGVs and visibility at the junction with the C2. Enforceable speed restrictions would be required on the C2. The proposal would be unlikely to comply with Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals Strategy (2014) Policies DM1 h (Efficient use of water resources on the site) and b (protection and enhancement of local amenity) and potentially DM2 a (Noise levels), b (Dust levels) and c (Air emissions). Site Assessment Criteria We wish to make the following additional comments on the observations in the Site Assessment. C8 Landscape Capacity. Two bridleways would be affected directly " E46/32 and E46/30. C9 Impact on Historic Landscapes. EDEP wishes to remove any doubt about the history of the site. Until 1980 this whole area was heathland: it was ploughed immediately before it was due to be designated SSSI. The extent of the heathland is very evident in Dorset Explorer 1972 aerial photography reproduced below: [Aerial photo provided] Had this not happened, the whole area including AS27 would have been heathland SSSI and managed appropriately for the last 39 years. C18 Impact on Sensitive Human Receptors has considered only residences and not users of the bridleways. C19 Impact on Existing Settlements has assumed all traffic will travel towards Three Legged Cross and onwards through Ashley Heath to the A31/A338. It has not considered the impact of HGVs driving through West Moors or Verwood (B3072) or travelling in the opposite direction through Horton and then onto the B3078 or straight on to the A354. There is major concern in all the settlements that could be affected: residents are worried that their lives will be blighted due to a long period of uncertainty followed by years of additional HGV movements. C21 Effects on Cumulative Impacts Population and human health has not taken into consideration the expansion of the Woolsbridge Employment site, in particular the increase in HGV movements due to the proposed waste handling there. the construction of the Verwood Upper School The relatively few properties in the area should be</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>given full consideration and not dismissed as a minor issue. The properties to the north of the site (along Horton Way) currently enjoy one of the most tranquil places one could find in East Dorset. It is not only the absolute noise and dust levels that should be considered but the magnitude of change they would have to endure. Air quality . As discussed above, we disagree with the assessment regarding air quality because of the dust from haulage along the bridleways and the problems associated with attempting mitigation. In addition to human/animal health concerns there is a risk that dust deposits on the solar panels will reduce their efficiency. The volume of water required to wash them and the cost of additional cleaning and maintenance should be taken into consideration.</p>	



Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
590610	Resident	Don't Know	Yes	Unsound	Effective	<p>AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should not be included in the Minerals Site Plan. There are only disadvantages I have lived in Verwood for over 40 years, frequently walking and in earlier years horse riding across Horton Heath. I know the area well. I am commenting on concerns close to my interest and list a few others which are being covered in detail by professional respondents.</p> <p><b>LANDSCAPE VALUE</b> The exceptionally peaceful and extensive open space will lose its rare and special character. The site AS27 and the planned access over Horton Common is the only stretch of open landscape with that true Dorset character within walking distance of Verwood. The high open land with long views and ancient ways (now bridleways) is reminiscent of the writing of Thomas Hardy. It is tranquil and energising with a wealth of natural interest. There is nothing like it around Verwood. A quarry site and long haul route (c 1km on bridleways plus c 450m on the new solar farm track to the C2) for the frequent trucks (c 10 per hour) would destroy what is so special about this place. All the noise, dust and action would take place on the prominent highest ground and all along the central length of Horton Common. It would be inescapable. <b>HEALTH AND WELL BEING</b> The contribution that this area makes will be severely compromised. Health and wellbeing is becoming a significant factor in the national agenda. There is increasing evidence of the physical and mental health benefits of exercise, especially in a semi-natural environment. The area around Horton Common is a space that supports the more adventurous walkers, cyclists and horse riders. There is also space to enjoy a slow amble without having to dodge other folk. You can completely relax in your own thoughts with less people in close proximity. Other areas such as Moors Valley and the recreation areas are well used and not at all peaceful. <b>BRIDLEWAYS</b> Bridleways that serve as key arterial routes to the network will be effectively lost to many users. The bridleways adjacent to the site and in the nearby area have been won by the British Horse Society Bridleways Officer. She presented evidence of their long use over many years. Bridleways E4630, E4632 and E4612 are effectively acting as a crossroads of the ancient routes that used to link up the villages of Verwood, Horton, Three Legged Cross, West Moors and Woodlands. Old maps (eg Ordnance Survey 1900) distinctly show tracks in the position of these bridleways. The substantial old brick arched Railway Bridge, built around 1866, over Horton Way, Verwood, indicates this route was likely to have been of some importance. The bridleways adjacent to site AS27 could not easily be diverted as there are SSSI sites and solar panels to the east and a precipice to the west. Any diversion would affect the circular routes that people take. These bridleways are crucial to horse riders in order to be able to, not only access this location, but also the other areas beyond. If this riding area becomes unusable to them, many horse riders will find they are cut off from the wider bridleway network. Most roads are no longer a safe option. The heavy industrial activity of extracting the sand and the frequent heavy trucks crossing the area would present risk. There is a danger of accidents as horses are likely to take flight in response to unusual loud noise or sites such as flapping tarpaulins. The dust may harm airways and the likelihood of soft muddy areas forming makes leg injuries more likely. Walkers and cyclists will also be deterred from coming to this lovely area and may find their routes more restricted owing to the incompatible industrial activity. <b>OTHER CONCERNS I SHARE</b> Comment on these topics is already on record Biodiversity, including additional evidence that is emerging Hydrology and lack of knowledge until a survey is carried out. Wet conditions occur around the site. There is likelihood of risk to properties around the site. Transport " The C2 is not suitable to take the sand away. The planned Horton Heath vehicle track will have unfavourable</p>	<p>The land owner should be required to complete restoration of his other site at Redmans Quarry before commencing work on AS27 Include wording to make it absolutely clear there is an obligation to restore land as specified. Please state a time limit for restoration to be completed. If phased digging is favourable, then time limits should apply to each phase.</p>

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>impact. History " The setting of the ancient monuments will be compromised for at least 12 " 17 years.</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
815313	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective	<p>I strongly object to this proposal as I did in 2014. I have used the bridleways running alongside this proposed site for 25yrs as it offers safe off road hacking in beautiful tranquil AONB countryside over Horton hearth / Horton Common, away from traffic and lorries. The bridleways E46/12, E46/30 &amp; E46/32 are used alot by myself &amp; many riders with horses, including young riders under 18yrs old, several times a week as a safe route, without the need to cross a main road ie the B3072 to Verwood to access bridleways. My horse is traffic shy due to already being in a near accident with a bus. For this reason I avoid riding on main roads using a safe network of bridleways. I would not want to come across a transportation lorry or digging machinery off road and I would fear for mine &amp; my horses safety. Having 80 lorries per day (160 movements per day in and out) would greatly impact on the safe access to bridleways, and would only be a matter of time before a serious accident happens putting a human life at risk. Horton heath is the best circular route without roadwork to ride around and gain access to E46/7 bridge farm combined with the bridleways mentioned above. This beautiful heathland countryside is used not only by horse riders but, walkers, runners, birdwatchers, dog walkers and cyclists too as R.O.W and for its far reaching views. The proposed route for lorries would mean them crossing bridleways twice to take the lorries past the solar farm through the landowners fields, this would have a huge impact on the bridleways surface degrading it. The extraction site runs right alongside the bridleways. The dust pollution caused by extraction &amp; 80x lorries per day would cover the solar farm panels in dust during the summer months surely reducing the solar farms efficiency likewise dust covers the leaves of the surrounding woodlands reducing their ability to photosynthesis. Horses are flight animals by nature... what would happen should a horse and rider be scared at the hgv cross over point at E46/12 and cause the horse to bolt towards the main road. This is high risk for an accident on the horton road and a lack of duty of care to horseriders, and car drivers. This extraction site would increased hgv traffic through Three Legged Cross, Ashley Heath and West Moors which the roads are not suitable for and would devalue house property in all of the above areas mentioned. Three Legged cross (just off the horton road) is a confirmed accepted site for the protected species of Common Dormouse, 80x hgv lorries a day through three legged cross would disturb their nesting &amp; breeding through noise and vibration from the lorries. Located nearby to AS27 in Three Legged Cross are also campsites &amp; equine businesses which would be affected as businesses by noise &amp; dust pollution. The past application of mineral extraction at AS08 is currently a barren mess, it has never been returned to heathland, there is just a massive crater left. What promise of returning this site AS27 back to valley / heathland is to be believed when the AS08 site hasn't. This would leave behind a scar on the landscape, 12-17yrs of extraction would destroy the heathland habitat. In addition to my objection the site is close proximity to Horton Common Site of Special Scientific Interest, (SSSI). Horton Common is a safe haven and noted for supporting the rare Coral Necklace. It also supports a diverse range of wildlife &amp; a number of protected species, including rare and protected annex 1 birds, newts, snakes and sand lizard, Dartford Warbler, Nightjar, Skylarks, Butterflies, Dragonflies, Heath Bush Cricket and Bog Bush Cricket (The Bog Bush cricket is hugely rare &amp; relies on heathy bogs which could be drained by extraction). These priority habitats and priority species will be disrupted by noise, dust and light pollution. (Security lighting left on at night would disturb nocturnal animals and spoil the natural darkness of the night skies affecting hunting &amp; breeding habits) Extracting minerals from this site would be devastating to all wildlife. There are several watercourses nearby including the River Crane which is a sssi</p>	This site should not be progressed.

