

**Draft Waste Plan Update – Additional and Emerging Preferred Waste Site Allocations (May 2016)**

**Schedule of all comments received with officer response**

This report sets out all comments received verbatim to the Draft Waste Plan Update (2016) during the consultation period.

Comments made to the paragraphs and polices within the Plan have been responded to below. Comments made to site options have been read and the issues have been summarised and responded to in a separate report.

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	1.1	2016WPP5	Disagree	Waste is indeed a big issue for us all. My house produces waste, and I need to get rid of it regularly. For householders it is a problem which we are paying for our council to help us solve. Over the past few decades, councils have used environmental concerns to justify introducing more complexity, and less utility, for families managing their rubbish. Any benefit from recovering energy and heat or from recycling go directly to the council, not the householder, who is paying for the service. But that isn't my main concern, which is that the level of service provided by the council is substantially WORSE than it was 20 years ago. This is a very big frustration for me. Pretty much the main job for councils is to help householders get rid of their waste - if you can't make it easy, we would be better off paying a 3rd party to do it for us. The complicated pick up dates (often changing), the increasing number of different bins, the smaller and smaller waste bin. What do householders want? Let me tell you: every week, collect the rubbish on the same day, from 2 bins, one for waste, one for recycling. I think you have forgotten you are providing a service to residents, and are acting on behalf of residents.	Your comments are noted and will be passed onto the waste collection authority.
Individual	1.1	2016WPP18	Comment	I have quite strong feelings about the way Dorset councils are handling waste. The consultation is focusing on the concerns of the council. I am more focused on the concerns of householders. I think it is quite easy for the council to forget that they exist to service the householder, not the other way around. Waste is indeed a big issue for us all. My house produces waste, and I need to get rid of it regularly. For householders it is a problem which we are paying for our council to help us solve. Over the past few decades, councils have used environmental concerns to justify introducing more complexity, and less utility, for families managing their rubbish. Any benefit from recovering energy and heat or from recycling go directly to the council, not the householder, who is paying for the service. But that isn't my main concern, which is that the level of service provided by the council is substantially WORSE than it was 20 years ago. The complicated pick up dates (often changing), the increasing number of different bins, the smaller and smaller waste bin. What do householders want? Let me tell you: every week, collect the rubbish on the same day, from 2 bins, one for waste, one for recycling. I think you have forgotten you are providing a service to residents, and are acting on behalf of residents.	Your comments are noted and will be passed to the relevant authority.
West Dorset & Weymouth & Portland Councils	1.1	2016WPP134	Comment	The draft Waste Plan Update includes three sites amended since the summer 2015 consultation. The following are West Dorset District Councils observations and comments on these three sites and should be read in conjunction with comments made previously.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Dorchester Civic Society	1.1	2016WP274	Comment	<p>The chief concern of the Society is that in the detailed analysis of the four sites in and around Dorchester (WP 10 land at Stinsford Hill, WP11 Loudsmill, WP12 Old Radio Station and WP 13 Charminster) under the heading 'Relevant Local Planning Policy' the relevant policy is referred to as West Dorset, Weymouth &amp; Portland Local Plan (Submission Document, June 2013). It is extremely worrying that Dorset County Council do not seem to be aware that West Dorset, Weymouth &amp; Portland Local Plan 2015 has been adopted by both District Councils involved, West Dorset adopting it on the 22 Oct 2015 some six months before Emerging Preferred sites document was published. This is of key significance as following the Inspectors Report into the examination of the plan the following paragraph was included:- 1.5.1 Although the plan is written to cover 20 years to 2031, it is likely that a review of the plan will be put in place by 2021. This is necessary not only to ensure provision of sufficient housing land to 2031, but also to ensure a continuity of policy beyond 2031 and to respond to unforeseen changes that are likely to occur during the plans lifetime. Subsequently at the Executive meeting of West Dorset DC on the 9 Feb 2016 a Local Development Scheme was approved which aims to have a draft plan to meet housing land needs to 2036 ready for submission by Q3 2018. The importance of this is that it would be the negation of planning if Dorset County Councils Waste Plan were to proceed in ignorance of, or without regard to, the review of the local plan which seeks to deal with housing land supply issues up until 2036. A brief review of the Local Plan and the background documents will reveal that there is likely to be a significant allocation for housing in the Dorchester area. It would be entirely wrong if the housing land review were to be compromised by an ad hoc selection of a waste transfer/management site. To take just one example namely that of land at Stinsford Hill. You already have the Society's view — that this is the least favoured site but in addition this area is clearly going to be one of the possible sites for future housing development. If that were to be the decision then any development in this area must be led by housing not by a Waste site. This is true of three of the four preferred sites, the exception being the expansion of the existing site at Loudsmill which could go ahead independently of any future housing allocation. Attached is a copy of the Society's original comments on the July 2015 Draft of this Plan.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted and the site assessments will be updated to refer to relevant local planning policy. You can be assured that the Waste Plan is being developed to meet the needs of Dorchester and surrounding villages both now and with regards to the planned new housing. Regular dialog has and will continue to take place between officers of West Dorset and Dorset County Council to inform the choice of site going forward.</p>
Affpuddle & Turnerspuddle Parish Council	1.1	2016WP541	Comment	<p>Affpuddle and Turnerspuddle Parish Council have considered the issues brought forward in the latest consultation exercise. The Parish Council considers that the Mineral and Waste Authority may not have considered all options for the disposal of waste and that too much reliance still remains on landfill. Recovery systems are available to ensure that higher percentages of waste are recovered and cleaned. The inert recovery washing plant at Wareham, for example, can ensure that waste for infill removes all traces of wood and plastic. Clean technology for energy generation from incineration now exists and could significantly reduce landfill and subsequently limited resources.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. However, the strategy for the future management of waste in Dorset relies upon the development of new facilities for the generation of waste and a move away from landfill in the early part of the Plan period.</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	1.1	2016WPS46	Comment	<p>I have several objections and concerns about the Waste Plan in general Site allocation on Green Belt Land and within residential areas, we should be locating these facilities on brown belt land and away from concentrations of population; b) Optimization of existing sites within the whole Dorset region (i.e. unified authorities of Dorset) is essential before new sites and increases in capacity are considered; c) Impact on local communities i.e. deterioration of quality of environment and threat to health and safety; d) Pincer movement on Ferndown i.e. the WP01 Ferndown site proposals is to the North West of Ferndown and WP05 Parley proposals is to the South East of Ferndown this will effectively double the environmental impact of the Ferndown, Tricketts Cross and Stapehill communities plus their surrounding areas; and e) I suspect that these proposals will lead to an increase in fly-tipping e.g. the closure of the Wimborne Household Waste facility will mean that some people will have to travel further with their rubbish to get to the WP05 site and I confidently expect that some people will just not bother and start fly-tipping rather than travel that bit further!</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Dorset Local Nature Partnership</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">1.1</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WPP904</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment</p> <p>Dorset Local Nature Partnership Response to the Dorset Waste Plan Update Consultation. The Dorset Local Nature Partnership (DLNP) was established in 2012 with a role to: Provide leadership for those working to protect and enhance the environment in Dorset; Advocate the good management of Dorset’s natural environment for its own sake and the many benefits it offers; Articulate the importance of Dorset’s natural environment to economic and social wellbeing; Ensure that the natural environment is taken into account in policy and decision-making. The National Planning Policy Framework, in paragraph 180, states that Local planning authorities should work collaboratively on strategic planning priorities to enable sustainable development in consultation with Local Enterprise Partnerships and Local Nature Partnerships. In paragraph 165 LNPs are also identified as having a key role in working with LPAs to assess existing and potential components of ecological networks, to ensure planning policies and decisions are based on up to date information about the natural environment. DLNP is looking forward to working with the LPAs as the NPPF requires and to progress these discussions. The DLNP welcomes this opportunity to comment on Waste Plan issues. DLNP operates at a strategic level in policy and planning matters, and is unlikely to become involved in the detailed discussion site-specific cases. It has taken an overview of the sites included in the consultation, to offer some overarching suggestions for principles which we believe the Waste Plan process should follow, in line with the DLNP Vision and Strategy [1] adopted in 2014. There are a range of sites included in the consultation where issues such as nature conservation and public enjoyment of the natural environment are of concern to LNP partner organisations, these are being raised in responses from individual partners. However, whilst leaving the details to our partner organisations, the DLNP does have a role to alert you to sites which raise such serious issues, in this case impacts on nature conservation that it would appear to be very difficult indeed to adequately avoid or mitigate them. In some cases it will be essential to consider alternative boundaries and/or essential mitigation measures to avoid major conflict with natural environment and the DLNP would wish to see these discussions held at an early stage to adequately resolve the concerns raised by our partners. The inclusion of sites which fail to meet the objectives that we have set out below would result in a plan which the DLNP could not support. We would urge careful examination of the potential impacts of all proposed sites, in line with the following principles as set out in the DLNPs Vision and Strategy. Natural Capital Dorset has some exceptional natural assets which already underpin the economic and social wellbeing of the county. The DLNP published its Natural Capital Investment Strategy [2] in April 2016. This sets out the principle that development can be achieved by taking a natural capital approach (ensuring there is a net gain in natural capital) to increase the quality of Dorset’s assets and make them more resilient. In particular we would seek outcomes through the Waste Plan which promote: Healthier natural systems which are managed in an integrated way. Maintenance and enhancement of high quality landscapes in which change is well managed. Natural Value A healthy environment is a pre-requisite for a healthy economy globally and locally, in Dorset it offers additional opportunities for sustainable economic growth which does not erode our natural capital. Outcomes we seek through the Waste Plan are: A transition to a low carbon, sustainable economy in which every business is a greener business. Reduced transport related impacts which contribute to a healthy environment. More efficient and effective use being made of scarce natural resources, particularly land, water and energy sources. Secure and affordable energy supplies making more effective use of locally available, appropriate renewable sources of energy, including where feasible waste to energy. Reductions in waste in all its forms and further increases in the reuse and recycling of waste as a resource to be used rather than disposed of. Natural Resilience Changes in the global economy, global climate and demography present a number of potential risks and threats to the resilience of both the environment and the communities which depend on it. But a well-managed, resilient natural environment can make a major contribution to our ability to adapt to these changes. In particular, the Waste Plan can contribute to: A high quality built environment meeting increasingly high standards of sustainable construction, waste reduction, water and energy efficiency in new and existing development, and in which sustainable travel options are promoted. More widespread adoption of landscape scale approaches to extending and joining up natural areas as the best means of improving their resilience to future change. A spatial planning system which is proactive in the way in which it seeks to deliver landscape scale, ecological networks that are able to withstand the pressures of climate change. Natural Influence We are looking for the Waste Planning process to contribute towards integration of social, economic and environmental goals, including by: Accurate and transparent accounting for environmental costs and benefits in the planning and decision-making process. Widespread adoption of the concept of natural value in the planning and decision making process. Identifying existing and potential ecological networks and policies for their improvement, and ensuring plans are based on an accurate and up to date environmental evidence base. An holistic approach to planning and development which takes account of the need to</p>	<p>Your comments are noted and will be discussed further.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
				maintain and create quality natural and historic environments near where people live, and space for wildlife to get food and shelter in a changing environment. Greater awareness of the impacts of the decisions we take as consumers on the environment, and more sustainable choices being made as a result. Dorset's ecological footprint being reduced over time both locally and globally. Potential mitigation strategies should be discussed with stakeholders and may include potential biodiversity offsetting so that when consents are granted, opportunities are taken to identify and secure other areas of land for biodiversity enhancement through legal agreements etc.	
Natural England	1.1	2016WV618	Comment	Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 26 May 2016 which was received by Natural England on 26 May 2016. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England is concerned that the statement: It should be noted that some of the sites below are also being considered for other uses and it is suggested that these sites will be the subject of a flexible waste allocation to allow for appropriate waste facilities to be developed where they address a proven need. In section 5 must be suitably supported by a robust policy such that processes which have been screened out of specific locations as harmful (to landscape or biodiversity or pollution concerns) cannot receive a defacto allocation at a subsequent stage.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	1.1	2016WV876	Comment	We agree with some of the residents that an executive summary, with a brief table of all the sites, will be useful. The table could be based on the tabular summary on pp 16-19 of the Update. Your introduction to the update would make a good introduction to this summary but please mention zero waste and the circular economy and remove energy from waste, which you added later; it is not a good option (except Anaerobic Digestion). Please make the existing sites map, Fig 3 in para 2.4 of the original draft, bigger, maybe 2 pages. Also, could residual waste disposal to landfill (including ash) be differentiated from inert fill. We have suggested before that the current and proposed sites, HRCs and neighbourhood recycling places could be included as an overlay on the Dorset Explorer map on <a href="http://explorer.geowessex.com/">http://explorer.geowessex.com/</a> ; also (a new suggestion), extending this map some 8 to 12 miles over the border would also be useful as many of us live close to other counties. We accept that neighbourhood sites often change and updates to the map would be infrequent but this delay should be acceptable and not generate too many calls.	Your helpful comments are noted. The final Plan will include an 'Executive Summary'. It is agreed that reference should be made to the concepts of zero waste and the circular economy.