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>Chalk stream and Mannington brook which is a tributary of Moors River also sssi, mineral extraction would have an ecological &amp; hydrological impact on these rivers. A number of direct and indirect impacts could result from aggregate extraction on the SSSI and SAC, this would include noise, dust, air quality and light pollution. Also hydrological impacts resulting from groundwater flow disruption from mineral extraction this close to these sites. As the citations include wet heath and bog habitats, as well as associated rare species, the impacts of hydrological changes on it could be severe. I do Not agree with this application, just as when it was applied for previously in 2014 and it was eventually turned down as being unsuitable. In 2014 it was proposed to extract 125,000 tonnes per annum with a mineral resource of &lt;750,000 tonnes over an 30hectare area. Now in 2019 its proposed to extract 200,000 tonnes per annum over 12-17yrs with a mineral resource of &lt;3,500,000 tonnes over an 16hectare area. How is this not destructive to the heathland. Please dont destroy Horton Common / Horton Heath.</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
928497	Resident	No	Yes	Unsound		<p>AS27 should not be included. Specifically: Roads None of the surrounding roads is suitable - C roads (eg. C2), B roads (eg. B3081, B3078) and A roads (eg. A31). The whole of this road network suffers from one or more of: insufficient capacity; insufficient width; adverse geometry; poor drainage; poor condition, exacerbated by poor inspection regime and inferior quality maintenance. Based on previous practice and evidence across the county, no new road capacity would be provided to cater for increased traffic brought about by this potential quarry traffic, nor would maintenance activity be increased to deal with the inevitable, further degradation of the highway network. The conclusion shown in Sustainability Appraisal of AS27 Land at Horton Heath " December 2018, section 15 that there will be no negative effect (ie. labelled Yellow/0?) because "Once on the C2, there are good links to the A31 to the east. The A31 can also be reached to the south along the B3072 although this would involve travelling through West Moors " is clearly perverse. The closest road to AS27 (the C2) is barely fit-for-purpose today, with usage imminently increasing following new developments already underway (eg. Woolsbridge Industrial Estate expansion; Three Legged Cross Park Home). Add in the increasing use by traffic avoiding the inadequate Ferndown/Wimborne by-pass stretch of the A31, the latter usually being nose-to-tail from West Moors to Merley, and holiday traffic in general (accessing Moors Valley Country Park, numerous camp/caravan sites, and other attractions) and the traffic density resembles that of an 'A' rather than a 'C' road. ....</p> <p>Impact on current activities The DCC comments (dated 17 October 2013) mis-represent and understate the current usage of the land in question, and thus the potential impact of quarrying. Use by motorcycles - whether informal or formal - is negligible, and has been for years. However, there is regular, frequent use for walking, horse-riding, cycling, clay shooting, 4x4 events .... all of which would be adversely impacted. .... Noise Currently, noise from clay shooting, and 4x4 events, is clearly audible, to the extent of being disruptive, across the surrounding area (mainly at weekends). It is therefore inevitable that noise created by: heavy plant carrying out quarrying activity and, the 80 movements per day - involving vehicles coming/going at ~4-5 minute intervals, will also be audible across the surrounding area. The cumulative effect is the end of any peace and quiet in the area, 365 days per year. This reality is contrary to the situation appraisal shown in Sustainability Appraisal of AS27 Land at Horton Heath " December 2018, section 8. " To protect and improve air quality and reduce the impacts of noise " which concludes that there will be negligible or no effect. ....</p> <p>Air Pollution Quarrying involves the use of heavy plant, as well as heavy vehicles. Air pollution from dust, internal combustion engine emissions etc is inevitable, as is its spread across the surrounding area by prevailing winds. Again, this is contrary to the situation appraisal shown in Sustainability Appraisal of AS27 Land at Horton Heath " December 2018, section 8. "To protect and improve air quality and reduce the impacts of noise " which concludes that there will be negligible or no effect. The above is submitted in addition to the Mineral Planning Authorities' original considerations which led to this site not being included in the Draft Plan.</p>	<p>Minimise AS27 size to be a small addition to existing Redman's Hill activity, thus enabling existing facilities (access etc) to be used. Would still need assessing as to effects/mitigations required.</p>
928869	Resident	No	No	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective; Consistent with national policy	<p>This site would be completely unsuitable for use because: 1. Excessive noise and disturbance to local population and wildlife from Heavy engineering works and excessive traffic. 2. Excessive vibrations from mining activities and heavy goods traffic 3. Unacceptable levels of dust, including microscopic airborne particles, injurious to the health, wellbeing and safety of the local population 4. An unacceptable increase of heavy goods traffic on the Horton Road. An already</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						dangerous road with severe width limitations and a road that has already seen accidents and a fatality over the past few months. 5. Unacceptable and unnecessary destruction of green belt area	
1149892	Resident	Yes	No	Unsound	Positively prepared	I believe that AS27 should not be included in the Mineral Sites Plan. From the information provided, there appears to have been no review of how additional traffic, specifically related to this site, will impact the local area. All of the roads leading to and from the site are either rated 'B' or Unclassified. The information provided suggests that there will be approximately 80 HGV journeys to or from the site each day whilst the proposed site is in operation. None of the roads surrounding the site are suitable for this additional HGV traffic. There appears to be an assumption in the information provided, that traffic to and from the site would likely be using the Ringwood/Horton Road to gain access to the main 'A' roads in the area. Ringwood/Horton Road is an unclassified road that already provides the principal access to the industrial complexes in the Three Legged Cross area. Traffic to and from the sites already includes a large number of HGV's. This road is also the only access to the site included in the Dorset Waste Management plan at the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. In addition, other possible access roads including via Horton, Verwood, West Moors and Holt Heath do not appear suitable to accommodate this volume of HGV traffic. There appears to be little or no acknowledgement that the proposed level of HGV traffic would have a significant impact on the residents adjoining any of the possible access roads.	If the site was included in the MSP, Appendix 1 of the consultation document should be amended. Section 4 - Transport/Access should be enhanced to ensure that the impact of additional traffic related to the site on local access roads is reviewed. This review needs to take into account any additional traffic flows, which may result from the proposed Waste Management site (included in the Dorset Waste Management Plan) at the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate.
1150331	Resident					I understand that the draft mineral extraction plan includes the Horton Road Site. Highways cannot fill the holes on the road quick enough already. My house shakes when a lorry passes and cracks are appearing. We have constant stoppages on the road due to extra wide traffic carrying mobile homes. Our hedges are destroyed by the current lorries. I would like to state that I OBJECT to the plan and would be willing to undertake peaceful ways of stopping it. Certainly if it does go ahead it would take nothing for the people living in the Horton Road to stop its production very quickly just by legally parking in the road.	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1193566	Resident	Yes	No	Unsound	Effective	<p>Knowlton Parish Council is a group council which includes Horton parish, within which site AS27 lies. Knowlton Parish Council OBJECTS to the proposal to include site AS27 in the Mineral Sites Plan. Legal Compliance Since it is beyond our competence to assess, we do not challenge the legal compliance of the Plan at this point without an independent opinion. Soundness We do not accept that the Plan, as proposed, is sound. General Issues The outcomes documentation of the AS08 consultation acknowledges that the publicity for the 2018 consultation referring to AS08 was not well achieved for local people. It went on to list means by which this could be improved, including on-line access, by which local people with an interest could be engaged in the consultation. It was disappointing, therefore, when the only notification of which we were aware was made directly to residents within a 500m radius, and to the parish and town councils. We were able to make the situation known mainly by word of mouth, since it seems we seem to be constrained from using address data available from the electoral rolls for this purpose under GDPR. Most rural parishes, especially one of our geographical extent, do not run to a parish office ' for public access. The reliance principally on internet-based responses is disingenuous. There is perhaps a lack of understanding of the realities of rural life behind this. The notification we received came on 17 Dec 18, at the beginning of the Christmas holiday season when it would be at its most difficult to liaise with interested parties and when a significant part of the consultation period would be unavailable. Nevertheless, many members of the public and the town and parish councils have made representations to this consultation and their general concern is strongly expressed throughout. The initial consideration of AS08 was undertaken shortly after planning permission was granted on 16 Aug 2018 for the site at Redman 's Hill. It not made clear whether the Inspector was aware, when making the suggestion that AS27 should be re-examined, of the possibility of a similar operation nearby with permission to operate until 31 Dec 2021. Reference is made in the current AS27 consultation to Redman 's Hill, but there is no indication that simultaneous operation of AS27 and Redman 's would not be constrained. Environmental and Social Issues In the main part, the environmental and social issues affecting this proposal are expressed clearly by other respondents. We support their concerns where there is no clear explanation or clarification from the various agencies associated with these subjects that meets their needs. These are real people, with real needs in their real lives and may not be passed by. The area which regularly appears as one of concern is that of local infrastructure. The only contribution to date is that of Highways England. Highways England is an organisation which clearly limits its area of responsibility as: operates, maintains and improves England 's motorways and major A roads . This is the organisation which appears in some of the earlier documents under its previous name ' Highways Agency '. It is not however the Highways Authority for Dorset, which is currently Dorset County Council. This would explain the reference to DfT Circular 02/13 The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development by Highways England, as their responsibility begins and ends, in this case, at the junctions with the A31. They have no influence or interest in B-classified and Classified Unnumbered roads, such as one affected immediately by the operation of any extraction work on Horton Heath and numbered ' C2 ' by Dorset County Council. The general function of each road classification is given by DfT in their document ' DfT - Guidance on Road Classification and the Primary Route Network ' in this extract: A B road will still be of significance to traffic (including through traffic), but less so than an A road A Classified Unnumbered road will be of lower significance and be of primarily local</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>importance, but will perform a more important function than an unclassified road. An Unclassified road will generally have very low significance to traffic, and be of only very local importance . C2, as a Classified Unnumbered road, is considered as of primarily local importance. This is not a strategic route. As many respondents have pointed out, C2 is a road which carries traffic of a type and volume from which both the road structure and the adjoining settlements suffer damage and discomfort. It is a road which has outgrown its classification by stealth. Stretching from the A31 Ashley Heath roundabout to the Wiltshire border, C2 has sections of winding road of narrow width where HGVs find difficulty passing, including one part on the western section which is one-way traffic even for cars and light vans. It is this cart track with a tarmac top which adoption and operation of AS27 could use to and from site and, as it has no direct connection to the A31 (other than by the B3078) to the West, it does not appear in their assessment because it doesn 't connect to their major roads. It is not yet clear what volume of traffic is expected to serve AS27. The Assessment makes an assumption of 50 vehicles per day if AS08 is discarded - sometimes. There is no indication as to the number of days per week, nor during what hours, that the site would be operated. This is an unknown which must be resolved, surely, before any discussion of adding AS27 to the Plan can be concluded? Criteria described in the Assessment frequently refer to mitigation to be a function of the planning phase. Whilst this is probably an accepted way to proceed, there is a concern that, over the 12+ years of operation of AS27, there would be inadequate resources or methods to monitor or enforce compliance. Mitigation deferred is mitigation lost, and a large number of these mitigated ' concerns should be resolved before there can be any reasonable justification to include AS27 in the Plan.</p>	



Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1197359	Resident	No	No	Unsound	Effective; Consistent with national policy	<p>Hydrology “ The proposed works would have an adverse affect on the hydrology in the area, affecting the flows of the natural springs that feed the surrounding ponds, lakes and streams, including the ponds/lakes on the land of the farms within close proximity of the proposed works, which all support local wildlife. In addition, our farm is 100% reliant on the springs, with no mains water, which it has done for hundreds of years. The water springs supply the farm animals and the household with all water needs. There is also the highly probable risk of water contamination which could also cause irreversible damage. Restoration of the site after use would not be able to return the springs to their natural flows. Transport “ As recognised in the Minerals Strategy (2014), The A31/A35 trunk road is a critical access route to the strategic network but suffers severe capacity issues, particularly at Wimborne, Ferndown, Ringwood and Bere Regis '. The local roads are too narrow in places, and cannot safely accommodate the proposal to have a further 50-80 HGVs per day, for the next 12-17 years, where there are already too many accidents, and in addition to the new Woolsbridge estate development, will make the already congested roads worse. Many people, ramblers/walkers do walk on the Horton Road, making this more dangerous. In addition, there is no direct access or suitable link from the proposed site to the Dorset strategic highway network or primary route network resulting in the HGVs passing through Three Legged Cross, Horton, West Moors (passing a school), and Verwood. Rights of Way “ The proposed site would have an unacceptable impact upon the safety and enjoyment of Rights of Way users, horse riders, ramblers, dog walkers etc, with the high level of HGVs using the tracks and the noise levels of the many machines needed to extract and load the HGVs. In addition, the recently approved site on the same land, Planning Application 3/17/0967/DCC, it was agreed that due to concerns raised as to the level and nature of interaction between Rights of Way users and HGV 's, the number of daily movements was revised from 13 HGV trips per day, to 7 HGV trips per day ', and restricting road haul activity between 8am-1pm (Monday to Friday) ' for 2 ½ years . In light of this, it is difficult to see how it would now be acceptable to approve a proposal for 50-80 HGV trips (100-160 movements) per day, 5 days a week, for 12 “ 17 years. Noise pollution “ mitigating actions would not be able to totally eradicate the noise levels of the movement of 50 - 80 HGVs and extracting and loading machines/vehicle s , and as we live in close proximity, as do others and any visitors to the area, which is currently a relatively quite, peaceful place, would be adversely impacted with constant noise for the next 12-17 years, 5 days a week. Dust pollution - with the number of HGVs moving on tracks and the extraction machines and loading vehicles, mitigation of dust will not be effective, and we are at risk of being affected by dust in the air. The dust can also be suspended in the air and travel reasonable distances, possibly affecting Verwood, Three Legged Cross and the local schools, and being particularly harmful for anyone with chest/ lung problems. Wildlife - The development would result in destruction/displacement of habitats, including scrubland and lakes, and important wildlife, such as different species of deer, badgers, foxes and numerous birds including buzzards and owls .</p>	Scale to be greatly reduced in line with the current extraction, and not to be started until current extraction has expired.

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1198112	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know			<p>I strongly object to site AS27. Consultation has not been relayed to all those who will be affected and sufficient time has not been allowed for those who have been consulted by letter to inform them. I refer to MSP AS08: Horton Heath/Clump Hill " Site Issues, I realise this is a different site but it is in close proximity and is a much larger site with further reaching impacts on the local community. Surely the same actions and further information requirements should apply to AS27. Consultation: Actions &amp; further information requirements The MPA will increase the level of consultation about proposed sites at the next consultation stage, through the use of site notices and direct neighbour notifications. Dorset for you mineral sites plan (online) Consultation on additional site " Land at Horton Heath (AS27) The Mineral Sites Plan was submitted to the planning inspectorate on 29 March 2018 for examination, and public hearings took place during September and October 2018. During the examination, a site that hadn 't been included in the submitted Plan was discussed " land at Horton Heath, Wimborne (reference AS27). The site is now being considered for inclusion in the final plan. Neighbours were not made aware of these public meetings, which is a contradiction of MPA- Actions &amp; further information requirements as above. There were no site notices and neighbours did not receive notification until week commencing the 18 December 2018, immediately prior to the Christmas and New Year holidays. All those alongside the B3078 through Horton, Three Legged Cross and Ashley Heath and those on West Moors Road, including a first school, residences, two doctor 's surgeries, rest homes and accommodation for the elderly, through to Ferndown will have already seriously burdened roads compromised further. These roads are inadequate for the increase in the flow of traffic to the extent within the proposal, which does not include site personel. The additional traffic gives rise to increased risk of road traffic accidents and health issues from air and noise pollution. This will also affect the inhabitants of Three Legged Cross, Horton, Verwood and West Moors, who should also have been notified and given the chance to give their views. The increase in maintenance of the roads will inconvenience these villages and there will be an inflation of costs on our district council 's budgets for this. This will reduce budgets that may be utilised in other areas serving the community. Another concern is that Site AS27 and Redman 's Quarry will run concurrently, adding further to the traffic issues afore mentioned. These communities, in particular, Three Legged Cross and Horton will be further affected by air and noise pollution exaggerated because of the lie of the land of site AS27. Those areas will be downhill from the site enabling for dust and noise to travel further. There has been no consultation with the landowners in the immediate vicinity to investigate how these factors will affect them. In relation to this factor I am particularly concerned that our property will be seriously in danger of air and water pollution because it is downhill from the site and the landscape of our property has a backdrop surrounding it. This leaves it vulnerable to airborne particles. Although we clear ragwort annually, the seeds travel from other areas in the air and come to rest on our fields. We have livestock and a stocked lake to consider, this is going to affect their habitat. I have concerns with the Hydrological assessment. I feel that personal visits for consultation of landowners in the immediate vicinity should be completed. There are farmsteads which solely rely upon provision of water from wells. Unless these properties are visited, I question if an assessment will be accurate. The water of these wells will be in danger of loss and contamination. Some of these properties are also providing incomes for the occupants, this could have a detrimental outcome. Wildlife and SSSI areas will suffer through changes in the water table and landscape. This area is at high risk for TB. There is a possibility</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>that badgers will migrate because of the noise and disruption increasing the risk of infection for the surrounding areas. There are implications for other local business 's reliant on leisure/tourism who will suffer, bed and breakfast, campsites, riding schools etc. Some of these are close to the site and knew nothing about it. The air pollution, noise will make the area unattractive to visit. Ancient monuments may be damaged through inevitable vibration. These activities and places of interest are a huge attraction in this area for walkers/cyclists and horse riders. Local shops, pubs, cafes and restaurants will also suffer financially as a result of a certain decline in tourism. I have concerns that some properties will suffer damage from the vibration of heavy plant and machinery. Will the landowner/contractor be made liable for any structural damages sustained? I am concerned if AS27 is passed as a mineral sites that there will be future changes applied for: Processing plant Landfill site Extension to the size of site</p>	
1198122	Resident	Yes	Yes			<p>I do not believe the land at Horton Heath should be included as part of the MSP as the impact on the local environment would be detrimental in terms of the land itself, the flora and fauna sustained within the area and sites of historic interest. The impact on local residents is likely to be disruptive and will affect their quality of life. This would include a greater volume of traffic, the vast majority of which is unsuited to the road conditions as they presently exist. The junction from the main Horton Road is already somewhat dicey with limited visibility a concern. Up to 80 vehicle movements a day increases the risks of road traffic accidents significantly and I fear these could be life changing in nature given the present speed limits. That traffic will impact the existing leisure pursuits of those who use the paths and bridleways negatively affecting the quality of life of residents and visitors alike.</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1198134	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Justified; Effective	I do not believe the Horton Heath land should be included within the Mineral Site Plans due to the impact on the local infrastructure. There is already an extremely high volume of HGV traffic down the Horton Road. We have had a pot hole outside our property repaired 3 times already. The house often shakes with the passing lorries and you feel like you are taking your life in your hands (especially when we are with our young children) walking to the local shop at times, as the lorries often speed by extremely close to the pedestrian's on the pavement. All this is based on current traffic volumes. The substantial increase that will result from the proposal going ahead will have a significant impact on the area. The volume of pedestrians, especially around the One Stop Area/end of Lions Lane is always high as there are many dog walkers, shop customers, school children catching buses etc. The road and area is not suitable for the mess, noise, speed and sheer size of the HGV's that will be using this road to carry loads excavated from the site.	I do not believe it should be included so no changes need to be made.
1197695	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective; Consistent with national policy	I strongly object to AS27 Land at Horton Heath being included in the Mineral Sites Plan as it raises many serious issues: 1. Proximity to Horton Heath (SNCI, SSSI, SPA and Ramsar), the site will cause excessive levels of noise and air pollution impacting on the ecosystem, biodiversity and diverse wildlife. 2. The disturbance to the water table that the site would bring to an area that in wet weather already becomes waterlogged and boggy. Residents' farms and dwellings that rely on potable well water will also be impacted by the site. 3. The area of proposed excavation is a site of ancient and historical monuments. The Archaeological Assessment December 2018 stated that tumuli, earthworks, bowl barrows and a Bronze Age burial ground and will destroyed by the site. 4. The site will increase the number of HGVs on an already overused, unsuitable Cat C Class road. The proposed site's access has poor visibility and Clump Hill is already an accident black spot. Additional HGV use will result in even more congestion on an already busy road with narrow lanes. 5. The impact on local footpaths and bridleways and those that use them such as horse-riders, walkers, cyclists and residents will have a devastating affect on their health, well-being and enjoyment of the area.	1. According to the Dorset Local Aggregates Assessment 2006-2015 May 2017 a large amount of the sand and gravel excavated is exported out of the county for economic growth but to the detriment of our beautiful countryside. 2. Any AS27 mitigation measures will still have a detrimental affect on the ecosystem, biodiversity, water table and ancient and historical monuments and will only serve to destroy the site and landscape.