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	1.1	2016WP877		<p>Section 1 (in the original Draft Plan): Consultation Draft Plan paras 1.1- 4 introduction Update para 1.1-3 introduction &amp; energy The only words added to your very good introduction are about energy recovery. Please remove them and bring it up later. Energy recovery technologies It's a cop-out to want the plan to be technology neutral. Among energy recovery technologies, there is a clear hierarchy, with anaerobic digestion of organics almost as good as recycling. Pyrolysis and gasification are much lower down and incineration is way down. Waste incineration with energy recovery is almost as bad as direct landfill of residual waste. The burning generates CO<sub>2</sub>. Bottom ash is still about one third of the residual waste, though it is more inert. There is, as yet, no safe way of preventing harmful fly-ash emissions and such burners can only operate fairly safely if operated continually at high temperatures, necessitating big contracts with waste management authorities, which then lose the ability to move waste up the hierarchy. Furthermore, the companies are reluctant to pass fly ash back through the burner, as this reduces energy gain, so the hazardous fly ash (or that portion of it that is trapped from the exhaust smoke) has to be disposed of, generally by mixing with landfill. At the very least, the WPA should leave itself room to decline this technology if it sees fit. We worry that, as it stands, the situation is unclear and it may be left to the operator to choose the technology. The WPA won't then be able to invoke BATNEEC (best alternative technology not entailing excessive cost) to decline incineration. Should the WPA agree to any new incineration plant it must be joined with Combined Heat and Power to provide local heating. We accept that new technologies may become available but it should be easy to position these on the finer scale suggested by the waste hierarchy. We would not oppose pyrolysis &amp; gasification and we support anaerobic digestion</p>	<p>It is important that the Waste Plan remains flexible to allow for advances in waste treatment technology. An independent report has been prepared to consider current and emerging technologies and the suitability of the shortlisted sites. This has ensured that the sites are likely to be suitable for a range of technologies that may come forward during the Plan period. The Waste Plan will contain sufficient environmental safeguards to ensure that proposals coming forward are appropriate.</p>
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	1.1	2016WP879	Comment	<p>Section 3 (in the original Draft Plan): Guiding Principles 3.9 aim for zero waste We repeat that this must be included in your policies in line with the Government's Waste Management Plan, which says The key aim of the waste management plan for England is to set out our work towards a zero waste economy as part of the transition to a sustainable economy. This is in their second paragraph. All waste planning has to aim for a circular economy and to push waste up the waste hierarchy. Land-use planning should do everything possible to support this aim.</p>	<p>It is agreed that reference should be made to the concepts of zero waste and the circular economy.</p>
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	1.1	2016WP880	Comment	<p>3.1-12 sustainable development, waste hierarchy, proximity Please don't change these paragraphs 3.25 additional information required for a planning application on an unallocated site (or on a change to an allocated site) We suggested the addition of an outline management plan. This is really only to facilitate setting planning conditions and we are happy for the WPA to use it or not, depending on its usefulness. Although it is recognised that such a management plan would be changed in the light of the situation when the operation starts, requiring an outline plan would be helpful in setting planning conditions. The reason for evidence of an outline management plan to be required as part of the planning application is threefold: The operators may not be known to, or trusted by, the waste authority; Where a site is well managed by competent people, there is nothing to stop the site being purchased by less scrupulous foreign-owned operators. There can be additional risk factors to a well-managed site, e.g. where their proposed extension includes land liable to flooding. The Government doesn't seem to be keen on planning obligations and an outline management plan will be evidence that any problems have been foreseen, and may provide pointers to reasonable planning conditions. One of our main concerns is restoration and, particularly in the case of inert fill, we feel that this is best done during operation and not afterwards.</p>	<p>The final Waste Plan will contain specific 'development considerations' for all site allocations. These will address issues as appropriate for individual sites and may be more appropriate than a generic management plan.</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	1.1	2016WPP552	Disagree	Section 1.2 Sustainability seems to be such a fashionably trendy word nowadays, but what does it actually mean in reality? If one of the waste management aims is to cut down on landfill, why are we pursuing the notion of looking for more places to dump our rubbish. Collecting and transporting across the county in huge trucks in an already creaking road infrastructure, sustainability? Square that circle please.	Your comments are noted. However, the strategy does not look for 'places to dump our rubbish' it is looking to achieve a network of facilities to maximise recycling and the generation of energy from waste that cannot be recycled.
Individual	1.1	2016WPP561	Disagree		
Individual	1.1	2016WPP810	Comment	It is obvious that waste must be removed to some place or other, but it is time that Councils vigorously lobbied the Government to ensure industry removes unnecessary packaging from its products to minimise waste.	Your comments are noted, however unfortunately there is very little the Waste Plan can do, at a local level, to reduce unnecessary packaging.
RSPB	1.1	2016WPP905	Comment	Conservation Regulations Assessment (Habitats Regulations Screening Report). We have considered the supporting Habitats Regulations Screening Report (HRSR) which has been updated to include assessment of the additional and emerging preferred waste allocation sites 2016. The HRSR has set out the results of screening to ascertain any Likely Significant Effect (LSE) of the proposed allocation on European protected sites. The report concludes only one site will have a LSE on European protected sites triggering the requirement for an Appropriate Assessment, that is ED04 "West Moors Petroleum Depot, which is not considered in this update to the plan so therefore has not been commented on. The HRSR also identifies four sites as having an uncertain LSE (p9, paragraph 5). The report suggests any risk to protected sites can be mitigated by inclusion of site specific text to Policy 17 of the Draft Waste Plan (Biodiversity and Geological Interest). The RSPB would expect further investigation of any uncertain LSE on protected sites to be undertaken at this early stage of the plan. The provision of site specific wording within the policy carries an inherent risk of allowing the proposals to progress through the various stages of the plan without full and detailed investigation until a later stage. Any level of uncertain risk to protected sites should be eliminated before it can be concluded that development of waste management infrastructure and technologies at these locations will not have adverse effects on nearby protected sites. Although the HRSR considers impacts of the proposed waste allocations on European sites in relation to proximity and key species, the RSPB does not feel that displacement of recreation has been fully considered for some of the sites, in particular WP01 - Ferndown.	Your comments are noted and will be considered as the Habitats Regulation Assessment progresses. Displacement of recreation is an important issue and will be flagged up as necessary through the screening report.
RSPB	1.1	2016WPP910		Remaining Proposed Waste Allocation Sites The remaining waste allocation sites described in the plan have all been assessed by the HRSR as having no LSE on European protected sites. The RSPB would like to highlight that some of the sites being considered, whilst not in proximity to European protected sites, are situated close to sensitive water courses and nationally protected sites. As such each site will warrant careful and detailed ecological investigation to ensure none of the waste treatment technologies proposed will result in environmental pollution, loss of important habitat or biodiversity.	Your comments are noted. It is agreed that there are issues in addition to impacts on European protected sites that should be considered. The final Waste Plan will include 'development considerations' this will enable other site specific issues to be highlighted to ensure they are given adequate consideration in the consideration of any planning application.
T A Colbourne Limited	1.4	2016WPP175	Comment	"The comments made to the Draft Waste Plan have been taken into consideration" Does this include the comments from the people and companies with vested interests, for example the waste processing companies and land owners who may be advantaged by decisions. Shouldn't their comments be disallowed?	Comments made by all stakeholders are considered throughout the preparation of the Waste Plan