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1197752	Resident	No	No	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective; Consistent with national policy	<p>It is recommended that planning permission be REFUSED for the following reasons: Noise to nearby residents The proposal fails to demonstrate that the noise from mineral extraction operations can be mitigated to an acceptable level so as not to interfere with local residents ' use and enjoyment of their property. Dust The proposal would have an unacceptable, adverse impact on the environment arising from the impact of dust for those living, visiting and working in the vicinity of the site. SSSI, scheduled monuments and listed buildings The site is located in an area of high scenic and recreational amenity, where the proposed development would be out of character with and detract from the amenities of the area and would interfere with SSSI, scheduled monuments and listed buildings in the vicinity Fauna The proposal is naively narrow in respect of the detriment to our wildlife, where it states: Loss of hedgerows could have impact on protected species e.g. dormice. The site has historically been an habitat for breeding buzzards, great crested newts, small tortoiseshell butterflies and migrant hawker dragonflies, among many other animals. St Mary 's First School and Nursery Breathing in particle pollution is harmful to health. 132 of our local children and infants in a nearby school will be subject to: course particles, called PM10, which can irritate eyes, nose, and throat. The dust from the extra lorries on the roads as well as the quarry omit types of PM10. Fine particles, called PM2.5, are more dangerous because they can get into the deep parts of your lungs " or even into your blood. PM2.5 will be derived directly from the additional lorries. It has been brought to my attention by parents that the proposal has already had a negative impact on the school with a decline in application numbers due to the widespread publicity about the threat of the quarry. Traffic The impact of the HGV traffic on the local transport system would be severe and would run counter to the local transport policy of putting sustainable transport first within town boundaries. An example how juxtaposed the application is can be demonstrated by the Dorset Local Transport Plan 2011 - 2026: Green thinking. We will look for opportunities to reduce the carbon footprint of all aspects of transport and travel and our related operations. Making the general public, and the freight industry, aware of eco-driving techniques which reduce fuel consumption. Stock There is no need for the mineral and the proposal would result in an uncontrolled oversupply of minerals provision. This is in line with Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset Local Aggregate Assessment, May 2017: All sources of aggregate demonstrate capacity for some increase in supply, should demand increase, and no sharp increases in demand are expected in the next year. In the longer term, there are adequate landbanks for sand and gravel and crushed rock. The emerging Mineral Sites Plan seeks to identify and allocate adequate new sites to maintain production and sales and allow for flexibility in the market. The Mineral Planning Authority has reasonable confidence that sites will be identified and permitted to maintain supply at the level of provision as set out in Policy AS1 of the 2014 Bournemouth, Dorset. There has been declining use of sand and gravel for many years. It is very unlikely that demand would increase more than marginally because of increased use of secondary and recycled aggregates. In the unlikely event of increased demand necessitating additional supply it is much more sensible and less environmentally damaging to extend existing quarries, than to create a new quarry with considerable adverse impacts in Horton, Woodlands, Wigbeth, Three Legged Cross, Verwood and West Moors amongst others. Cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders The road network is not suitable for the increase in HGV usage. The details in the application for road usage is contrary to: Dorset Local Transport Plan 2011 - 2026, LTP3 Strategy Document, Implementation Plans. Applying the Dorset Rural Roads Protocol to</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>ensure that decisions affecting rural highways conserve and enhance the outstanding quality of its landscape and settlements, while delivering a safe and convenient network for all modes of travel. Managing HGV movements efficiently, including reviewing routing and direction signing to minimise impacts on local communities affected by noise, vibration and poor air quality. Site promoters: ACS The operating company is relatively inexperienced for a site of this sensitivity and complexity and has not demonstrated sufficient financial assets to be able to cope with unforeseen events. Airport There is substantial risk of a bird strike due to large amounts of birds being attracted to the quarry site. The proposed quarry would be less than 8k from Bournemouth Airport, approximately 100 seconds flying time from the airport, and directly under the flight path at a point where aircrafts are flying at a height 200 metres. A quarry inevitably creates a void which fills with water and attracts birds. Landing and take-off are the most dangerous aspects of flying. It would be totally unacceptable to create such a hazard in such a location. The number of passengers and flights using Bournemouth Airport is projected to increase substantially in the next few years. More flights would result in a greater danger for even more people. Water table There is a grave danger about the possible disturbance of the water table, and the possible contamination resulting from incidents such as diesel spills. This includes contamination to the surrounding ponds and the River Crane. As illustrated in Dorset Minerals &amp; Waste Local Plan: It is therefore important to establish that the site can be operated without unreasonable detriment to the environment or amenities of local people. Motorcycle users I have no doubt that there will be a water cleaning system adopted to assist in removing debris from HGV tyres, but this is not a totally effective method in ensuring highly hazardous deposits of mud and sand are not present on the road. Other contributors have discussed at length the narrowness of the road network leading from the site, along with the interference of established trees; this all leads to increased risk and dangers to the most vulnerable road users. There are very many very compelling reasons to refuse this planning application. Please do so.</p>	
1197760	Resident	No	Yes	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective; Consistent with national policy	<p>This is a wholly awful proposal and a sad indictment of the areas mineral policy for the site to be considered at all. The location of the site and sheer excessive size is completely unacceptable and a disaster for the area and communities, and in the unlikely event the result is fortuitous for the quarry, then it will continue to be a disaster, scar and incoherently awful decision that will blight us all for decades. What would be the justification of a very poor choice of site for the quarry? A cyclist death or deaths, increases in asthma in our children, communities grid locked with roads ceased up, wildlife gone and lost, our third age residents housebound and unable to open windows from the threat of swamping their houses with dust. Will these only be of relevance afterwards, when bad decisions cannot be unmade? No one should have to look back in hindsight with the stain and regret of permitting this application. There are other already established quarries, fit for expansion, that are far more suitable than this application, to meet the low demand for sand. I vehemently and unequivocally do not support land at Horton Heath for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan.</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1198031	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified	These minerals are not required in the local area, therefore the environmental impact far outweighs the gain to local environment. Namely the Historic monuments which attract visitors will be impacted by mineral extraction vehicles in terms of aesthetics, noise, dust, obstructions on roads, carbon emissions, vibrations are also a concern. The road leading north west towards Horton, from the proposed site is not fit for the volume of mineral extraction traffic. The roads have multiple blind corners, hidden dips and narrow points where lorries cannot pass simultaneously. In addition there are small bridges so the route cannot sustain this volume of heavy lorries running through a green belt. 80 lorries in a working day may equate to one every 6 minutes. There are a number of hedgerows which interlink across this road, and the Dorset Wildlife Trust have been monitoring the habitats. These would be adversely impacted by the proposed lorry traffic. Also the drains may be damaged and the result of this could be to failure to deal with water, hence icy roads and more accidents.	Lorries should only travel south onto the main A31
814494	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Justified	I strongly object to this proposal. as a local business I three legged cross this will greatly impact my business and my clients. I run an equine livery yard which prides itself on offering safe off road hacking in beautiful countryside over Horton heath / Horton Common. All of my livery clients use the bridleways E46/12, E46/30 & E46/32 with their horses, several times a week. Having 80 lorries per day (160 movements per day in and out) would greatly impact on their safe access to bridleways, and would only be a matter of time before a serious accident happens with a human life endangered. My business would suffer from lack of safe horse riding, my liveries would find other yards to keep their horses at. My children also hack out using Horton common / Horton heath as I know it is a safe route for them without them having to cross the main road (to Verwood B3072) to access lower common in three legged cross. Horton heath is the best circular route without roadwork to ride around and gain access to E46/7 combined with the bridleways mentioned above. The proposed route for lorries would mean them crossing bridleways twice to take the lorries past the solar farm through the landowners fields, this would have a huge impact on the bridleways surface and also I imagine cover the solar farm in dust during the summer months surely reducing the solar farms efficiency. What would happen should a horse and rider be scared at the cross over point at E46/12 and cause the horse to bolt towards the main road. Currently there is a shut gate at the exit however if there are 80 lorries per day in and out are they going to be opening & shutting it for each lorry?? I doubt it - it would be left open - a higher risk to an accident on the main Horton road. I also own a house in three legged cross - this mineral site with 80 lorries per day and increased traffic through three legged cross, Ashley heath and west moors would decrease my house value and also impact on future buyers too over the next 12-17yrs. These small towns cant cope with the volume of traffic already, let alone if the proposal goes ahead. It would also affect our beautiful countryside used not only by horse riders but, walkers and cyclists too. The wildlife would be affected as would the SSSI land in very close proximity to this site. The past application of mineral extraction at AS08 is currently a mess, it has never been returned to heathland, there is just a massive crater left. What promise of returning this site back to valley / heathland is to be believed when the AS08 site hasn't. I do Not agree with this application, just as when it was applied for previously in 2013/14 and it was eventually turned down as being unsuitable.	this site should not be allocated

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1198161	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Positively prepared	Our school, the Ringwood Waldorf School recently visited the Monmouth Ash, an important local historical site near the proposed quarry on Monmouth Ash Farm. The owners of the land allow access on to their land to any members of the public, including school groups such as ours, to view this site. Although the public thereby have access by arrangement, I understand that they have not been consulted, and therefore have insufficient time to raise their concerns. Although there may not be legal public access by way of footpaths etc., the public are most definitely welcome to visit by arrangement and in our case even gave us a free guided tour. The commencement of quarrying operations nearby may compromise this beautiful and historically important site. Safety, contamination and damage to historical buildings are concerns that need proper consideration and therefore I would urge you to extend the consultation deadline to give time to consult properly with the owners of Monmouth Ash Farm.	Our suggestion as outlined above, is to extend the deadline in order to consult with the owners of Monmouth Ash Farm.
1198181	Resident	Don't Know		Unsound		I do NOT think it the land at Horton Heath should be included in the Mineral Sites plan because it is a natural site and should be protected. The most important matter is the increased traffic of 80 or more trucks every day on Horton Road going to the A31. It will make the road very dangerous, busy, noisy, increase pollution. The private houses on Horton Road and in the area will suffer from high pollution and noise. The road is narrow and this increased traffic is very dangerous for all the users and residents of the area.	
1198204	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound		We are concerned about the accessibility of this land by HGVs and the use of the Horton Road. The road width is too narrow for these huge lorries. Horton Road drain holes are always being repaired and indeed we are hindered by extra wide lorries frequently and have to take avoiding action. It is also getting very difficult to get access to the A31 and A338 from the Ashley Heath Roundabout because of extra traffic coming from trading estates and business parks. There are local schools and residential areas which are going to suffer from noise, air pollution and traffic congestion. Also, the Horton Road is not suitable for two HGVs to pass each other safely. The historical heathland habitat will be destroyed with consequences to the wildlife and water table. Our countryside should be protected for future generations and not for the sake of short term quarrying.	The whole proposal is completely unacceptable to local residents due to its negative impact.
1198214	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound		This site is entirely unsuitable for mineral extraction, in my opinion, for the following reasons ; Proximity to SSSI. It would deny access to and use of bridleways and footpaths, causing loss of amenity. Permanent damage to the local environment. Unjustified and intolerable increase in traffic over a large area, and the commensurate environmental and air pollution, devaluation of property in the surrounding area with the quoted number of lorry movements (Totalling 160 per day - 80 in and 80 out)	
1198217	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective	It feels like this proposal has been sneaked in through the back door over the Christmas period at a time of year when people were distracted. Not only that but it is very wrong that something that impacts on local residents over a much wider area than 500m from the project area was not notifiable by consultation notices in the post with a reply/comment form that could have been returned the same way. The demographic of the surrounding villages contains a large elderly population, it is most unlikely the majority of these were able to obtain the information in paper form or complete an electronic online form even if they knew what was happening. This will have detrimental implications on wildlife, farming and the water table in the area. It will cause noise and environmental pollution plus cause traffic chaos through West Moors where the roads could not possibly sustain 80 lorry journeys per day for the length of the project. What would become of the site once it has been stripped out? Another eyesore in what was once beautiful countryside. There	It should not be undertaken.



Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						have to be other more suitable sites in Dorset to extract sand from than here. Please reconsider this unsuitable proposal on all of the above grounds.	
1198228	Resident	Yes	No	Unsound	Justified; Effective; Consistent with national policy	The inclusion of AS27 is not justified or consistent with national policy because: The other sites already included in the proposed plan already provide more capacity than is required during the lifetime of the plan There are numerous sites within the plan area already banked and not exploited awaiting commercial opportunity The proposal is contrary to the NPPF in terms of its impact on priority habitats and ecological connectivity - loss of internationally rare habitats (acid grassland, heathland and associated flora and fauna) The site is contrary to the LTP because of its impact on the Rural Roads Protocol which aims to maintain local safety and tranquillity on minor roads The inclusion of AS27 is not effective because The site would cause irreparable damage to habitats, ecology, individual species, human wellbeing, drainage, hydrology, air quality, road infrastructure, scheduled ancient monuments, recreational experience Substantial mitigation would be required in order to ensure: Restoration of habitat (acid grassland, fragmentation of heathland, disturbance to protected wildlife) Protection of existing drainage patterns, avoidance of disruption to hydrology and the need for restoration upon completion Improvements to the road infrastructure to cope with the large number of heavy vehicle movements on the minor roads and junctions with the A31 The need for road safety measures to reduce risk to local users from heavy vehicles on roads which are already too narrow for large vehicles Manage the noise of the extraction and vehicle movements during operation and requiring the restoration of tranquillity upon completion Avoidance of damage to Scheduled Ancient Monuments, archaeology Diversion of rights of way and other recreational opportunities during the extraction and then restoration upon completion Avoidance of dust, noise, mud on roads, pollution form vehicle exhausts	Substantial mitigation would be required in order to ensure: Restoration of habitat (acid grassland, fragmentation of heathland, disturbance to protected wildlife) Protection of existing drainage patterns, avoidance of disruption to hydrology and the need for restoration upon completion Improvements to the road infrastructure to cope with the large number of heavy vehicle movements on the minor roads and junctions with the A31 The need for road safety measures to reduce risk to local users from heavy vehicles on roads which are already too narrow for large vehicles Manage the noise of the extraction and vehicle movements during operation and requiring the restoration of tranquillity upon completion Avoidance of damage to Scheduled Ancient Monuments, archaeology Diversion of rights of way and other recreational opportunities during the extraction and then restoration upon completion Avoidance of dust, noise, mud on roads, pollution form vehicle exhausts
1198230	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Justified	I do not think the AS27 land at Horton Heath would be included in the mineral sites plan. The Horton road is totally unsuitable for the Heavy lorries that would be necessary to remove quarried material. The quality of our lives is already damaged by the amount of traffic using Horton Road. This includes parcel distribution, tanker and many other types of lorries literally shaking our house both day and night.	The site would only be acceptable if a relief road was put in and a weight limit put on the Horton road to stop lorries using it.
1198240	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know			It seems to me that AS27 Land at Horton Heath should not be included in the Mineral Sites Plan, for the following reasons; The increased number of the HGVs on an already overused, totally unsuitable rural C Class road is of serious concern, where road lanes are not wide enough for 2 lorries to pass comfortably. The access to the proposed site from the main road has extremely poor visibility and increased HGV use is only going to result in more a congestion on an already very busy road not to mention the likelihood of more serious accidents. The vibrations due to this increased HGV use will cause structural damage to the many old buildings along this road some of which are Listed. Horton Road dangerous with many recorded accidents " 2 fatalities within 5 years. Volume of traffic of lorries and site employees causing blockages for Ambulances and paramedics needing to access the 3 care homes near by. The levels of air and noise pollution this would cause, would be detrimental not only to delicate ecosystems but will greatly impact on the health of local residents. The heathland is home to wide and diverse wildlife including reptiles. These areas of outstanding natural beauty need to be preserved not destroyed. This also raises concerns regarding disturbance to the water table this site would produce in an area that is already wet and boggy and would also impact on the farms and dwellings that rely an well water. The daily crossing of footpaths and bridleways	Yes

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						by HGVs will impact greatly on walkers,ramblers, horseriders, cyclists and residents alike. Not to mention disturbance to sites of ancient and historical interest.	
1198241	Resident	No	Yes	Unsound	Justified	The draft Site Plan already has adequate provision. The inclusion of AS27 is neither necessary or justified, nor is it in the interests of the local community. The assertion that AS27 is unsuitable for inclusion within the Plan is supported as follows: Given the proximity of the site to the Hampshire border where, with reference to the Hampshire Mineral and Waste Plan, there are two active mineral extraction sites. Local building supply can obviously be satisfied by access to these existing sites. Furthermore the existing sites are served by B class roads more suited to HGV traffic, giving access to the A31 via slip roads, rather than residential C roads, as would be required by the AS27 inclusion. The C2 Horton Road is likely to be the primary access route for the AS27 HGV traffic. The road is narrow, and already likely to be at capacity, particularly at rush hour and student travelling times, in view of the expanding Woolsbridge Trading estate. This road is also the primary access for utilisation of the local forest amenity, particularly the Noors Valley Country Park, and Ringwood Forest. The road has narrow pavements in some cases less than 1 metre, presenting a real hazard to pedestrians from passing HGVs, who at 2.5 metre width need to use the entire width of their carriageway. In summary this carriageway is unsuited for HGV traffic and if AS27 is adopted will present a real and increased threat to pedestrians, cyclist, horse riders and other road users. The C2 emerges at the Ashley Heath Roundabout, notorious for fast moving traffic; slow, and inevitably impatient HGV drivers will represent a significantly increased hazard at this junction. I also find reasons for concern with respect to the effect on the landscape: clearly the effect on the hydrology of the area is of significant import, it is difficult to believe that the quantity of sand to be extracted will not impact upon the water table and consequent effect on wildlife and the important wetland areas in close proximity to the site; I also note the comments of the Dorset Wildlife trust, both noting the impact on specific species, but also noting the failure of delivery on past promised mitigations. I submit that the proposal should be rejected on the aforementioned grounds	It is difficult to believe that, if allocated to the Mineral Sites Plan, and planning permission subsequently granted, any mitigations or assurances could be relied upon without enshrinement in Agreements, independent scrutiny and adequate consequence for failure to comply.
1198270	Resident	No	Don't Know				
815104	Resident					I am a small business of 40 years and resident of 48 years. My business would be affected to the point of bankruptcy as clients would not want to ride on serious health concerns i.e. Sand, gravel particles, roadside dust, traffic pollution HGV lorries all damaging their chests, lungs etc. Some of my riders are small children who have a lifetime ahead of them so their health issues will burden the NHS for years. My horses need to be sound in wind and limb otherwise they will fail the Vetting Riding School Yearly inspection which means they cannot work, nobody will want to buy them except the meat man. The mental trauma personally will kill me these beautiful animals are part of my family and have been with me for some part of the 40 years. My clients including OAP, RDAs and under 4 year olds will be very upset and local business will lose our trade. There are not many small Riding Centres left where you can enjoy an old fashioned traditions. The bridleways rides are a leisure activity to get away from everyday problems often better than a good night's sleep! We see all the wild life, deer, badgers, foxes, rabbits, lizards, snakes, mice with the birds of prey hovering overhead. Sometimes we have heard a Cuckoo were else could we experience this with the wind in our hair and the ponies loving it. Our Cottage is 450 years old and could be made unsafe if the Mineral Site's vibrations effected the structure rendering it dangerous and	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						unsaleable. There are traffic jams in the 3 Cross Village now which means if the mineral site lorries start, the local delivery lorries will be forced to find alternative routes possibly down Church Road which is narrow and bendy in places. My business leads out directly to Bridleways 12 which could become permanently muddy if any water courses flood it. Mud is a health and safety hazard for any activity, walking, cycling, Jogging, dog walking and riding. Bridleways 12 has dragon flies, butterflies, moths, lava. Robins Sparrows, woodpeckers, wrens, tree creepers, and many more.	
815741	Resident	No	Yes	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective; Consistent with national policy	The land at Horton Heath should not be included as an allocation in the MSP. It is a large area totally out of context with the local area which includes SSSI, public rights of way-footpaths and bridleways as well as areas of important historical interest including ancient burial grounds. There would be an irreversible effect on the natural wildlife in the area, not only from the sand extraction itself but from the excessive increase in lorry traffic serving the quarry and the general pollution of the surrounding areas. There is an abundance of wildlife here including reptiles and a colony of sand martins which would then be at risk from the development. The area is used by many people, cyclists, walkers, dog walkers, tourists and riders and a bridle way runs along 2 sides of the proposed area. This will increase the risk of danger to horse riders and all users of the paths not only from the activity within the area itself but also the increase in traffic-80 lorries a day!!!! Also the surrounding villages are not set up to cope with absorbing such an extra load of traffic. These lorries will be passing through villages with preschools, schools and nursing homes on their main routes away from the site. The roads to and from the site as well as through the surrounding area have limited capacity and visibility to cope with a huge increase in large lorry traffic. Extraction of minerals to such a huge degree will effect the natural ecosystem of the area and is likely to increase flooding which in itself will again damage local wildlife and make the area unusable for people. It would also increase the risk of contamination of natural water in the area.	
816493	Resident					I oppose this Mineral Site AS27 as this will bring far too much traffic onto the Horton Road, which is overloaded already. Apart from the fact they will be using the bridle road or crossing it, there are dog walkers and bikes, a lot of people enjoy the peace and quiet and lovely views. All these lorries will destroy all of this.	
1004543	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Justified	I object strongly to the inclusion of this site for mineral extraction. It would have a devastating effect on the safe use of three bridleways which connect to provide a safe off road circular route often used by horse riders, cyclists and walkers. Consideration of this site for mineral extraction is not justified in consideration of the total amount of damage to the landscape, public rights of way and wildlife. The impact of such a huge amount of lorries crossing Horton Common to access the road would extend to wildlife on nearby protected SSSI land. The impact once lorries finally reach the road would extend to traffic dangers on the all ready overloaded local road network and increase the risk to road traffic accidents and damage to the highways. I cannot see that such a relatively small site could produce sufficient aggregates to justify the damage and distress imposed.	I cannot see where any changes could reduce sufficiently the damage caused which could possibly justify this site for inclusion.
1148363	Resident			Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective;	WE DO NOT AGREE THAT THIS SITE SHOULD BE INCLUDED OR DEVELOPED DUE TO THE EXCESSIVE NUMBER OF DAILY HGV MOVEMENTS IT WILL BRING ON THE HORTON RD. THIS ROAD IS ALREADY USED BY MANY HGV'S, IS IN POOR CONDITION, DANGEROUS FOR PEDESTRIANS ESPECIALLY THE ELDERLY, AND VERY QUICKLY GETS	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
					Consistent with national policy	CONGESTED AT PEAK TIMES OR AFTER ANY ACCIDENT SO VEHICLES WILL CHURN OUT EVEN MORE CO2.	
1151754	Resident					No it should not be included in the MSP. Briefly the road between three cross and Ashley Heath already is over used , of inadequate standards of construction for modern lorry traffic of over 40 tons and likely to break up further if subjected to continuous traffic far in excess of its design. The original width of the road is no longer adequate and already presents risks to those using pavements where they exist by lorries carrying extra wide loads and subject to meeting other such traffic given the varying width of the roadways. Numbers of accidents on the stretch are high and speeds often in excess of safety considerations. High numbers of cyclist use the road in the west moors country park area at considerable risk to themselves at present. Quite apart from considerations on pollution levels which are often high due to traffic being queued back from the Ashley Heath roundabout each morning and evening following the expansion of the industrial centres along the Horton Road the prospect of further use occasioned by the proposal for the rubbish sorting plant with near the three legged cross pub and associated vehicles will further exacerbate the problems. I think unless this proposal includes provision and capital for major expansion of the road and considerable rebuilding work to repair the existing road structure the potential for risk to asthma sufferers, ratepayers and those normally enjoying the quiet roads in this pleasantly forested area are unacceptable.	
1195649	Resident	No	Yes	Unsound		The existing Mineral Sites Plan is already sufficient for the needs of the County and to consider additional sites is unnecessary. The application was made just before a major holiday period, a possibly cynical attempt to limit the time for objections to be raised. My objections are as follows: 1. The volume of HGV movements on C2 is already at saturation point due to the expansion of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate and other industrial commercial businesses requiring access. 2. The C2 and the connecting roads are not suitable for the size of lorries used for the movement of minerals, in some places they not wide enough for two large heavily loaded vehicles to pass each other without overhanging the pavement 3. The stated 80 movements per 10 hour working day would equate to more than one every 7 minutes, a number of which would be at times of heavy traffic, further increasing congestion at the pinch points at the mini roundabouts at Three Legged Cross and the Ashley Heath roundabout 4. The roads are extensively used by cyclists who are already disadvantaged owing to the poor quality of the road surfaces. Increased wear and tear by heavy lorries, plus the debris that will inevitably fall from the vehicles, will endanger cyclists safety. 5. I regularly cycle on this road and have to use the pavement for safety as the road is so busy and narrow, but even by doing so the speed of the lorries going past (40 mph or more even along the residential parts of the road) have caused me to overbalance due to their backdraught and to avoid the wide wing mirrors of these vehicles 6. The already consented waste disposal centre near the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, plus the expansion of the Industrial Estates will mean further future increases in HGV movements that cannot yet be included in the exiting traffic monitoring figures. 7. This minor road cannot bear any more volume of traffic and will be at more than saturation point for a country road that has thousands of holiday makers, with many cars towing caravans to access the numerous campsites in the area. 8. Access to the Moors Valley Country Park, not only by cars but by pedestrians and cyclists of all ages will be compromised by further large numbers of HGV lorries 9. In my experience, drivers of such lorries are less likely to observe designated routes for HGVs and will use any method	This site should not be included in the Mineral Sites Plan however if it were adopted then Appendix 1 would require comprehensive independent third party professional reports on all aspects of its use.