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
T A Colbourne Limited	1.4	2016WPP179	Comment	I refer to paragraph 1.5 "Detailed comments were also received in relation to the site options put forward." A number of the comments appear to be from waste companies and landowners who have a vested interest in promoting a particular site, surely these should be disqualified?	Comments made by all stakeholders are considered throughout the preparation of the Waste Plan. It is then the role of the Waste Planning Authority to balance the need for waste facilities with the concerns and issues raised through consultation.
Individual	1.4	2016WPP563	Disagree		Noted
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	1.7	2016WPP878	Disagree	1.7-8 consultation dates We are comfortable with the delay. A good plan is far better than a quick one. Thank you again for the good stakeholder involvement in the plan preparation. You said in para 1.8 that we would have no further opportunity to comment after Sept 2015, so the addition of new sites and this consequent update gives a welcome opportunity to us.	Noted
Individual	1.7	2016WPP564	Disagree		Noted
Individual	1.8	2016WPP597	Disagree	Section 1.11 of the Plan states that the only hard copies of the Plan available to the public are in the three libraries in the towns of Bournemouth, Poole and Dorchester. This effectively stops anyone in the area chosen for the least popular facilities (which are for some reason clustered in or near East Dorset) seeing a hard copy and picking up a response form, unless they have the money, time and health to travel to Bournemouth, Poole or Dorchester - driving times of up to 45 minutes. Why were hard copies and response forms not put in libraries in the chosen area, such as the libraries at Wimborne, Ferndown, Colehill, West Moors and Blandford? Hard copies are important for people who cannot use computers. This denies a fair hearing to the people most affected by these proposals.	Hard copies were made available in certain locations as well as being available online. In the past copies of documents were placed in libraries throughout the Plan area. In order to reduce costs hard copies were only placed in libraries following specific requests. Such a request was made for hard copies in Ferndown Library during the consultation. We would encourage stakeholders to get in touch with officers if they are having difficulty accessing the documents. It is usually possible to send hard copies or relevant sections of Plans and response forms directly.
Individual	1.8	2016WPP565	Disagree		Noted

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	2.1	2016WP17	Comment	I have gone through the online document but find no mention of an issue which could seriously impact on the calculation of Arising's and Shortfalls. This is the parallel Hampshire planning round in which the Somerley waste disposal site is listed as a candidate for closure. Should this be closed then the population of Verwood and a number of surrounding villages, which undoubtedly now use Somerley, will change the arising's and shortfall calculations. I can find no reference to this in your paper (I may have missed it) However we do not live in water tight (or waste tight!) compartments and surely this must be recognised in our Dorset planning?	The Waste Planning Authority and Dorset Waste Partnership (DWP) are aware of this consultation and are concerned about the impact of closing the Somerley HRC or the prevention of Dorset residents using the facility. The nearest existing HRC in Dorset is Wimborne which is already congested. The Waste Plan is looking to address this need and has shortlisted an area of search in Ferndown for allocation of a replacement HRC - however this is likely to be a longer term solution and is still some distance from Verwood. It is our understanding that DWP are working on a financial arrangement with Hampshire which could contribute to their costs to keep the Somerley facility open to Dorset residents.
Individual	2.1	2016WP20	Comment	In view of the likely restructuring of local government on this area, does it really make sense to plan on the basis of different recycling policies for what are currently independent areas? I suggest that it does not and hence the most likely policy should be applied across the whole area of Dorset. Further, it seems likely to me that the restructuring may well involve either formal constitutional links or closer contractual links with areas outside the current borders of Dorset, in particular with East Devon and South Somerset. The report should therefore indicate the results of initial exploratory discussions with these areas on joint planning of policies and facilities. Hence it makes no sense to cart material from Sherborne in a southerly direction when facilities used by Yeovil are so much nearer. There must be, within the plan, an objective of minimising distances travelled. As far as forecast tonnages of the various categories are concerned, a note that an increase per person is anticipated. This increase involves several assumptions that can be challenged. It assumes that there will be no legislative changes to reduce waste: for example, returnable bottles and cans; taxes on packaging; prohibitions of certain types of packaging materials	The Waste Plan covers the three authorities of Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole. The Plan has been prepared in consultation with other authorities in the wider region and beyond. Wherever possible national waste policy suggests that waste should be dealt with within the Authority, however it is acknowledged that it is sometimes necessary to transport waste to facilities outside the authority particularly for specialist waste to regional or even national facilities. There are a number of facilities outside of Dorset that manage our waste through contractual agreement and this is likely to continue in line with the proximity principle. Please refer to the 2015 Draft Waste Plan for further details on the overriding principles that drive the need for new facilities. These will be included within the final Waste Plan for publication in 2017. With regards to waste forecasting, this work has been undertaken over the last couple of years through discussions with the waste industry and the three waste management authorities.
W H White LTD	2.1	2016WP4 19	Disagree	The decision to roll forward the plan period to 2032 is consistent with guidance set out in paragraph 157 of the NPPF.	Your support is welcomed

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Intelligent Land	2.1	2016WPP446	Disagree	I act for Ankers and Rawlings and its allied companies. When making previous submissions to the earlier version of the plan I made the point that this Client operates a skip hire and recycling business. For ease of reference I set out in the heading the reference of the last planning permission for these premises known as Rogers Concrete at East Stoke. The important point is that the plan fails to take account of existing operations such as this and the role these sites may play in the future.	The Plan has considered capacity within existing facilities and the detail is set out in a background paper that supports the Waste Plan.
Christchurch and East Dorset Councils	2.1	2016WPP456	Comment	The Councils do not intend to comment in detail on the updated forecasting for waste arising's as this does not affect the comments on the proposed site allocations as set out below. It is noted that projections have been extended to 2032 and this also reflects a higher rate of housing development as identified in the latest Eastern Dorset Strategic Housing Market Assessment.	Noted
Individual	2.1	2016WPP851	Agree	The decision to extend the life of the plan period to 2032 is welcomed.	Your support is welcomed
Individual	2.1	2016WPP566	Disagree		Noted
W H White LTD	2.4	2016WPP423	Disagree	WHW welcomes the revised municipal waste forecast (increased from 1.66% to 1.68%) which takes account of both the objectively assessed need for housing set out in the SHMA for Eastern Dorset and the extended plan period.	Your support is welcomed
	2.4	2016WPP852	Agree	New Earth previously highlighted the potential impact of the revised housing figures coming through the SHMA for Eastern Dorset. We are pleased to see that this has been addressed in the Update and note this, combined with the extended plan period, has resulted in an increase in the municipal waste forecast (up from 1.66% to 1.68%	Your support is welcomed
Individual	2.4	2016WPP568	Disagree		
W H White LTD	2.7	2016WPP424		WHW welcomes the revised commercial and industrial waste forecast (increased from 1.12% to 1.13%) which takes account of the extended plan period.	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	2.7	2016WPP425	Comment	In line with WHWs comments on the issues and options document, para 2.11 duly acknowledges that waste management is increasingly complex, as it often involves includes multiple stages of processing and management. Furthermore, the WPA have recognised that the Plan will need to be flexible to allow for changes and advances in waste management technologies. WHW is pleased to see such references within the opening sections of the Update.	Your support is welcomed