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>and route they can to save time and fuel. Imposing strict limits on their movements will be ignored once the drivers leave site. Already this road is used by unaccompanied very wide loads, which necessitate cars to mount the pavement (where there is on) or the verge to avoid collision 10. The water table in the area is vulnerable to disruption by deep extraction of sand, and this could have a catastrophic effect on the local residents water supplies (wells) but even more importantly, on the environment and its wildlife. The proximity to the historic heathland would, over time, inevitably be destructive and ruin the landscape forever. There are fishing lakes that would be affected by any lowering of water levels and have to be abandoned if this were to happen 11. Pedestrians and dog walkers accessing the Ringwood Forest from the residences on the opposite side of the road, including the designated footpaths that open directly onto the C2, will be at increased risk at a place where there have already been fatal accidents in this 40mph stretch of road from Ashley Heath roundabout to Three Legged Cross</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or 'unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1197366	Resident	No	Yes	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective; Consistent with national policy	<p>Unsound plan I strongly believe this is an unsound plan. It has been slipped in over the Christmas period without any proactive advertising and this severely disadvantages the significantly elderly population of the area, many of whom do not have access to the internet. As someone who is internet savvy the first and only time I have seen any proactive communication it was ironically referenced incorrectly in the online domain as Holton Heath which led people to believe it was not locally. This effectively has reduced the consultation period to about 2 weeks. Further specific issues I see in the unsoundness include: The undue haste with which this is being rushed through and disenfranchising the elderly in this process. Planning a hearing date for Feb 14th in just over 2 weeks from the closure date by which time you will only have been able to pay lip service to the consultation feedback. The consultation is unclear on traffic volumes and routings. Specifically it is not explicitly clear where the entrance/exit is, beyond saying this is the current access point to the solar panel site. I thought this was from Crab Orchard Way from historic and anecdotal mention by local Verwood friends but the document seems to imply but is not explicit that this is from Clump Hill on the C2 Horton Road. Further, there is no information on vehicle routing and end point of the sand deliveries " will this be to various builders merchants or will it go to local large build plots (eg as potentially mooted for Verwood, Alderholt and elsewhere). Without all this information residents are unable to comment meaningfully. I note that that previous site AS08 only had a site visit of some 1h20mins. To do justice to assessing site AS27 I believe it is necessary not only to visit the site but also to travel all the adjoining roads and engage with local communities in order to really understand the concerns. This must really be almost an all-day commitment. Anything less is simply playing lip service to this consultation exercise. Other respondees have highlighted that this plan contravenes a number of policies covering wildlife and the Dorset road network, which I fully support and I will not repeat here. I have 2 primary concerns as a resident of a property adjoining the Horton Road and also as a user of the ponds adjacent to the proposed site. Resident concerns The addition of HGV traffic to an already overloaded local road network in the immediate area. This cannot be looked at in isolation but as an addition to the not yet implemented but expected Woolsbridge Waste project plus the in-train expansion to the Woolsbridge Estate and a new exit road where the sheer volume and size of vehicle traffic is a significant threat to road safety, pedestrian safety, air quality and traffic flow. The Horton Road is a C2 and was never intended for the current volume of traffic, let alone further HGV traffic. Currently very large HGVs including unescorted vehicles carrying park homes effectively bully vehicles coming the opposite way off the road in order to pass by. A quarry vehicle travelling in the opposite direction to one of these large vehicles, or indeed 2 quarry vehicles passing each other, will be a real road hazard. Congestion is common with any vehicle or road works obstructing the road network. As I travelled through 3 Legged Cross this morning at 9:15am the traffic in both directions on the Horton Road had come to a halt with a broken-down lowloader on the road right on the mini-roundabout to West Moors. Though I turned down the road to West Moors I could see traffic backing up well down the Horton Road towards the proposed (I believe) entrance/exit at Clump Hill. This is but one current example of the issues this road faces every day. The relatively straight piece of road from Clump Hill to Three Legged Cross is not typical of the full length of the Horton Road and is a race track in both directions notwithstanding the marked speed limits. I use this road frequently and impatient drivers travelling in either direction see this piece of road as a first opportunity after a period of twisty road from the Wigbeth direction or built up</p>	I cannot see anything that will mitigate this unsound plan

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>traffic on the approach to 3LX from Verwood/West Moors/Ashley Heath to overtake the vehicle ahead of them irrespective of the legal speed of the vehicle travelling ahead of them, and these are very often when there is a vehicle approaching closely towards them. Adding in quarry vehicles to the mix will be a very very serious road hazards with these inconsiderate and dangerous drivers. Clump Hill with its blind summit has itself has sustained a fatal accident in recent times and is a very dangerous entry/exit point. It is already established that the Horton Road is operating significantly beyond capacity and was never intended for significant HGV traffic. Most of the 7,000 residents of my parish (St Leonards and St Ives) prefer to exit to the A31 northwards onto the Horton Road via Lions Lane and Woolsbridge Road as the A31 Woolsbridge Roundabout is a notoriously dangerous and time-consuming exit point given the fast speed and high volumes of traffic passing through on the A31. They will be further inconvenienced by the additional HGV traffic, estimated by one respondee as one extra HGV every 3 minutes during the working day (80 lorries over a 10 hour working day). Properties adjoining the Horton Road have already found they experience significant access, noise, vibration and fumes from the traffic using this road and any further increase will surely impact adversely on property prices in the whole area. There is also a major safety issue. Cyclists and horse riders no longer feel safe on this road, and there have been incidents of pedestrians walking apparently safely on the pavement having their bodies clipped by vehicle mirrors when 2 vehicles pass each other in opposite directions on a narrow road. It is only a matter of time before there is a fatality involving a non-car user. 2 Ponds adjoining the proposed site The following extract from the Sustainability document with my emboldening and underlining significant understates the issue and is further demonstration of the unsound nature of this consultation and that the necessary ground work has not been done. The site falls entirely within Flood Zone 1 (low risk " fluvial flooding) according to the Environment Agency 's relevant flood modelling, and is not shown by relevant mapping to be at theoretical risk of surface water flooding. However, the site is seen to be approximately 1000m upstream / south of extensive fluvial, surface &amp; ground water flooding adjacent to the Main River Crane, Bridge Farm &amp; beyond, and is approximately 400m upstream of a number of on-line ponds (Wedge Hill Farm) which may well have a commercial and/or recreational purpose. These 3 ponds are a key asset of Christchurch Angling Club with over a 1000 members who value the assets of the club. The club have recently invested tens of thousands of pounds in improving these ponds and they are unique in providing a natural and very peaceful fishing environment which is enjoyed by multiple generations. It provides a great introduction for youngsters and I myself regularly take my grandsons there. At the other end of the age range it is also much used by the elderly and those with mobility problems as it is a very accessible fishery. There are multiple threats to this environment from the proposed site including water levels, water quality, the threat of diesel spills as well as the wider impact on bird and wild life.</p>	
1198293	Resident	No	No	Unsound	Positively prepared	AS27 Land at Horton Heath is virtually a land locked site almost 2 miles from the nearest 'B' class road and almost 5 miles from the nearest 'A' class road. All roads in the area are already inadequate for the existing traffic flows and an additional 80 heavy lorry movements a day would add to the considerable congestion and harm to the environment.	Yes. Public consultation of the homeowners/occupants around the AS27 site and the roads accessing the AS27 site never came to the attention of the majority of occupants. The development of this AS27 site will affect the lives of thousands of people. Originally this site AS27 was NOT part of the Mineral Sites Plan, presumably because of the huge adverse impact.

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1198321	Resident					I would like to express my objection to the mineral extraction lab at Horton heath. I have only just been made aware of the proposal and have been unable to print the required form in order to then scan it and return. Please accept this email as my objection. I don't believe that the infrastructure of the surrounding area is suitable to accept 80 large lorry movements per day. The Horton road is narrow single lane traffic with houses living directing off the road. Currently when large lorries travel down if they go over into the opposite lane making cars and traffic slow down in order to pass. It is also busy at peak periods and school holidays at the Ashley heath roundabout often queuing back to the woolsbridge road junction. It states on the proposal that traffic movement is currently only estimated which is not good enough for such a large amount of additional plant vehicles.	
1198324	Resident	No	No	Unsound	Positively prepared; Effective	The plan is not sound as it does not consider the impact it will have on the local wildlife, the increased heavy goods traffic to the local area (unsuitable infrastructure), poor air quality due to dust. It will also spoil peoples leisure pastimes, horse riding, running, walking and Cycling. Impact on local residents.	
1198330	Resident	No	No			Firstly I must say how quietly this application has been actioned as I have not found many people who have any idea it is 'in the pipe line' as they will - hopefully now be voicing their concerns along with mine as to the knock on effects - wild life disruption, air pollution, noise pollution, general wear and tear of the country roads surrounding the site, disruption of all local villages and hamlets due to increased traffic finding other ways to avoid delays caused by countless lorries travelling to and from the site. The peace and tranquillity of the footpaths and bridlepaths will all be ruined for the many local people who use them. This is obviously a plan that has no consideration for the local environment or the people who actually live in and around the area.	
1198333	Resident					Extraction of sand from this site will cause disruption to local traffic as our roads are not suitable for heavy traffic and another 80 lorry movements a day. This site is also close to SSSI and SNCI sites and scheduled monuments. We have several riding stables in th area and many riders use the three bridleway that are going to be crossed by the lorries 80times a day! As a horse rider I find this horrific! Many dog walkers and ramblers also use this area which will become polluted from all the lorry movements.	
1198343	Resident		Yes	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified	I do not think that AS27 should be added to the Mineral Sites Plan as it would have a huge impact on the right of way known as Horton Way that spans this common. It is high ground and will have a great visual impact on local views, particularly from Stephen's Castle and Chalbury. C7 & C8. Accidental pollution of the river Crane and nearby fishing lakes is a high risk. C1, C3, C12 & C13.	IF site is added it should be restricted to 5 years which still allows 1,000,000 tonnes to be extracted with just 40 x 20tonne lorries per day.
1198347	Resident	Yes	No	Unsound	Effective	No - the concern is that Historic Landscapes have not been properly considered. There is no proposal to restore to acid grassland to benefit Monuments and their settings. The impact of Quarry traffic on local businesses will be far too great! The Horton/Ringwood road is already overloaded because of the furthter development of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. The enormous impact on local residents in the Three Cross and West Moors area will create problems for emerging access to the considerate number of aging population members whether in their own homes or in the many nursing and care homes. There are also a large number of warden controlled residences. The Public Rights of Way and Bridleways which follow the boundaries of the site will be destroyed for at least 12-17 years.	Yes.



Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1198350	Resident	No	No	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective; Consistent with national policy	Having a quarry at Holt (AS27) would disrupt the roads as the area is not suitable for the amount of lorries intended. Disruption to Bridleways - this is my main riding route and I feel safe riding around there and would not feel safe with lorries and machinery working there. The poor people living around the area will suffer the most with Dust, noise for 17 years.	The site should not be included in the plan.
1198355	Resident	No	Don't Know	Unsound	Justified; Effective	This land shouldn't be used for extracting minerals because: as a public bridleway, 80 lorries a day for 12-17 years (therefore meaning they would be going up and down the road 160 times a day) would destroy the bridleway and disrupt a good, safe, circular route for horse riders, walkers and cyclists. as a young horse rider, this amount of lorries, along with the machinery used at the site, would mean I would not be able to access a safe route because of the disruption the quarrying would cause. Horton Road is already an unsafe road, so transporting all the goods with such big vehicles would make it even more dangerous. I live in West Moors too, which would be on the transport route and would also be massively effected by so many lorries. The quarrying would also mean the fields and houses surrounding the site would be more prone to flooding than they already are. Noise and dust pollution would affect the wildlife and people living around the quarry, especially because of the amount of time this project is due to take place for.	
1198414	Resident					We are strongly objecting to this proposal due to the resultant huge increase of heavy lorry traffic that this would bring onto the Horton Road. This is an already busy route on this narrow bus route and would be highly detrimental to the environment and to its safety. This road has a number of issues and bottlenecks, from the narrow roundabouts at Three-Legged Cross with its shops, the double access entrances to the Wyevale Garden Centre, the entrance to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate and the entrances to the Three-Legged Cross pub (on a double-bend in the road), the access to the RSPCA centre (again on a bend), the entrance to the Ashley Heath caravan park, access to the Moors Valley Country Park, through to the significant residential area and shops of Ashley Heath, and an entrance to the Sheiling School before finally reaching the roundabout giving access to the A31 and the A338. The Horton Road also has many side roads leading primarily to residential areas. There are already lorry weight restrictions on Woolsbridge Road and we fear some lorries may even disregard these limits on their way to the A31.	
1198470	Resident	Yes	Yes	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified	Not included. Unconvincing and very general economic justification Contradictory re number of vehicle movements Unconvincing re post operational return to acidic grassland Little reference to many years of visual/acoustic disturbance.	Great deal more attention to control of operations Enforceable constraints re vehicle movements Binding commitment to re establishment of acidic grassland with extensive period of monitoring
1198139	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know			This addition seems to have been made somewhat "quietly" as far as local residents are concerned - by local residents I mean those who enjoy various aspects of the countryside in that area eg ponds at Wedgehill, the various SSI, bridleway, and the local roads around this area. I do not think this land should be included without further and wider consultation. I note that Dorset Wildlife Trust has objected and although I am not a member of that group would concur with their arguments. The hydrology assessment by Dr King has been done in-house by someone from Dorset Council. How subjective and biased is that report? I am concerned with the increase in lorry traffic to move the quantities proposed. I note the report which gives 50 lorries per day. What sort of working day is involved? Whilst the A31 is adequate for lorry traffic, some of the local roads are narrow and already used heavily. I am also concerned that the extraction may have adverse consequences for SSSI and Wedgehill Ponds. Before approval is	What will happen to the "hole" produced. I would want some sort of assurance that it wouldn't be used as a rubbish infill site - there could be longer term pollution issues.

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						given I think there needs to be further and specific consideration. What sort of access road will be created. Is there not further potential for bothy the road construction, the processing on site, and the movement of lorry traffic to cause some visual damage?	
1198180	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective	I strongly object to AS27 Land at Horton Heath being included in the Mineral Sites Plan A Proximity to Horton Heath (SNCI, SSSI, SPA and Ramsar), the site will cause excessive levels of noise and air pollution impacting on the ecosystem, biodiversity and diverse wildlife. B. The site will increase the number of HGVs on an already overused, unsuitable Cat C Class road. Additional HGV use will result in even more congestion on an already busy road with narrow lanes. The road is already frequently under repair and with very narrow pavements is a concern for pedestrian and cyclists safety. The road is often gridlocked with traffic to Moors Valley Country Park and an alternative route when the A31 is congested. The proposed site's access has poor visibility and Clump Hill is already an accident black spot. C The impact on local footpaths and bridleways and those that use them such as horse-riders, walkers, cyclists and residents will have a devastating affect on their health, well-being and enjoyment of the area.	
1198181	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Consistent with national policy	I object to AS27 being included in the Mineral Sites Plan as it is a site of natural beauty and wild life which will be destroyed. And the lorry traffic of 80 lorries a day on Horton Road is totally unacceptable. The road is narrow and already widely used by local residents. It will create pollution, noise, road danger and traffic jam near the A31.	
1198203	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know			This site is wholly inappropriate in a rural area such as Horton Heath. The proposed development would mean a huge number of heavy lorry journeys along roads that are already inadequate for the volume of traffic using them. Also despite any so called control on the number of heavy lorries using the roads it is obvious that without monitoring 24 hours a day, which would never happen, it would be the thin end of the wedge. These vehicles would also make use of other minor roads in the area, some of which already suffer from use by Heavy goods vehicles going to and from the golf club and local potato merchants etc. There would be a considerable impact on those of us who like to take walks in the area without being blighted by HGVs driving across public footpaths and creating dirt, dust and noise and cutting up grass verges. Many horse riders would also suffer too. There would also be a major impact on birds and wildlife. Those people who rely on well water would suffer a huge problem following extraction of sand and gravel from the area as well as possible contamination of water supplies. I understand that there have already been threats to homeowners/landowners affected who have expressed opposition to the plans by persons unknown. This site is wholly inappropriate in this rural community.	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1198207	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Justified	<p>No - not on the basis of the current proposal - I have no specific knowledge of mineral sites but I have worked for organisations who have provided equipment to move bulk substances such as aggregates and also the UK's largest Logistics operator for more than thirty years and unfortunately have experience of operators using very large vehicles on unsuitable road networks - I also am a responding as a resident and on behalf of a number of residents who don't have email, in the Ashley Heath area who have expressed significant concern about the impact of this proposal on them and the Horton Road specifically. I have also unfortunately had to investigate two separate fatalities and one very serious road accidents where pedestrians were either killed or very seriously injured by large vehicles on road networks that were not adequate, quite often even glancing blows from large goods vehicles can result in fatalities of pedestrians, the Horton Road for example has only two safe location to cross along its whole length, pedestrians will not walk a mile to reach that point when considering crossing a road . I have used my industry experience to review these proposals as they stand and believe that they fall a long way short of the safety controls requirements that are rightly justified for this type of operation, major logistics operators choose operational bases near major road networks such as motorways or large A roads because these offer the safest options that will have far less impact upon their neighbours. I have considered other environmental issues that I am certain will become evident and believe that insufficient consideration has been given to the plan to use roads such as the C2 Horton Road as a route of transport for the 30 tonne bulk carrier trucks - these are very noisy, dirty and large vehicles that without doubt will have a major impact upon residents in this area and the other very large number of road users who travel along this route. Bulk material truck operators also work on small profit margins and will without question not be using the latest and less polluting vehicles because they are too expensive, drivers are frequently self employed or working on short term contracts - this does not encourage the best standards of vehicle care and maintenance or driver behaviours. I am not questioning the demand for this material just the poor transportation plan for the movement of this material - I mentioned that I have experience of providing bulk conveyor systems, these are designed for projects that have 10 - 15 year lifespans and where local road networks make other options unsuitable - the can also be routed across farmland and provide income for a farmer for the projects lifespan, it may be possible to use a system such as this with a bulk loading area at the end next to an A road where the safety and environmental impact will be far less significant. Unsuitable rural road systems should of course not be adopted for a long term plan of this type, after all the Horton road is already experiencing increased traffic from additional local housing and expanded Industrial sites and for this reason this road is already near its ultimate capacity during working hours. Pavements are particularly poor and this has led to unofficial crossing points that are unmarked and a disaster waiting to happen for unsuspecting pedestrians and children using them all year round.</p>	Yes - I have already mentioned that significant safety and environmental changes would have to be made to make this proposal anywhere near acceptable
1198213	Resident	No	No	Unsound	Effective; Consistent with national policy	<p>No - Concern over the size and timeline of the proposal - Insufficient road infrastructure, roads are too small to accommodate existing usage, never mind 50-80 more HGVs per day for 12-17 years - Concerns over the impact on hydrology - 100% reliance on spring water as has been the case on the farm for hundreds of years - Concerns over water pollution - There will be noise and dust pollution and the impact that would have on quality of life and health - Bridle paths and footpaths, concern for the safety of right of way users - Lack of communication to people not living within 500m, but will be greatly affected - Detrimental impact on</p>	Restrictions on movements and on the scale of the operation

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						wildlife - Having lived here all my life, 50+ years, and seen many changes, this is the most damaging for both the environment, wildlife and local population. I have seen it burnt, bulldozed, and now you want to dig it up!	
1198215	Resident	No	Yes	Unsound	Justified	AS27 should NOT be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan for the following reasons. "During the examination, a site that hadn't been included in the submitted Plan was discussed - land at Horton Heath, Wimborne (reference AS27). The site is now being considered for inclusion in the final Plan". Hardly transparent Governance. It's just an added/tacked on area without any real thought given on how all these extra HGV vehicles would impact on the local amenities/vicinity. The Horton Road just cannot accommodate any further HGV traffic. Horton Heath means just that. A Heath adjoining a site with a special scientific interest. Horse riders/walkers/dog walkers utilise the area daily.	This site should NOT be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan as a tacked on/afterthought area. I have first-hand knowledge of how Mineral Sites Plan can be manipulated. A planning permission is granted for x years with restrictions i.e. opening/working times/vehicle movements. Then further down the line, they apply for an extension, this is granted, again, with restrictions. The Company operating the site then does it's own sweet thing, totally ignoring all restrictions placed upon them. When residents complain and offer evidence of planning restrictions abuse, nothing gets done and they carry on regardless.
1198226	Resident	No	Yes	Unsound	Justified	The sites already recommended with the plan provide more capacity than required during the plan period. The inclusion of AS27 as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan is not desirable, justified or necessary. Regarding the suitability of AS27 as an additional resource for sand extraction, I make the following observations / objections: This site sits in a rural location very close to the border with Hampshire. Reference to the Hampshire Mineral and Waste Plan shows that on the border with Dorset, between Verwood and Ringwood, are two active sand and gravel extraction sites. These are served by a minimum of B class roads providing access to the A31 at Ashley Heath. These are located only a mile from AS27 thereby negating any argument for the necessary provision of local sand and gravel from an additional site. The existing sand and gravel extraction sites are served by the B3081, a more suitable road for HGV's, that gives direct access to the A31 via slip roads, at a safe location, without having to access the A31 via a roundabout. In contrast, the proposed AS27 site will be accessed primarily via the C2 Horton Road. This road averages only 6 metres in width and already carries a substantial volume of traffic which continues to increase with the expansion of the local industrial estates and consequently is nearing its capacity. In addition this road, especially at its eastern end, serves a large number residential properties, either directly or via residential access roads. Further, this road is the primary access to local forests popular with walkers and pet owners, as well as the extremely popular Moors Valley Country Park. Whilst being a road that primarily serves residential properties it has narrow pavements averaging only 1 metre in width, presenting a danger to pedestrians from passing HGV's. Such vehicles, being 2.5 metres in width, require the full lane width to negotiate this narrow road, placing the nearside of these vehicles at the pavement edge with mirrors overhanging the pavement. I point out that a rigid HGV carrying a 20 tonne load (being the most likely vehicle to be used in such movements) requires a substantially longer stopping distance than a motor car (currently the main user of the roads in this locality). AS27 proposes increasing substantially the movement of HGV's on this unsuitable road. This will proportionally increase the danger and risk presented to pedestrians, cyclists and other road users. This danger would not be mitigated by any further reduction in road speed limit. Routes from this site via the Horton Road to the A31 include, through the village of West Moors, presenting additional danger to shoppers and pedestrians, or via Wooldsbridge Road presenting danger and congestion as a fully laden HGV, waits and attempts to enter the busy A31 via the small and busy roundabout or Via Ashley Heath onto the fast moving and busy roundabout there, which would also present additional danger and likely congestion. I submit that AS27 is not located in a suitable area for the safe movement of the proposed HGV loads of	Should the site be allocated to the Mineral Sites Plan over and above the substantial local objections already raised, I have concerns over how well the site would be managed and how effectively any conditions applied at planning level would be complied with. I submit that given the previous failure to comply with conditions, consideration should be given to securing funds from the operator to cover restoration of the site in default. Independent monitoring of the operation of the site to ensure compliance with conditions should be enshrined in the permission. The scope of the Transport Assessment should be wide enough to cover all the access routes from the site to major trunk routes.