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	2.7	2016WPP8 53	Comment	I note that the commercial and industrial waste forecast has been revised to allow for the extended plan period.	Noted
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	2.7	2016WPP8 81			Noted
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	2.7	2016WPP882	Comment	Section 4 (in the original Draft Plan): Forecasting waste arising's Para 2.6 and 2.8 in the Update. Local Authority collected waste and commercial and industrial waste Question 1 in the Draft Plan was: - Do you agree that the Medium Growth Scenario forecast for LACW is the appropriate choice? To which we answered no as we preferred the low growth scenario and Question 2 in the Draft Plan was: - Do you agree that the Low Growth Scenario we are forecasting for Commercial and Industrial waste is appropriate? To which we answered an emphatic yes . The need for flexibility We appreciate that the Plan has to ensure that facilities available to manage the waste produced in the County. We accept that there may be more housing. Also, we would not wish to block the potential for waste to be imported into the County to be processed if this was a highly sustainable option. However, ideally we still prefer the low growth scenario in order to put pressure on waste management authorities to introduce stronger measures to reduce waste arising's in both the domestic and commercial and industrial waste streams. If you plan for an increase in waste arising's per household, there will be little or no incentive for Local Authorities to make progress with their waste prevention/reduction programmes. Our worry is that the medium growth scenario allows for an increased tonnage of waste per household, which does not force householders to re-use or recycle. This goes against the Waste Hierarchy Principle, which puts Prevention at the top of the Hierarchy. See Policy 1 "Sustainable Waste Management. Imagine we are 10 years in the future, in 2026, and the low waste scenario has occurred (as a result of effective national and local waste reduction action). In this situation, the Waste Planning Authority needs to be able to decline unnecessary applications. What is needed is flexibility in the plan to permit this. Proposed Policy 3 is helpful in this aim with respect to unallocated sites. See also Policy 4 and the spatial objective in Para 6.2 of the draft Plan. We disagree with the Officers that lower economic demand will prevent new applications. Experience shows the opposite, e.g. deregulation in other sectors has created a spurt of excess developments in heavy competition. Also, speculative investment is rife in every sphere of development. There is, according to a very low estimate by the UN (UNODC/GPML), over US\$ 2 trillion pa of hot money from crime, corruption and terrorism looking for any legitimate investment that doesn't make too great a loss "this is on top of a greater amount of legitimate money. So demand for development land in Dorset will always outstrip supply. The county has already had some major crime in the waste industry and organized crime has already infiltrated the international waste sector. This will be a headache for waste management in the future.	The Waste Plan must be realistic and the projections included in the 2016 Plan are based on the best available information. Planning for low growth is likely to underestimate waste arising's and result in insufficient allocated sites. This may lead to unsuitable sites being allowed on appeal. Allocating sites should not affect any progress that the waste management authorities make in their waste prevention programmed. The Waste Planning Authority is committed to monitoring waste arising's to ensure an appropriate level of provision is made.
Individual	Table 1	2016WPP5 69	Disagree		Noted
Individual	Table 2	2016WPP1	Comment	45% of our waste is unwanted advertising matter. Stop this and cut waste	Your comments are noted. Unfortunately there is very little the Waste Plan can do, at the local level, to stop this unwanted waste.

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
W H White LTD	Table 2	2016WP4 26	Disagree	WHW notes the WPA assessment of recycling needs and capacity. Based on the information available, the 60% recycling target would appear pragmatic.	Your support is welcomed
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Table 2	2016WP883	Comment	Section 5 in original draft: what is the need for new facilities? Para 2.15 "2.52 in the Update We welcome the Officers response that household recycling centres will have a covered area. We see recycling as something the family can enjoy, with HRCs becoming weekend leisure centres with shop for renovated goods, recycling advice, charity shops, workshops, bring-and-take, cafe, play area, attractive sculptures, helter skelter, go-karts, etc (all made from scrap), all generating cash. Energy recovery technologies We covered this in 1.1	Your support is welcomed
Individual	Table 4	2016WP303	Disagree	The WPA has identified a surplus in permitted capacity, albeit delivery will need to be closely monitored. As highlighted by the WPA, this should not serve to discourage new facilities from coming forward where this would help to push waste up the waste hierarchy. ABPM concur with the WPAs commentary and therefore welcome the introduction of a criteria based policy (4).	Your support is welcomed
W H White LTD	Table 4	2016WP427	Disagree	The WPA has identified a surplus in permitted capacity, albeit delivery will need to be closely monitored. As highlighted by the WPA, this should not serve to discourage new facilities from coming forward where this would help to push waste up the waste hierarchy. WHW concurs with the WPAs commentary and therefore welcomes the introduction of a criteria based policy (4).	Your support is welcomed
Individual	Table 4	2016WP5 70	Disagree		Noted
Individual	Table 5	2016WP304	Disagree	The WPAs commentary provides a helpful update on the volume of food waste being collected by Bournemouth Borough Council (which is less than originally envisaged) and Borough of Poole's decision not to proceed with separate food waste collections. Inevitably this has led to a reduction in the need for further treatment capacity. The predicted surplus from 2016 onwards is noted. ABP support the idea of a criteria based policy (5), but would respectfully suggest that the provisions should to go beyond merely contemplating need. ABPM consider that a new provision(s) should be introduced to encourage food waste treatment plants where they would reduce double handling and transport miles, recognising that a new generation of containerised Anaerobic Digestion plants are now available. Without such a provision proposed policy 5 could serve to inhibit competition and unduly fetter the delivery of sustainable development.	Your comments are noted. Food waste arising's and capacity will be monitored regularly following the adoption of the plan. This should enable the WPA to react to changing circumstances and seek to allocate new facilities in future reviews of the Waste Plan reviews should the need arise.

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
W H White LTD	Table 5	2016WP428		The WPAs commentary provides a helpful update on the volume of food waste being collected by Bournemouth Borough Council (which is less than originally envisaged) and Borough of Poole's decision not to proceed with separate food waste collections. Inevitably this has led to a reduction in the need for further treatment capacity. The predicted surplus from 2016 onwards is noted. WHW supports the idea of a criteria based policy (5), but would respectfully suggest that the provisions should go beyond merely contemplating need. WHW considers that a new provision(s) should be introduced to encourage food waste treatment plants where they would reduce double handling and transport miles, recognising that a new generation of containerised Anaerobic Digestion plants are now available. Without such a provision proposed policy 5 could serve to inhibit competition and unduly fetter the delivery of sustainable development.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further.
Individual	Table 5	2016WP854	Comment	The commentary provides a helpful update on the volume of food waste being collected by Bournemouth Borough Council (which is less than originally envisaged) and Borough of Poole's decision not to proceed with separate food waste collections. Inevitable this has led to a reduction in the need for further treatment capacity. The predicted surplus from 2016 onwards is noted.	Noted
W H White LTD	Table 6	2016WP429	Disagree	The increase in residual waste arising stemming from the extended plan period is noted; as is the increase in permitted treatment capacity with the grant of a solid recovered fuel facility at Parley. As illustrated in table 6, the closure of remaining landfill capacity will lead to a 163,000t shortfall in residual waste capacity in 2021. The shortfall is predicted to increase steadily to 222,000t by 2032. The extent to which the figures within table 6 take account of latent capacity within established facilities is unclear. It is understood that DM Opco Limited has previously indicated that an additional 30,000t of residual waste treatment capacity could be released through technological and process innovations over the life of the Plan. Similarly, latent capacity within the MRF operated by Commercial Recycling (Southern) Limited could readily be released through granting direct access to the ATT facility " it is estimated that this would equate to a further 80,000t per annum (c.30,000tpa over and above the notional capacity of the existing MRF). Para.2.38 identifies the need for at least one new treatment plant. The difficulties encountered in delivering new waste treatment facilities are well documented, with access to investment and planning risk ranking highly. It is difficult to secure funding without a sizeable underpinning long term waste contract. However, in the case of the MRF and ATT plant, the infrastructure is either largely already there or already consented (including access road, weighbridge and utility connections) thereby de-risking delivery. This is alluded to, but not fully explored, within the site assessment set out at para. 3.7 of the Technology Review and Site Assessment commissioned by the WPA, which perhaps understandably focusses on the opportunities for the extension of the Site Control Centre.	Your comments are noted and will be addressed within the final plan.

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	Table 6	2016WP855	Comment	The increase in residual waste arising stemming from the uplift in housing need and the extension of the Plan period is noted. As illustrated in table 6, the closure of the remaining landfill capacity (offset in part by the consented energy facility at Parley) will lead to a 163,000t shortfall in residual capacity by 2021. This shortfall is predicted to increase steadily to 222,000 by 2032. New earth has previously indicated that an additional 30,000t of residual waste treatment capacity could be released through investment in new processing plant and technologies/process innovations over the life of the Plan. It is unclear whether this has been taken into account in predicting shortfall.	Additional capacity at New Earth has currently not been built into the projections because it is not currently permitted. Capacity for allocations in the final Draft Waste Plan will be reflected in the projections to show how the shortfall is intended to be addressed.
Individual	Table 6	2016WP5 71	Disagree		Noted
Individual	2.41	2016WP5 72	Disagree		Noted
D.K. Symes Associates	2.43	2016WP472	Comment	This comment refers to: Para 2.44 The recognition that activity in the construction sector will increase is supported as being realistic. However, what this means is there will be an increase in Excavation waste, the majority of which is unsuitable to be recycled. This comment refers to: Para 2.46 It is recognised that it is difficult to obtain accurate figures on inert waste arising's, further complicated by the use of Excavation waste for a range of engineering works. Attention is drawn to this, and the comments at paragraph 2.44 as the increase in arising's will be from the Excavation sector. The recycling figure of 80% for the entire inert material (which includes Construction, Demolition and Excavation waste) is more inspirational than realistic. A more accurate figure would be closer to 50 " 60% for inert material that can be recycled.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	2.43	2016WP8 84	Comment	We welcome the decision to enable a high level of inert waste recovery and recycling.	Noted
Individual	2.48	2016WP5 73	Disagree		Noted
Individual	2.49	2016WP60	Comment	Binnegar Quarry - It will be good for these HUGE holes (30 meters deep) to be filled with inert material and the landscape returned to something that is pleasing to look at. The material must not hold water as the ground water levels are important here. There is now a planning application for homes (26) in Binnegar Hall which is close to the Binnegar Quarry site. This should be taken into account regarding noise, pollution etc. As should the road usage, speed limits etc. for both the A352 and the Puddletown road (used regularly by cyclists) which are also used for military manoeuvres.	Your comments are noted. The Mineral Planning Authority (MPA) was consulted on the application to develop housing in the vicinity of Binnegar Quarry. The MPA responded advising on the current situation with regards to quarrying and provided some recommendations.