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>extracted sand. With regard to the environmental impact the proposed AS27 extraction site presents I concur with the points and objections raised by the Dorset Wildlife Trust who state: Dorset Wildlife Trust maintains its objection to the inclusion of this site in the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals Sites Plan. It is not justified because the sites already recommended with the plan provide more capacity than required during the plan period. Additionally a number of sites proposed for development in the Local Plan review will require prior extraction of minerals, and these will be prioritised over other sites in order to deliver the required housing on time. It is not effective because the need for much detailed survey information and the substantial mitigation measures required would make delivery of the site potentially too expensive to be deliverable. Dorset Wildlife Trust 's major objection to this site is that it will cause further fragmentation of the remaining areas of heathland of the once extensive Horton Common (areas all now designated as either SSSI or SNCI). Until 1980 this whole area including all of the AS27 site was heathland. It was ploughed immediately before it was due to be designated as a SSSI in a widely publicised case. Mineral extraction over this large area will prevent any connectivity between the remaining areas of good quality habitat during the lifetime of the extraction period, contrary to NPPF para 170d o establish coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and para 174b to promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species: and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. If gravel extraction were to be permitted there would be a need for substantial compensation for habitat loss during the works, including measures to extend and link the remaining areas of heathland/acid grassland habitat to comply with the above requirements of NPPF. As stated in the Site Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, the site is linked hydrologically to the International sites, and any disturbance of the Broadstone Clay layer below the sands and gravels risks affecting the hydrology of Horton Common SSSI. Detailed survey and assessment with robust mitigation measures will be required to ensure no adverse impacts on the hydrology of Horton Common, (and the adjacent parts of Horton Common SNCI). The adjacent area of Redman 's Hill received planning permission last year (3/17/0967/DCC) and is already being worked, adding to the area of biodiversity loss. There is an active sand martin colony on this site, and the Biodiversity Mitigation Plan which was conditioned as a part of the planning consent required measures to ensure the maintenance of the colony throughout the works and the creation of a further face for nesting in another part of the site. The site is only separated from the proposed AS27 site by a bridleway, and this much larger area of disturbance with many more lorries, and more noise over a longer period of time may well make it impossible to maintain this sand martin colony. If the site is taken forward, and planning permission granted it is essential that any machinery does not cause damage to or collapse of sand martins ' nests as a result of vibrations. Guidance of RSPB on sand martins and working quarries should be followed: <a href="https://www.rspb.org.uk/globalassets/downloads/join-and-donate/cemex-and-rspb-sand-martin-quarry-advice.pdf">https://www.rspb.org.uk/globalassets/downloads/join-and-donate/cemex-and-rspb-sand-martin-quarry-advice.pdf</a> . This is an important area for recreational activity, with much use of the adjacent and several nearby and bridleways by walkers and riders, as evidenced by the many responses to this consultation, and contacts to DWT by local people concerned about the application. There is likely to be considerable displacement of recreational activity if extraction goes ahead here, which could impact upon the Internationally designated heathland sites. With regard to the proposed reinstatement of the</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>site at the conclusion of the proposed sand extraction, I note that there is presently a small area of previous extraction within the bounds of a previous application AS08. I understand that the previous planning permission for extraction of sand there was in the same ownership (PA3/04/0833) in 2004 (which damaged part of the Horton heath SNCI), required restoration to heathland by the end of 2006, and a cessation of motor cross activities on this site. Further that to date neither of these conditions have been adhered to. This gives little confidence that any conditions regarding site restoration in any future planning application on the AS27 site would be adhered to. I consequently submit that AS27 should be rejected on these grounds also. I raise concerns regarding the effect on the water table in the area and what will happen to water necessarily pumped from the extraction site. I am aware that the water table across the heathland and forest in this area is very close to the surface. The proposal is to remove 200,000 tonnes of sand per year over a 12 to 17 year period. Given the small size of the proposed site and the estimate of 2,400,000 and 3,500,000 tonnes mineral resource, it follows that this will involve extraction to a substantial depth. It is reasonable to assume that this will drain the water table in the surrounding area into the excavation which will necessarily require pumping of this water away. I do not believe that this can be accomplished without either affecting the water table damaging the surrounding heathland or increasing the risk of flooding to the surrounding area. I submit that AS27 should be rejected on these grounds also.</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1198229	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know	Unsound	Justified	<p>I wish to give my reasons why this site should not be included in the plan</p> <p>1.Lack of consultation The lack of consultation with the residents who will again be affected should these proposals go ahead. Most are retired and have received no notification allowing them to put in objections. I only heard about it via word of mouth . Social media is of no use to vast numbers of these residents. Proper notification should have been given to all the residents of West Moors, Verwood and Ashley Heath so more people could make their voices heard.</p> <p>2. The Road system. The roads these lorries would use to access the A31 are unlit making visibility very poor especially in the winter months .Roads in the area are narrow, and there is a mini roundabout at the junction of the Verwood and Horton Road too small for lorries to get around easily. Cars are prone to speeding down these road and as I live in a side road near a bend in the Horton Road I already often have to take account of cars speeding around the bend when I am trying to access the Horton Road. Obviously this is even more dangerous in the dark winter months. Add even more large lorries into the mix and this can only get worse. Planning permissions already granted will increase the number of cars and lorries onto already heavily used roads which were never built for the purpose. I understand this includes a waste treatment plant with goodness knows how many lorries per day. The number of elderly and frail people residing in the area including in the nursing homes on the Horton Road who already have to navigate pavements that are not continuous but move from one side of the road to the other are already at risk when out walking and this will only get worse. The number of near misses accidents and fatalities already on the Horton Road is already unacceptable and there was another fatality only the other week. A very robust study of the Road system should be undertaken before this proposal is even put forward for consideration for inclusion in the plan. The local streams and water table As a keen fisherman I am very concerned about how this quarry would impact on the fishing lakes that are very near to the site. It would also badly impact the wildlife and flora and fauna with all the resultant noise and dust. I consider that this site is totally unsuitable for development, it would appear that planning permission has already been given for an expansion to the Industrial Estate and for another smaller quarry. If the residents were consulted about either of these I certainly heard nothing about it and I am a long standing resident of the area. Both of these will further impact on a road system that is already over loaded. Lastly it is my understanding that this site was previously rejected for inclusion in the plan and is only now being considered due to pressure by persons seeking to gain financial benefit. It must be therefore that enough sites have already been identified for Government targets to be met. This site should not now be included via what is effectively the back door.</p>	
1198234	Resident					<p>We live within approximately 500 metres of proposed site AS27 and have received no correspondence relating to this. My concerns for objection are: * It has not been made clear how many lorries...40 in and 40 out? Or 80 in and 80 out? * Horton Road is being used for more than enough "heavy traffic" already, it surely is unable to take this added heavy traffic. This road is not suitable for these vehicles,especially at the speed at which they travel..this is likely to be extremely dangerous. * When we are all encouraged to be "environmentally friendly"...has looking after our wildlife suddenly been forgotten just because it suits?! * Finally, how is it going to be possible for there not to be huge clouds of dust and noise day in day out while these operations are ongoing?</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or unsound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1198239	Resident	Don't Know	Don't Know			It seems to me that AS27 Land at Horton Heath should not be included in the Mineral Sites Plan, for the following reasons;The increased number of the HGVs on an already overused, totally unsuitable rural C Class road is of serious concern, where road lanes are not wide enough for 2 lorries to pass comfortably. The access to the proposed site from the main road has extremely poor visibility and increased HGV use is only going to result in more a congestion on an already very busy road not to mention the likelihood of more serious accidents. The vibrations due to this increased HGV use will cause structural damage to the many old buildings along this road some of which are Listed. Horton Road dangerous with many recorded accidents " 2 fatalities within 5 years. Volume of traffic of lorries and site employees causing blockages for Ambulances and paramedics needing to access the 3 care homes near by. The levels of air and noise pollution this would cause, would be detrimental not only to delicate ecosystems but will greatly impact on the health of local residents. The heathland is home to wide and diverse wildlife including reptiles. These areas of outstanding natural beauty need to be preserved not destroyed. This also raises concerns regarding disturbance to the water table this site would produce in an area that is already wet and boggy and would also impact on the farms and dwellings that rely an well water. The daily crossing of footpaths and bridleways by HGVs will impact greatly on walkers,ramblers, horseriders, cyclists and residents alike. Not to mention disturbance to sites of ancient and historical interest.	Yes
1198281	Resident					We strongly object to this proposal, which seems to be part of a gradual Stealth Policy of converting our once beautiful countryside into a semi-industrial area. Critically, we only learned of these proposals by chance over the weekend. Apart from despoiling the area, this will entail additional HGV traffic on an increasingly degraded and congested Horton Road. The writer is sure that we will be able to organise a vigorous campaign to oppose this DMEP, and will be sure to benefit from the amount of legal knowledge which can be drawn upon from residents within our locality	
1198282	Resident	No	Don't Know	Unsound		There is not the road infrastructure to accommodate the many extra lorries that will be accessing the site. The Horton Road is already a dangerous road, with a speed limit of 40 and HGV using the road continuously at great speed, with narrow lanes as well as very narrow footpaths you take your life into your hands whilst walking these. The council have lifted the greenbelt on the Woolsbridge industrial estate allowing developers to build what I believe to be a waste incinerator as well as more industrial units, which will obviously increase the traffic on the already over congested Horton Road. The Three legged cross Relief road is now more than ever needed to ensure safety for all the people who live in this area. I believe this new site will have a negative impact on lots of different communities starting with the people who will be living next to it through to the impact the extra lorries will have on the communities they drive through. Ramblers, Horse Riders and tourists will also be impacted as well as the greenbelt it currently sits on and all that goes with this.	I can not think of anything positive
1198288	Resident	No	Yes			Access to this site would be via Horton Road. This road has already seen numerous traffic accidents as well as at least one fatality. The addition of 80 plus heavy good lorries each way, every day on an already extremely busy and relatively narrow road with many turnings and private entrances would in my mind be highly dangerous and would result in more accidents and fatalities, as well as deterioration of the road itself and vibration damage to adjoining properties.	The site should not be added to the Mineral Sites Plan for the reasons above.



Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1198299	Resident	No	Don't Know	Unsound		I do not think AS27 should be included in the Mineral Sites plan. There is already a site close by and the effects of this additional and larger site on the local community, both human and animal, is likely to be devastating - vibrations, noise, dust etc. In addition the volume of heavy good vehicles would greatly increase the potential for more accidents on the Horton Road, which is narrow and winding in places and unsuitable for this kind of traffic.	
1198323	Resident					I found out about the aforementioned only Friday 25th at 16.00hrs and find the proposal quite alarming. The web site where it says download forms does not work, so having to object to this proposal via this email. Question, given the scale of the proposal and the expense, why is neighbourhood notification restricted to residents living within 500 m of the proposed site? A very clever and cunning way of getting the proposal through without to many objectors. The dates that were chosen to raise objections ie Christmas and new year also I would say were deliberately set to avoid peoples objections. This affects everyone living along and within the vicinity of the Horton Rd for the obvious reasons associated with traffic volume and safety. The Horton Rd has recently had some repairs to the road surface which all looked good at the time. There are areas of the renewed road surface already breaking up due to heavy traffic. Now with this proposal, there is going to be increased probability of considerably more traffic of the wrong sort in a residential area. So I assume that the whole of the Horton Road would be subject to be completely re-engineered owing to the fact that the Road is presently built on sand/soil yet alone wide enough and would not only unsafe but unsuitable for purpose. I try and be brief about my concerns and other objections as I am work: 1) noise pollution 2) air quality 3) downgrading the area generally 4) lack of any cycle lanes. 5) debris caused by accidental spillage causing damage to windscreens on vehicles and possibly to pedestrians How long has the council known about the precious soil conditions? Why can these not be mined elsewhere away from residential areas? Does the council consider the mineral extraction to be more important than the well being and the safety of the area and the people who reside? Will there be compensation for residents and for their properties? Will there be speed restrictions and or any additional speed cameras? There is to date, too many accidents/ fatalities down the Horton Rd. My neighbour recently had bad accident coming out of St Ives Wood onto the Horton Rd heading towards the Ashley heath roundabout. I have ask the question before and would ask again, will the council /highways whatever department consider reducing the speed limit from 40 mph to 30 mph or slower. Where I am referring to there is a blind bend, cars as well as lorries hurtle round that bend having come off the A338 or the slip rd at faster speeds, thinking they can continue at that speed. With the increase in heavy traffic, there can only be more accidents due. I'm sure that I have only touched the surface with regards to objections and possible future problems. I do strongly object to this idea and with regards to the waste developement idea that is also on the drawing board. This too will add to the traffic problem. I was a firm believer that council representatives of all departments were there for the good of the community and the environment, if you are, then why are you destroying ours!	
1198328	Resident					We are appalled to learn of this proposal only over the weekend with the deadline being today. This has not been communicated well enough for residents of Verwood, Stlves & St Leonard 's to have a chance to digest and comment on the proposal. An extension should be sought for comment and the issue highlighted in a better way to residents that will certainly be effected by the increased HGV traffic in Horton Road to the A31 as well as those trying a cut through via the	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						Verwood roads which are not equipped to deal with such heavy increased traffic. The recent fatal accident close to the junction of A31 on Horton road proves the infrastructure of narrow roads with bends, inclines & declines is just not suitable for such a proposal and the supporting infrastructure around the proposed site is non existent. We will support a vigorous campaign to oppose this DMEP.	
1198335	Resident					we can 't believe that you would allow big gravel lorries up and down a small country road as horton road there is not enough room for these lorries . we are both against any plans for the mineral-site at horton heath (AS27) why you would want to destroy a lovely area we don 't understand , we will both be attending the next consolation meeting.	
1198336	Resident	No	Yes			No I don't think it should be included. 1. The extra lorries on the Road are bound to cause extra damage to the already poor road surface. 2. We use this Road to cycle to Moors Valley with our Grandchildren and this is dangerous enough now. 3. What about all the wildlife that live on the heathland there and it change in the water table levels to the environment.	
1198341	Resident					Question 1. Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not? Answer: No, it should not be included in the MSP. In this document this road ' and the road ' refers to the Horton / Ringwood road extending from West to East from Horton to the Ashley Heath roundabout. In this document, I have not attempted to comment on impacts of the development on Westmoors and Verwood. I assume a significant proportion of HGV traffic will flow East on the road. 1. I am not aware of current published analyses of existing HGV flows and projections for increased flow from Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, as currently being extended, and from the proposed mineral extraction site. I propose that, if no current research has been carried out, published and advertised to the public, that this be sufficient grounds, in itself, for the proposed development not to be included in the MSP " because the public will not have a basis on which to opine on risks resulting from the proposed development and on any implications with respect to legality of planning proposals. . I set out additional objections below. Assuming a significant proportion of HGV traffic will flow East on the road, traffic will be forced to negotiate a T junction to Mannington and a roundabout at Three legged Cross which serves Verwood, Ashley Heath and West Moors. It has been previously demonstrated in published papers that neither junction is fit for purpose to handle even traffic flows several years ago. 2. For HGV traffic continuing East along the road there are a number of factors making such flow unacceptable. 2.1. Quarry HGV traffic will add to existing high HGV flows from the Woolsbridge Industrial estate (which is being significantly extended at this time with consequent future increases in traffic of all types) and from other industrial estates adjacent to the road. 2.2. The road is subject to wide loads from the portable building manufacturer in Woolsbridge Industrial estate 2.3. The road has lanes that are little wider than a typical HGV and significantly less wide than ' wide loads ' that are transported along the road. In some cases, close to the proposed site, the road is sufficiently narrow not to allow safe distance between say an HGV and car passing in opposite directions. In the past this has reportedly resulted in many unreported RTCs, especially those involving in broken vehicle wing mirrors. I believe evidence exists to prove this point. 2.4. In my view, speed limits throughout the length of the road are too high, illogical and, generally, unenforced. In practical terms, I believe the only total solution (which is not proposed by way of mitigation in the MSP) would be to apply appropriate speed limits enforced by average-speed cameras positioned to cover sections of the road subject to	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						<p>increased risk, for instance, of RTCs due to narrow lanes and poor sight lines for vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists and horses joining the road from side roads, lanes and driveways. In addition to RTC risk, considerable nuisance to residents and road users is caused by this factor. Noise nuisance to residents is exacerbated by increasing HGV traffic in the early hours of the morning. At these times, it appears (by observation, not measurement) that HGV speeds are higher. Specifically para 2.4, taken together with high traffic on this inadequate road, implies a number of risks: <math>\phi</math> Road traffic collisions. Increased probability of RTCs and severity of RTCs. These risks are greatly increased by poor sight lines where residents exit driveways on to the road (and particularly at the junctions of Woolsbridge Road with Horton Road and Lions Lane with Horton Road). The area of a roadside carpark by the One Stop convenience store, near Lions Lane, is a danger spot because of the number of vehicle movements in and out. The access to the RSPCA is another danger spot due to severely poor sight line. New roadworks for the extended Woolsbridge Industrial Estate have, in contrast, created good sight lines. <math>\phi</math> Danger to people. A significant number of pedestrians and cyclists (as well as occasional horse riders), use the road, for instance, to access the highly popular Moors Valley Country Park, as well as periodic activities such as car boot sales and Banger Racing'. It should be noted that pavements are either very narrow or non-existent on long stretches of this road. <math>\phi</math> Traffic jams. Traffic regularly backs up at the Ashley Heath and Three-legged Cross roundabouts at peak times. Traffic jams invariably occur at holiday times (eg access to Moors valley) and when events are staged. Admittedly, HGV movements tend to be less at most of these times. Traffic jams, of course, create increased pollution, nuisance and increased journey times. <math>\phi</math> High-speed emergency vehicles. Woolsbridge road is subject to a significant number of emergency vehicle movements (sirens on), generally approaching from the South. The junction of Woolsbridge road is already a risk area due to poor sight lines and the configuration of the High Street where a kindergarten and pharmacy are situated. Increasing traffic passing this junction can and does impede entry of emergency vehicles to Horton road. <math>\phi</math> Emissions pollution. Already-high vehicle emissions cause risk to residents living adjacent to the road and to pedestrians &amp; cyclists using the road. Sections of the road have relatively high-density housing which is generally very close to the road. Two residential care homes are adjacent to the road. I propose that, if no current research on vehicle emissions has been carried out, published and advertised to the public, that this be sufficient grounds, in itself, for the proposed development not to be included in the MSP " because the public will not have a basis on which to opine on risks resulting from the proposed development and on any implications with respect to legality of planning proposals. <math>\phi</math> Increased noise and vibration pollution. The road surface is severely potholed in places. The road is subject to an unusual number of excavations for installation / repair of services. These factors, in conjunction with sunken drain covers, cause excessive noise and vibration (N&amp;V) when HGVs pass along the road. Further, HGVs produce significant tyre and engine noise. I am not aware of research on this topic where, for instance, N&amp;V measurements are taken at roadside and inside properties adjacent to the road. This N&amp;V is not necessarily confined to properties immediately adjacent to the road. I experience excessive HGV-induced N&amp;V at night in a property nearly 50 meters from North side of the road. I propose that, if no current research on vehicle-induced noise and vibration has been carried out, published and advertised to the public, that this be sufficient grounds, in itself, for the proposed development not to be included in the MSP " because the public will not have a basis on which to opine</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
						on risks resulting from the proposed development and on any implications with respect to legality of planning proposals. $\phi$ Road destruction. I am advised that the road surface is inadequate for the weight and volume of traffic. I am also advised that renewal of the road surface would not solve this issue and that consequent rebuilding of the road foundations would be necessary. I am not aware of any current feasibility or costing analyses in respect of this. I propose that, if no current research on this topic has been carried out, published and advertised to the public, that this be sufficient grounds, in itself, for the proposed development not to be included in the MSP " because the public will not have a basis on which to opine on risks resulting from the proposed development and on any implications with respect to legality of planning proposals. In summary, my reason for objecting to inclusion of the AS27 development in the MSP is inadequacy of the road for purpose and the stated risks that this implies.	
1198348	Resident	Yes		Unsound	Justified; Effective; Consistent with national policy	As a new resident to the area and with a house that backs onto the Horton Road, I feel very strongly that AS27 Land at Horton Heath should not be included in the Mineral Sites Plan. We daily walk along to Horton Road to access the Jacks Garden Forest on the Horton Road, which provides access to all to the Castleman Trailway and Moors Valley Country Park and the road is already too narrow and over used by HGV. An increase in the number of the HGVs on an already overused, totally unsuitable rural C Class road is of serious concern, especially as the road already has recently been the scene of a tragic accident fatality and with the speed cameras is a know safety blackspot. The access to the proposed site from the main road has extremely poor visibility and increased HGV use is only going to result in more a congestion on an already very busy road not to mention the likelihood of more serious accidents, like the one recently. The levels of air and noise pollution this would cause, would be detrimental not only to delicate ecosystems but will greatly impact on the health of local residents. The heathland is home to wide and diverse wildlife including reptiles and is used by families near and far to access the beautiful dorset countryside. These areas of outstanding natural beauty need to be preserved not destroyed. The daily crossing of footpaths and bridleways by HGVs will impact greatly on walkers,ramblers, horseriders, cyclists and residents alike, including my family and I.	
1198354	Resident	Don't Know	Yes	Unsound	Positively prepared	My concern with the proposed quarry site is that the access is described as "Access to the site should be via the access route to the solar farm". This does not accurately describe the required route as there is a bridleway between the solar farm and the proposed quarry. I am a regular user of the bridleway for Mountain Biking and it is one of the busiest in the area for cyclists, horse riders and walkers. The expected 80 lorries performing 160 journeys per day would be dangerous to bridleway users that currently do not have to share the space with vehicles regularly. I feel that the proposed site has these disadvantages: 1. Danger to bridleway users - walkers, cyclists and horse riders 2. Regular heavy vehicle traffic using the road through Three Legged Cross and Ashley Heath which has inadequate capacity. Another consideration should whether the additional dust produced by the quarry could render part of the solar useless if sunlight is blocked by dust.	Appendix 1 needs to clearly define how the bridleway will be crossed or avoided.