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Christchurch and East Dorset Councils	2.49	2016WP457	Comment	The Draft Waste Plan includes proposals for the management of waste through restoration and the following sites in Christchurch are identified as providing opportunities for the landfill of inert waste: Hurn Court Farm Quarry Roeshot In terms of these proposals the development of / restoration of minerals sites within a 13 km radius of the aerodrome are subject to controls and will need to ensure that bird activity is managed having regard to the safe operation of the airport.	Your comments are noted.
D.K. Symes Associates	2.49	2016WP500	Comment	Para 2.49 This paragraph recognises that the non-recyclable inert waste (and the non-usable residual waste) can be beneficially used in the restoration of quarries. The paragraph notes that this is classified as Recovery, however recent policy changes at the Environment Agency may no longer support this view. If non-recyclable inert waste is to be beneficially used in restoration, the position of the Environmental Agency needs to be clarified, as the current policy is not supportive. The identification of Roeshot Christchurch and Woodsford Quarry as potential allocations is supported.	Your support for the identification of Roeshot Christchurch and Woodsford Quarry is welcomed, however this will be updated when the final Mineral Sites Plan is published.
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	2.49	2016WP8 85	Comment	2.49 For landfill, the inert waste needs to be of the correct permeability and pH for the site it's being used to restore. E.g. a pit in an area of acid heath should not be filled with limestone waste. Realistically, operators may find they can only have a general control of this but it needs to be in the planning conditions where relevant	Noted

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
W H White LTD	2.52	2016WHP430	Comment	<p>WHW is pleased to note that the level of inert waste arising predicted at the issues and options stage have been revisited and recalibrated to reflect the objectively assessed need for housing over the Plan period. As a result, the Planned Growth Scenario, incorporating GVA at 2.4% per annum, will be applied and the shortfall in capacity, shown in Table 7, is far greater than set out in the Draft Waste Plan. With respect to para 2.46, WHW would respectfully suggest that there are three methods of managing inert waste "recycling and reuse (such as that undertaken at Whites Pit), recovery operations (whereby the material is used in engineering and restoration projects pursuant to a beneficial end use) and finally disposal (which might otherwise be described as inert landfill). This approach is recognised in paragraph 2.49 of the Update. The target of 80% inert recycling serves to highlight the critical role of established inert waste recycling facilities. Whilst WHW recognises that there is crossover with the Minerals Strategy, WHW would implore the WPA to allocate the established aggregates recycling plant at Whites Pit within the emerging Waste Plan. Considerable capital investment has been made in the refurbishment of the washing plant and mobile plant despite the fact that the facility only benefits from temporary consent. Given that the plant has a proven operational track record and is very well related to the main settlements, within and around which construction is likely to focus, it would be appropriate to dovetail with the Minerals Strategy and allocate the plant in order to safeguard its continued operation. With respect to paragraph 2.50; The planning application seeking permission for Minerals extraction and restoration work and change of use from Golf Course to a SANG at Canford Magna Golf Course was refused by Borough of Poole on 27 th May, 2016. The reasons for refusal relate to perceived amenity impacts, by virtue of noise and dust, rather than the principle of minerals extraction or the use of inert fill in restoration. It is WHWs view that the amenity concerns can be satisfactorily addressed and overcome and the applicant (CRE) is working on a revised scheme. Thus WHW would respectfully request that the WPA reserve judgement and that the wording maintain sufficient flexibility so as to accommodate this scheme.</p>	Your support for the revised level of inert waste is welcomed. Reference to the planning application at Canford Magna golf course will be updated as appropriate.
Individual	Table of Additional Sites	2016WHP2	Comment	<p>With reference to the "eco composting" at Parley. The title column on the left states eco composting. Within the detail box there is no mention of this but there is mention of a "solid recovered fuel processing plant." Are these things to be considered as the same? If so please use one term or the other and do not use eco composting as a euphamism for SFR, if that is the case.</p>	Your comments are noted at the proposed uses will be clarified within the final Plan as appropriate.
Individual	Table of Additional Sites	2016WHP4	Disagree	<p>I object to the use of green belt land at Blunts Farm. We need to encourage people to use outdoor space for exercise and to reduce costs on NHS, etc. Reducing access to green space and impacting the local bridleways and trailways which border this site. The trailways may not be impacted, but people will not wish to exercise or enjoy a rural walk next to a tip. This should be in a brown field site?</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	Table of Additional Sites	2016WP550	Disagree	<p>Ferndown and Parley proposed sites WP01 and WP05 are I have several general objections and concerns about the use of these two sites “ a) Site allocation on Green Belt Land and within residential areas, we should be locating these facilities on brown belt land and away from concentrations of population; b) Optimization of existing sites within the whole Dorset region (i.e. unified authorities of Dorset) is essential before new sites and increases in capacity are considered; c) Impact on local communities i.e. deterioration of quality of environment and threat to health and safety; d) Pincer movement on Ferndown i.e. the WP01 Ferndown site proposals is to the North West of Ferndown and WP05 Parley proposals is to the South East of Ferndown “ this will effectively double the environmental impact of the Ferndown, Tricketts Cross and Stapehill communities plus their surrounding areas; and e) I suspect that these proposals will lead to an increase in fly-tipping “ e.g. the closure of the Wimborne Household Waste facility will mean that some people will have to travel further with their rubbish to get to the WP05 site and I confidently expect that some people will just not bother and start fly-tipping rather than travel that bit further!</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Individual</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Table of Additional Sites</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WP898</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Disagree</p> <p>Objection 2 “Site PK03 Binnegar Environmental Park, Wareham Binnegar Environmental Park is a consented waste management facility under planning permission no` 6/2007/0516. This permission grants consent for the development of waste infrastructure for the recycling and treatment of up to 110,000tpa of waste materials, as well as a Vehicle depot and workshop for the parking of up to 25 HGV’s. This permission has been implemented and is extant. To date the Materials Recycling Facility has been constructed. This commercial facility for the processing and recycling of dry mixed recyclates “with the ability to operate 24/7- is currently mothballed due to the depressed recyclates market. However the site has been mothballed in a way in which it can be brought back into operational use within a matter of weeks. The consented Environmental Park also allows for the biological treatment of waste by In-Vessel composting. In the previous Waste Local Plan for Dorset, Binnegar Environmental Park was allocated as a Schedule 1 site. SUEZ have not seen any evidence whatsoever from the planning Authorities or their Consultants to justify why Binnegar Environmental Park should not be allocated for waste recycling or development within the currently consented 110,000tpa capacity Similarly SUEZ have not been approached by the Planning Authorities consultants to enquire about future plans of the Landowner, e.g. whether the Landowner plans to deliver the consented In-Vessel composting facility or seek to vary the technology within the currently consented capacity limit, in order to deliver a different treatment technology such as Anaerobic Digestion. The site is also capable of fuel preparation from residual waste (either as RDF or SRF) or by means of biological treatment for waste arising’s from the western side of Dorset (an activity which would have evident carbon savings from minimising the travel distances of untreated residual waste to its final recovery point). SUEZ would contend that the Planning Authorities and their consultants have shown a total disregard for the extant planning permission at Binnegar Environmental Park. Supporting documentation to the Draft Waste Plan Update includes the Report on comments to the Draft Waste Plan Site options and Officer Response May 2016 demonstrates this disregard. For site PK03 “Binnegar Environmental Park, the Officers have contained a number of comments that have resulted in the site not being allocated. Those comments are shown below in italics, SUEZ response to those comments are shown in red; Issue 1 Cumulative impact of minerals and waste traffic should be considered. Officers response 1 A Sustainability Report will be undertaken to support the final Waste Plan, this will include an assessment of cumulative impacts of waste development with other developments including where appropriate minerals proposals. SUEZ response 1 A cumulative impact of minerals and waste traffic has been considered as part of an Environmental Statement under planning application 6/2007/0516 and more recently as part of an Environmental Statement under planning application no` 6/2015/0421 for the extension to Binnegar Quarry to form the new working area (Area B2) which was granted planning permission on 18 th May 2016. This is therefore an unjustifiable reason to not allocate Binnegar Environmental Park for recycling and treatment capacity up to 110,000tpa. Issue 2 Reduce the opportunity to restore the site Officer Response 2 Further consideration will need to be given to restoration of the site if this site is to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. SUEZ response 2 Planning permission 6/2007/0516 creates an area for waste management recycling and treatment in perpetuity which is more than large enough for all types of recycling or treatment activity up to a capacity of 110,000tpa. The waste management area is not subject to restoration requirements. This is therefore an unjustifiable reason to not allocate Binnegar Environmental Park for recycling and treatment capacity up to 110,000tpa. Issue 3 Impact on Ecology Officer response 3 There are ecological concerns relating to the additional activity, movement, disturbance and noise resulting from further development on this site. The loss of habitat creation opportunities caused by the lack of restoration is also of concern. Consideration will need to be given to whether mitigation could reduce these impacts to an acceptable level if this site emerges as preferred. SUEZ response. Ecological impacts from 110,000tpa activities including recycling and In-Vessel composting were assessed and addressed in the determination of planning application 6/2007/0516. The baseline ecological environment surrounding this site has not substantially changed since permission was granted in 2010. This is therefore an unjustifiable reason to not allocate Binnegar Environmental Park for recycling and treatment capacity up to 110,000tpa, particularly given that other sites are allocated in the Draft Waste Plan update for 212,000tpa of thermal treatment when those sites are located directly adjacent to SPA, SAC &amp; RAMSAR sites. Similarly the consented waste management area is not subject to restoration requirements. Issue 4 Traffic Impact “rural roads Officer response 4 Issues raised relating to the impacts of additional traffic are noted, however the highways authority has no concerns over the development of a waste transfer facility in this location. SUEZ response 110,000tpa has already been consented and therefore there are no traffic reasons for the site not to be allocated. Issue 5 Site should be considered for a vehicle depot. Officer response 5 There are a number of reasons why this site has not been shortlisted for a waste vehicle depot. Firstly, it is considered that there are other options</p>	<p>The Waste Planning Authority would welcome the opportunity to discuss the future of Binnegar Environmental Park in greater detail.</p>
---	--	--	--	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
				<p>that are more consistent with the aims of national policy, due to their location on industrial/employment land. In addition, it is considered that development on this site would give rise to landscape/visual and ecological impacts. There are also unlikely to be opportunities for employees to utilise sustainable transport to access the site at a convenient time. This site is also poorly located given that the main populations the facility will serve are Wareham/Swanage. Given that there are more sustainable, alternative options for the development of a waste vehicle depot, Binnegar was discounted as an option for this use. SUEZ response A vehicle depot for 25 HGV's has already been consented at this site under planning permission no` 6/2007/0516 Issue 6 Mothballed site that could be quickly brought back into operational use Officer response 6 A material recycling facility is located on the site but has recently been mothballed. Subject to planning permission this building could be used for an alternative use. However, the waste planning authority is not aware of the landowner/operators plans for the site. SUEZ response The landowner has a number of plans for this site to bring it into full operation up to a maximum throughput of 110,000tpa, with or without the re-commissioning of the mothballed Materials Recycling facility Issue 7 Remote site away from residential properties and well screened Officer response 7 It is agreed that this is a remote site, however its remoteness gives rise to additional vehicle miles compared to sites closer to communities that generate waste. SUEZ response's highlighted in the allocation for this site in Schedule 1 of the Dorset Waste Plan 2006, this site is located within 16km of over 50,000 households. A remote location is not surprising given that the site is located in a rural district of Dorset. Such a location was not deemed by Dorset County Planning Authority to be an issue in granting planning permission no` 6/2007/0516. This is therefore an unjustifiable reason to not allocate Binnegar Environmental Park for recycling and treatment capacity up to 110,000tpa. Suggestion 2 Binnegar Environmental Park For the reasons highlighted in the red text above, that Binnegar Environmental Park is allocated as a site for waste recycling and treatment and recovery (by means of biological treatment / AD) up to a capacity of 100,000tpa. Whilst the site is capable of handling and recycling more than 110,000tpa, it seems reasonable and sound to allocate the site to match the capacity of the consented (but as yet largely undelivered) capacity.</p>	
Individual	Table of Additional Sites	2016WP6 08	Disagree	I disagree with land at Stapehill being used in this way. Road capacity is full. It is simply unacceptable to progress more development without infrastructure.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Stinsford Parish Council	Table of Additional Sites	2016WP834	Comment	<p>This site at Beacon Hill on the edge of Puddletown Forest was suggested by the Parish Council for the following reasons:- 1) all current proposed sites have major problems, whether they be pollution, water contamination, wild animals, aesthetics and traffic to name but five. On this basis alternative sites need to be sought. 2) The proposed site does not suffer four of these problems, although there would still be spread of disease by birds and rodents etc. 3) the proposed site is further out of Dorchester but has much better traffic access - uncongested access roads, good visibility and acceleration/deceleration slipways. The lorries leaving the site predominantly travel eastwards and there would therefore be reduced fuel consumption. 4) Whilst further for residents of Dorchester to travel, it would be nearer to those using it from the Puddletown area. 5) The landscape impact would be less as screening would be provided by Puddletown Forest. 6) The siting of a waste management centre should be based upon the structure appraisal of the environmental and landscape impact and not upon the offer of land by landowners who are looking at the financial advantages to them. Alternatively, it is suggested that the household recycling activities be retained at Louds Mill with the extension of that site and the transfer and depot aspects could be based at this site out of town. I recognise that the consultation period has now ended and I apologise for not having responded sooner; I was out of the country and unable to access this email account. However, if it is possible for the Parish Council's suggestion of this site to be logged alongside the comments already submitted, I would be extremely grateful.</p>	<p>The need for a replacement household recycling centre to serve Dorchester and surrounding towns was first identified in the Waste Plan Issues Paper (December 2013). This document contained an area within which a search for a suitable site would take place. This area was centred on Dorchester and focused on employment sites, consistent with National Planning Policy for Waste. Greenfield sites outside of the town were generally not considered unless specifically suggested by a landowner or other consultee. Household recycling centre's need to be well located to serve the populations that they are intended to serve. Land at Beacon Hill is some distance from the centre of population resulting in a large proportion of the users of the site having to travel much greater distances to access a facility.</p>
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	4.1	2016WP886	Comment	<p>4.2: the policy is fine; it needs a policy number and it's the Waste Planning Authority, not application (just a typo).</p>	<p>Noted, the Plan will be updated to reflect your concerns.</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Christchurch and East Dorset Councils	Policy - Proposed Waste Site Allocations	2016WPP458	Disagree	The following draft policy is set out in Chapter 4 of the update to the draft plan: The sites set out in Schedule 1 are proposed to be allocated to address the waste management capacity gap and identified needs for new and improved waste management facilities. Applications for waste management facilities, within these sites for the proposed uses, will be permitted provided that the application demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Waste Planning Application that any adverse impacts will be mitigated and that the proposal complies with other relevant policies of this Plan. The Councils object to this wording as it ignores the policy requirements of the adopted Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan in relation to the sites considered below. The last sentence should refer to compliance with policies in the district and borough Local Plans which form the Development Plans for the respective areas. The Development Plan for Christchurch and East Dorset includes the Core Strategy and saved policies from the 2001 Christchurch Local Plan and 2002 East Dorset Local Plan. In particular the proposals for sites WPO1 and WPO2 are contrary to the adopted Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan. Section 4 sets out the schedule of proposed waste allocations which includes the following sites in Christchurch and East Dorset: WPO1 Ferndown Area of Search WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate WPO5 Eco Sustainable Solutions, Parley, Christchurch and East Dorset Councils object to these proposed allocations and detailed representations are set out within Section 5.	Your comments are noted. It may be more appropriate to have a general comment within the Plans introduction which explains the range of development plans prepared by districts/boroughs in Dorset.
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	Policy - Proposed Waste Site Allocations	2016WPP887	Disagree	4.4FF: could the overview map please be bigger (on 2 pages and rotated to match the following pages).	It is agreed that a larger map would be helpful.
Individual	Policy - Proposed Waste Site Allocations	2016WPP600	Disagree	Looking at the map in section 4.4, it appears that proposed sites for the least popular facilities, the strategic waste facilities (residual/bulky waste) are clustered together in or near East Dorset. There is nothing I know of that makes East Dorset a more suitable site for these facilities. On the contrary, there are many reasons NOT to site such facilities in East Dorset (e.g. problems with the road network there, large residential/work population). There must be sites across the rest of rural Dorset where far fewer people would be affected by these unpopular facilities. Why are there no proposals to site them around Dorset?	The Waste Plan Issues Paper 2013 and Draft Waste Plan 2015 considered the locational requirements for strategic waste facilities. The need for facilities for the management of residual and bulky waste are driven by Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole and any new facility needs to be strategically located in the County. Given that Dorset is a rural authority and the largest quantities of waste will be derived from in and around the conurbation this would be the most likely locations for such a facility.
Individual	Policy - Proposed Waste Site Allocations	2016WPP574	Disagree		Noted