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1198401	Resident	Don't Know	Yes	Unsound	Positively prepared; Justified; Effective	<p>As indicated from the <a href="https://data.gov.ukweb">https://data.gov.ukweb</a> site showing Article 4 areas, the proposed mineral extraction is right in the middle of an Article 4 area. This ties in with the fact that at a public enquiry the judgement was to impose an Article 4 over all of the owner 's land because he was continually changing the goal posts, with no regard for people in the area. Since then, the owner has continued to do just what he wanted despite a plethora of complaints to EDDC mainly about the noise from organised clay pigeon shooting events, motor bike racing, and 4x4 competitions and in addition they have also curtailed horse riding along the adjacent bridleway. There is no mention of the Article 4 in the report. Furthermore, this enquiry has been conducted in great haste without those affected being told, especially when the noise will undoubtedly affect those in SW Verwood, Woodlands, Ashley Heath and Slough Lane. The report does not take into consideration the height of the proposed extraction. The impact of the number of lorries along the exit road which is a C road is not sufficiently covered. None of the residents along that road was informed; it is a large quality residential area with numerous entries onto the road in question. Dorset is famous for its heathland, and close to the proposed extraction is an SSSI which is likely to be affected. Nightjars and Dartford warblers are in the area and there are, as might be expected, nesting sand martins and skylarks as well as sand lizards; on our own farm, not too far away, we have rare Barbastelle bats. Not enough time, especially in winter, has been given to make a decent wildlife assessment of the proposed extraction area. The report again, makes little reference to the impact resulting from noise and vibrations that will be inevitable if the proposal was adopted. Dorset also has a strong reliance on tourism and the report does not consider walkers from the caravan site at Romford Mill or the access to the popular Moors Valley Country Park. [ redacted ]</p>	<p>It would be a travesty if the proposal went forward, but clearly there is a lot more assessment work that would need to be carried out. The person sitting in judgement should make a site visit accompanied by Dorset Wildlife Trust, a fishing lakes representative and someone who is aware of the previous problems on that area.</p>
1198413	Resident					<p>I am well aware of the development to all local areas over a long period of time., and the necessity and advantage to us all as a result. regarding these plans,, there appears to me to be no benefit for local people, either now, or in the future, from this development . However there is obviously a very strong negative aspect, insofar as the volume of traffic both during the implementation and subsequent day to day running of the site. the local roads, already overworked, and under- maintained, will undoubtedly deteriorate further, and increased volume of traffic will also present increased risk of motor accidents involving heavy goods vehicles. for this reason i remain steadfastly opposed to this planning going forward, and would like you to record my objections appropriately</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
229025	RSPB, South West Regional Office					<p>Thank you for consulting us on the above. We have in preparing these comments considered the following: Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan Consultation on land at Horton Heath (AS27), December 2018 Horton Heath AS27 " Site Assessment, December 2018 Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Sites Plan Pre-submission draft Assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, November 2017 Appropriate Assessment of the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Sites Plan Pre-submission draft, presented as an addendum to the original assessment, dated August 2018, revised December 2018 to incorporate assessment of AS27, Land at Horton Heath. Introduction We understand that AS27 is part of a previously considered proposed allocation AS08, which was dropped from the consultation process in 2015. AS27 is a new proposed allocation, being reviewed at the suggestion of the Inspector following hearings in late 2018. We understand that AS27 comprises an agricultural/wooded site of approximately 16.2 ha, capable of producing c 200,000 t.p.a, with suggested reserves of 2.4 to 3.5M tonnes and a 12 to 17 year extractive life before restoration, which is currently suggested to be to acid grassland. AS27 lies to west of Horton Common SSSI, a component of the Dorset Heaths SAC and Dorset Heathlands SPA and Ramsar site. As such it is subject to strict protection under the remit of the EU Birds and Habitats Directives, and the Ramsar convention. In short Horton Common represents one of the UK 's finest wildlife sites, supporting rare and vulnerable habitats and species and for which the UK has international responsibility. Commentary presented within the Council 's Appropriate Assessment (AA) suggests that AS27 is linked hydrologically to the SSSI. Additionally, geological features are present on AS27 which if disturbed (through extraction) risk affecting the hydrology of the SSSI (AA, paragraph 3.1). Appropriate Assessment AS27 has been screened into the AA to acknowledge the likely significant effect on adjacent European sites. The AA identifies that mitigation against this effect is needed, and goes on firstly to propose that this must focus on policy wording ensuring the site will not be worked until the issue is explored and resolved and secondly, to describe what investigations are necessary to have been undertaken and concluded to avoid an adverse effect on the European sites. Suggested text is then presented for inclusion in the final paragraph of Policy MS-1: Production of Sand and Gravel within the draft Mineral Sites Plan and also the Development Guidelines for AS27 (paragraph 4.1). Commentary The AA concludes that without mitigation the inclusion of AS27 would lead to a likely significant effect and an adverse effect on the integrity of the European sites would result. The Mineral Planning Authority 's response is to include safeguards within the Mineral Sites Plan Policy MS-1 and furthermore to direct within guidelines where the focus of investigations should lie (in addition to the other general factors highlighted in policy MS-1). We consider these pragmatic and essential steps and support the safeguards suggested. We would nevertheless highlight the considerable uncertainty over the deliverability of the proposed AS27 allocation, given the important and complex environmental considerations that have been raised in the AA, but are satisfied that the policy measures being suggested by the Authority are adequate at the plan level. Should a development proposal come forward subsequently, the RSPB will scrutinise this against the plan measures described above and additional site-level criteria including site-level biodiversity impacts. We trust our comments are useful. Please contact me if you require any further information or clarification.</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1198340	Verwood Runners	No	Yes	Unsound	Justified	As a local resident and part of Verwood Runners this impacts on the natural environment that we enjoy locally. Additionally the vehicular impact will be significant and again damage the local area.	
815917	Verwood Town Council					<p>The Verwood Town Council wishes to register a strong OBJECTION to the inclusion of this site situated at Horton Heath. The site in question is close to the border of the Verwood Parish and is considered by the Town Council to potentially have a number of significant issues, which will impact on the wellbeing of our community. The details of the key areas of concern, in support of our objection, are set out below: Impact on the C2 : The potential removal of up to 3.5 million tonnes of mineral will create up to 80 HGV movements on a typical day during the extended 12-17 year lifetime of the extraction period. The council considers that such an intensification of HGV movement will increase still further the traffic volume beyond the existing and anticipated increase resulting from the expansion of the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate on the C2. The plan for Woolsbridge includes a household waste transfer depot, which in itself will generate significant additional HGV traffic movements. To the south and east, Highways England has commented that the site has the potential to impact on a number of A31 trunk road junctions including West Moors &amp; Ashley Heath. Both these junctions can only be accessed through Three Legged Cross in our parish via the C2. The C2 is narrow and has already suffered problems due to the compaction of its subsurface by HGVs. Ongoing remedial work was started last year and is continuing this year. The increase in HGV traffic will seriously impact the nature of this road which is already coping with traffic volumes above the road design limits. There are a number of concealed entrances and accesses to residential property along the C2 in all directions leading from the site access. Environment Impact to the immediate and surrounding area : The permitted low volume mineral extraction at Redman 's Quarry and the adjacent solar farm has already had a significant impact on the natural environment. The industrial scale of mineral extraction from site AS27 will have a significant impact on the intensification of land use and harm the peace and tranquillity at this prominent location. With Verwood and Three Legged Cross only a short distance away, it is the only high area within easy walking distance for residents of our parish that offers such wonderful views. It offers exercise in the natural environment and resulting health benefits to our population of over 14,000. The area of Horton Common includes SSSIs, SPAs, open access land and existing and potential ecological networks all of which are close to site AS27 and impose similar ecological and environmental constraints to those which render the nearby site AS08 unsuitable. The town council also has concerns about the water table may be contaminated due to the extraction impacting on the hydrology. Local Farmers use water sources from wells in the vicinity of the extraction sites. Rights of Way Considerations: There is a potential and indeed real concern about the conflict between HGV traffic and horse riders/walkers using the rights of way adjacent to the site and its proposed access. HGV traffic will also have to cross some of these rights of way. The access route to the solar farm only provides a short distance separated from existing bridleways.</p>	

Person ID	Company / Organisation	Question 1 Do you consider the inclusion of this site in the Mineral Sites Plan is legally compliant?	Question 2 Do you consider the inclusion of this site affects the soundness of the Mineral Sites Plan?	Question 3a Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan sound or unsound?	Question 3b Do you consider the inclusion of the site makes the Mineral Sites Plan 'sound' or un sound' because it is/ is not: positively prepared; justified; effective; consistent with national policy?	Question 4 - Do you think AS27, Land at Horton Heath, should be included as an allocation in the Mineral Sites Plan or not?	Question 5 - If the site was to be allocated in the Mineral Sites Plan, do you think any changes should be made to the site or Appendix 1 of the consultation document?
1197220	West Moors Parish Council	Yes	Don't Know	Unsound	Justified	West Moors Parish Council objects to the inclusion of the site in the minerals plan for the following reasons: The C2 road allocated in the plan as the transport link is not a suitable class of road for heavy vehicles and therefore there is a possibility of increased heavy vehicle traffic on the B3072 through West Moors. There is a precedent regarding heavy vehicles from the West Moors Army Petroleum Depot Defence Fuels Group, which are forbidden from using the B3072 Station Road through the centre of the village. The B3072 Station Road is also fairly narrow in parts, as are the footpaths and increased heavy vehicles could be dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians. There is also a first school located on this road, with lots of young children having to cross the road. Any increased traffic has an effect on air quality and noise and concerns about debris falling from lorries travelling to and from the site, which has the potential to cause damage to the road surface and other vehicles. The location of the site would have a negative impact on local bridleways	
814649	West Parley Parish Council					Thank you for inviting this Parish Council to offer further comment on the County Minerals Sites Plan-omission Site AS27. Although this Parish is some 7 miles from the proposed site, the location is well known to our members and they are fully aware of the various constraints attached to the land in question. It is the considered view of Councillors that a more unsuitable site for minerals extraction would be difficult to find within the County. We have read and debated the detailed views put forward by both the British Horse Society in respect of the two Bridleways abutting the proposed site and the East Dorset Environmental Partnership. It is considered that both organisations summarise the case cogently for non-inclusion of the site and the Council unanimously make a recommendation to the Inspector that this site be not included as a site for extraction.	