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual		2016WPP1 1	Comment	Please note the red disk noted for the Blandford site appears south of the bypass on the map whereas the site is north of the bypass.	Your comments are noted and will be addresses in the final Waste Plan.
Individual		2016WPP1 6	Comment	The Brook Rd Wimborne site is indeed small, half having been sold off some years ago, but its useful life can easily be extended while you search for a regional site. Remove one skip to leave a gap. This reduces the manoeuvres to change skips from 6 to 2, reducing turnaround time and the resultant queues of frustrated ratepayers	Your comments are noted and will be passed to the relevant authority.
Individual		2016WPP80	Agree	I personally feel that myself, my family and the local community will benefit from all the proposed sites, in particular WPO1 - Ferndown area of search and WPO3 Mannings Heath Area of Search. I feel that these areas in particular lack these kind of facilities so would benefit from it as would all the other proposed sites. I am in favour of this new waste plan.	Your support is welcomed - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised.
Individual		2016WPP5 76	Disagree		Noted
Individual	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP6	Disagree	Any further development of an industrial nature in and around the area of Wimborne Road West/ East will cause an even greater adverse impact on traffic which is already shambolic thanks to the ill conceived planning of Canford Bottom roundabout which has successfully gridlocked all the surrounding access roads. In particular I am concerned with the proposals for a household waste management scheme being implemented in this area. There is already a depot situated 2 miles from the proposed site, in Brook Road, Plus the impact this would have on the many residential developments in the area are a negative impact regarding being plagued with flies, which I know occurs due to my Mother having one within a mile of her home. Her quality of life has suffered due to this development. Could you please inform us how many councillors live within 250m of the proposed development which is my situation. Cars from local businesses already use our guest parking spaces as a convenience to access their work buildings and I feel this situation would worsen with new developments. Please note residents comments more than was done with Canford Bottom roundabout for which heads should have rolled	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP329	Comment	After looking at the map the roads surrounding this proposed area are very congested without the addition of more traffic & lorries, they are also not wide enough to compensate for the additional traffic. We also have three schools not far from this site with children of all ages walking or cycling to their schools. We also have a large population of elderly people, quite a few of these are no longer able to drive & therefore have to use the local transport, crossing the road to whichever bus stop they require is already a very big problem for them as well as for the parents and children using these roads.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP32	Disagree	This area provides a green route from Ferndown into Cannon Hill plantation. It is used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders and joggers/runners as a safe means to cross the A31 avoiding Canford Bottom roundabout and Uddens Crossing. The area is managed by the Friends of Cannon Hill who have improved the site with no or little assistance from local authorities to make it a valuable public amenity for recreational activities.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP33	Disagree	I can't believe the council are considering using this area for waste treatment. The increase in road use by heavy lorries and workers transport would put our local roads in gridlock! These roads are already causing problems to commuters most days of the week causing build ups back to Ferndown industrial estate to Cranford bottom. Noise levels would increase as would exhaust fumes from idling engines stuck in traffic jams. We need to protect our green belt land for all to enjoy. There are numerous properties in close proximity to this proposed site that would be affected by this proposal going ahead! Noise from the industrial estate already resonates across to neighbouring housing estates which would be escalated with further excessive use of this area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
in	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP37	Disagree	I object to the Preferred Waste Plan which is under consideration for the Uddens area. Once again The Cannon Hill Woods are targeted to be destroyed. First sand & gravel, then a Gypsy site and now Waste. It seems to me that DCC is intent on destroying the whole of the East Dorset Environment area. Massive housing planned, dreadful traffic congestion. Please note that this area is a recreational area, for walkers, runners, cyclist, and horse riders. Used by families, dog walkers, local school groups, cubs and scouts and other organisations. We have less public space on our door steps than some towns who have open commons and parks. Please consider the local people.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP39	Disagree	I object most strongly to use of the land to the SW of Blunts Farm for this purpose. It is a much used community asset, accessed by walkers, joggers and horse riders of all ages and is well maintained by local volunteers, The Friends of Cannon Hill. It is also used as a safe pedestrian crossing over the A31 to access the rest of the Cannon Hill Plantation and the Castleman Trailway. In addition to the above, the access at Uddens Drive is already very busy with cars and HGV's going to and from the industrial estate and the additional traffic from any waste facility would have a massive impact on the amount of traffic using this junction. It would also have major repercussions on already gridlocked Canford Bottom roundabout. In fact, 3 of the 4 areas of residents that are listed in the waste plan as expected to use this facility will have to negotiate the roundabout to get to the site, which would be a significant number of extra vehicles using this already beleaguered junction.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP40	Agree	I am very concerned that Uddens woodlands could be used as a waste disposal area. The area is a green belt site and is well used by walkers, bikers, dog walkers etc. I use the woodlands regularly and am always surprised at the amount of wild life to be seen. I saw my first Jay there much to my delight. It is an area where children can walk, play, ride a bike safely and learn about nature. PLEASE do not use this area and spoil the wonderful facility which is used by so many people in our area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP42	Disagree	I simply cannot believe Cannon hill woods south is once again under threat. A little pocket of woodland in a built up area which is home to an abundance of wildlife and is a tranquil space for family recreational activities such as walking, cycling, running and horse riding. We fend off plans for gravel extraction and gypsy sites to now be faced with a waste treatment plant, surely greenbelt should stay as greenbelt not to be built on when the council feels it can. If this is given the go ahead it would: - *take away a safe and pleasant route which is used by residents to access Cannon hill Woods North (Colehill side), *cause horrendous congestion on Uddens Drive (I can envisage queuing cars and lorries back onto Stapehill Road at busy periods!) and add to that the noise and pollution this would in turn would cause. *the access simply is not be suitable from Stapehill Road (at present it is an accident waiting to happen with lorries struggling to make the turn from Stapehill Road) *be detrimental to the many species of wildlife that reside in the woodland. * cause effect to the numerous properties in close proximity to this proposed site - Noise and smells from the industrial estate already carry across to these properties and this would be exaggerated further. I am a Ferndown resident and use either Millhams or Brook Road waste centres with minimal fuss, therefore I cannot get my head around the need for another plant in Ferndown?? Please leave us with this pocket of greenbelt land for future generations to enjoy!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP46	Disagree	Most unsuitable plan for this beauty spot. 1. It is greenbelt land 2. Situated in a high density population area. 3. It is used daily for recreational activities. 4. There are three schools situated in the vicinity 5. The value of all the property in the area will be adversely affected. 6. The property would need to be re-evaluated for reduction in Council tax. 7. There is already heavy traffic using the local roads due to access to and from Canford Bottom round about. 8. Water draining from the site will cause pollution in the local water supply and the surrounding countryside. 9. There is a lot of wildlife in the forest which will be affected. 10. the surrounding air will be polluted especially if, as proposed there is an incinerator 40ft. will not be tall enough to protect the air and health of local residents, higher than that will pollute further afield and the atmosphere. The whole plan is simply not tenable. A total destruction of a much loved, needed and used amenity	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP49		<p>I have read with disbelief and absolute horror about the proposals to locate a Household Recycling Centre together with a Bulky Waste Transfer and Treatment Facility serving, it seems, not only the local area but Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset on land comprising Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands, Dorset. This proposal must not be allowed to become a reality. This unspoilt area of green belt woodland and open areas is enjoyed for quiet rural recreation by many people of all ages, not just those whose houses adjoin it, but a large number of people from surrounding communities without the benefit of such a space. They appreciate the efforts of the strong band of dedicated Friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands supporters who help to keep it in good order for the enjoyment of all. In addition it provides home and shelter for many species of wildlife. Apart from the proposed facilities taking away a much valued amenity area, access could only be off the A31 single carriageway Ferndown bypass, a very busy road which is an important access to Wimborne and Dorset generally. Wimborne does not deserve to become known as the town just past the waste disposal depot. The current access to and egress from Uddens Drive is not good at present and has been an accident scene. The volume and type of traffic this proposal would generate would make this extremely dangerous and any traffic lights or roundabout would make the traffic holdups on this road totally unacceptable, so close to the recent Canford Bottom hamburger junction, which already can come to a standstill at busy times. By their very nature facilities of the sort proposed should not be located on amenity land close to residential areas, but in an area of industrial use. A far more suitable site would be adjacent to the large roundabout at the start of the Ferndown Industrial Estate just off the A31. This roundabout is mainly used for lorry parking but could easily provide an access point to a waste facility which would not be visible from the A31 Ferndown bypass. I note that this deplorable proposal has been agreed for consultation by the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals and Waste Advisory Committee and is therefore an early example of how the green belt areas of Dorset would be under threat if a single Unitary Authority were to be formed for Dorset. Bournemouth and Poole do not have a good record of preserving green areas and have now all but run out of open land on which to build. The large towns would wield their weight at the expenses of rural Dorset and the whole character of Dorset as a delightful area of countryside would be under extreme threat. If it is necessary for Authorities to join together it should be with those of like character and interests, rural areas linking with other rural regions and the larger towns joining together. A mix of the two would be a recipe for severe difficulties.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP52	Disagree	<p>I wish to strongly object to the proposed waste plant at Uddens Woodlands/ Cannon Hill South. I regularly walk through this area to access Cannon Hill on the other side of the bypass, it's a quiet beautiful area that saves those of us living on this side of the woods having to walk around the hideous Canford Bottom Roundabout and up to Colehill to get there. I don't need to walk along any roads at all as I can use the Castleman Trail ,which runs behind my home, to access the south side of the woods, and then cross the bypass to the other side. I live on Wimborne Rd West and the traffic here is already dreadful with the huge Ferndown industrial estate and its lorries vans and cars just up the road. We also have to contend with the massive amount of traffic using Canford Bottom Roundabout all day and the knock on effects from that. To add that volume of extra traffic using a waste plant just up the road would be complete madness and lead to us having an unacceptable and huge upsurge in traffic volume plus the smells associated with a huge chimney and rubbish rotting. Take it somewhere well away from our already compromised homes and roads PLEASE!!!!</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP55	Disagree	Cannot believe that the Council are considering this area. Reason the land has less value than other areas!!. How can you put a value on the right of people in built up areas to be able to walk, walk their dogs and ride in comparative safety and enjoy the wildlife in the process. This land deserves to be protected for the future. Also that area is totally unsuitable for the type of vehicles that would be using it.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP62	Disagree	I am writing to oppose fully any development of the Cannon Hill Wood site for your waste disposal plans on any Green Belt land. The fact this is your preferred site shows a great deal of disconnection from the local community who are already opposed to the Travellers site proposed there. Or any other development on Green Belt. Please could you confirm what future plans you or the council have for the development of the Brook Road site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP67	Disagree	Fumes Transport Road Links Residential Properties Its been turned down before why now?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP70	Comment	I am writing to raise my concerns about the development of a waste sit in Cannon Hill Woods. I use these woods daily with my children and am not at all happy about the prospect of waste Lorries travelling to the site or the impact it will have on a beautiful nature resource. I oppose this strongly please find an alternative site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP71	Disagree	I also disagree with the use of this land which borders the bridle ways and rural area of Ferndown. The transport links to Ferndown are poor at best with the options being the a31 via canford bottom roundabout or Wimborne road East both of which are heavily congested on a very regular basis and large HGV's will only add to this. Many local residents visit this area which is very pleasant and an incinerator and waste plant would seriously damage this area and I fear that the area would be avoided	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP76	Disagree	I have read the above proposal with disbelief! Apart from the fact this proposal would be on green belt land, have any of you driven through the Canford Bottom roundabout on a normal day with a normal flow of traffic? It's tricky, and in rush hours and summer time when it's a main tourist route it's practically impossible so to add 100,000 cars plus associated lorries to that mix is madness. I understand there is an additional bulky waste transfer and treatment facility also planned for the site so that would mean even more lorries coming from Bournemouth, Poole and East Dorset. And does this term mean an incinerator will be involved? That would cause pollution and thus a damage to health in a built up area. I think whoever thought up this idea should have a serious re-think.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP81	Comment	It has been brought to our notice that there is a proposal to make Uddens forestry the main waste vehicle depot with facilities for recycling household waste. Bulky waste transfer and treatment facility and taking waste from Bournemouth, Poole as well as East Dorset with the possibility to build an incinerator with an estimated 40m chimney. I cannot understand how the environmental services could even consider the site of Uddens Forestry for this purpose. As a friend of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodland and using the site of great recreational importance, for all members of the public, seems inconceivable that you could even consider this site of great beauty and ecological importance. A lot of work has been invested by a troop of volunteers to make this site a place of tranquillity to enjoy all the diverse flora and fauna the site has to offer. Looking at the petitions signed when a proposal to build a gypsy and traveller site, you will be aware of how many people feel very passionately that we need a space for resident and visitors to the area to enjoy. This site is not only used by the families and people of Staplehill, but also Cannon Hill, Ferndown, Longham, Cannon Hill and north of the bypass. It is also used by the people working in the industrial estates in the area to get a much needed break. If such a motion is passed, it will be taking away a much loved and used site leaving no substitute. This proposal will also have a massive impact on the health of the residents if a chimney is built to burn industrial waste. The fallout fumes from the proposed 40m high incinerator chimney could jeopardise fresh air for miles, encompassing schools, housing and industrial units, potentially leading to health issues for all. I will be proposing that this should be taken up with the Court of Human Rights if this proposal gets the go ahead. With a proposal to build 6000 new homes in the area, we need more recreational land, not less. The sustainable alternative natural green spaces are all very well but they are not mature natural areas. We have used Uddens Forestry for the last 40 years and hope that our children and grandchildren will also enjoy these wonderful spaces. This proposal will also impact on the Castleman Trailway used frequently by cyclists, walkers, and horse riders. This route is also used by workers on the industrial estate as a safe alternative way of getting to work. The road infrastructure which would serve this waste unit would be swamped by an estimated 100 lorries per day, every day of the year, 24 hours a day. This in addition to the 100,000 cars using Brook Road currently, and would transfer to Uddens drive. I urge all concerned in considering this proposal to please think very seriously on the consequences passing such a plan would be. As mentioned, since we moved to Staplehill some 40 years ago, we have been plagued with so many proposals to ruin this lovely community with its Forestry. From a proposal by pass along what is now the Castleman Trailway to the traveller's campsite. This is not a suitable area for any of these proposals. Please consider the lives you will be impacting with this proposal and the recreation area we have worked so hard to protect for generations to come.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP83	Disagree	This area is totally unsuitable for waste disposal. It is Green Belt land which is widely used by residents for recreation. It also allows pedestrian access to Cannon Hill plantation on the north side of the A31 via the footbridge. Canford Bottom Roundabout is already a bottleneck and the increased traffic will exacerbate this.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP91	Disagree	I am prepared to sue for any damage to my health caused by inhalation of fumes given off by such an installation or any resulting loss of value to my property, notwithstanding the potential damage to the health of children at Ferndown school.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP92	Disagree	Madness to install this chimney near to a residential and workplace including schools. Not only a health hazard but cannot believe it can be put there in such a nature environment. Notwithstanding the pollution it will send out.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP93	Disagree	How can this be allowed. Too many aspects to list. Chimneys chucking out waste are being knocked down. How can this be going up?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP94	Disagree	Cannon Hill is a quiet area of woodland enjoyed by dog walkers, cyclists, joggers and workers from the nearby industrial estate which can be accessed without travelling on the busy A31 road. The green space areas are already limited in this area and the roads are already heavily congested. Therefore siting any waste processing centre here would be inappropriate.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP95	Disagree	I am not happy with the proposal for the huge waste plant at Cannon Hill South as I live close to it! We have enough traffic from the canford bottom roundabout and any more would result in further disruption to Stapehill and Ferndown. I also do not wish for my child to inhale anything from the proposed 40m chimney. Please rethink your actions and construct it elsewhere	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP100	Disagree	I am strongly objecting to the proposal to put bulky and residual waste treatment facility, HRC and a waste vehicle depot in the areas of Blunts Farm, land adjacent to Blunts Farm or Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates on these grounds; The close proximity of residential areas and schools could prove hazardous. There is a question mark over where and there could be potential harm caused to people from the long term effects of any waste burning facility. Despite regulations it is questionable as to whether the companies who run these installations are as rigorous as they should be in applying the safety measures. They may be tall chimneys but what goes up must come down again. The prevailing winds mostly come from the west bringing smells and fumes over the whole of Ferndown. Up to 100 HGVs on Ferndowns roads particularly Canford Bottom roundabout per day, it's a ridiculous proposition, the area would be in total gridlock. Apart from the noise and odour on surrounding areas. Why should Ferndown take the whole of Dorset's waste. Its noticeable it would be far away from Dorchester. The land adjacent to Blunts Farm is picturesque woodlands. I have seen lizards, snakes and many varied species of birds there. It is frequently used by local people for recreational purposes with access to the Castleman trail way	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP103	Disagree	I am devastated that you could even consider Cannon Hill South for a Waste Disposal Unit. These woods are in constant use by the local community for dog walking, cycling, schools use it regularly for nature walks with children and it is always busy. We are told to exercise more and you are thinking of taking away this amenity. Why do you keep trying to take this special site away from us. We had talk of a Gypsy Camp and now you are talking about a Waste Plant. Please reconsider, this is not a suitable area for such intrusive use. I look forward to you making a more caring and sensible decision.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP106	Disagree	This beautiful area of woodland that is a pleasure for all locals and visitors alike and should be left as it is and NOT changed in any way especially the proposal to put a waste plant here. NO THANK YOU.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP107	Disagree	This beautiful area of woodland that is a pleasure for all locals and visitors alike and should be left as it is and NOT changed in any way especially the proposal to put a waste plant here. NO THANK YOU.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP111	Disagree	As a resident of the immediate vicinity and an active member of the Cannon hill Woodlands Group it is with great dismay that I read that our woodlands are being targeted again for development. There are numerous other sites in the consultation some of which the land owners are actively encouraging the waste facilities because they dovetail into already existing businesses. The woodlands are a valuable leisure resource and form part of the GREEN BELT. The woodlands group have had many work parties over the past five years improving the woods much of which has been funded by Dorset County Council. It would be very disappointing if all of our hard work and council funding were to go to waste. The volume of traffic in the surrounding area is already at saturation point so come on planners do the right thing and drop this site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

<p style="text-align: center;">Individual</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WP112</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Disagree</p> <p>We are writing to object to the use of land SW of Blunts Farm being considered for a Waste Plant. It is appreciated that Blunts Farm is a designated employment site and this is supported, however any development should incorporate a sizeable buffer zone to the south west, ideally the area from Uddens Drive to the current boundary of Blunts Farm. The proposed use of this land SW of Blunts Farm for a Waste Plant is considered wholly inappropriate and detrimental to the local community. It is neither a sustainable nor a healthy option. It has local impacts: Depriving local community of access to green space Too close to residents Access not satisfactory Concern for pedestrian/cyclist/motorist/horse rider's safety with increase in traffic Wimborne Road West cannot sustain a regular quantity of lorries on top of local traffic and Uddens Drive, in particular, is not suitable for this purpose. Recreation This area of land SW of Blunts Farm is a key community resource: a green space for the local community, used by those working on the Industrial Estate, users of the Castlemain Trailway, dog walkers, horse riders, bike riding, children's play, wildlife and general walking. Its paths are also wheelchair friendly. It is easy to access by foot without the need to get in the car and drive to alternative sites, such as the nearby Ferndown or Holt Heaths (SSSIs) - if this area is to be used for Waste treatment then the accumulation of more people using the heaths could have serious implications on their fragile ecology and wildlife. A lot of work has gone into making this bit of woodland user friendly and to encourage wildlife, it also takes a lot of pressure off the nearby protected heathland. In this respect, the Sustainability Appraisal perhaps should consider this SW corner separately rather than include it within the Ferndown Area of Search " it is a key community resource and far more important for recreation than the larger area as a whole. NPPF 8. Promoting healthy communities Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required. Castlemain Trailway The important, popular, long distance trailway from Ringwood to Poole passes through Cannon Hill South. It is used by walkers, horse riders, cyclists and commuters. East Dorset District Council (EDDC) has policies to improve the use of trailways, bridleways and footpaths, to protect heaths and reduce reliance on the motor car and the proposal conflicts with policies in the Councils Local and Corporate Plan and Core Strategy. For example: Open Space, Leisure &amp; Green Infrastructure: Policy HE4 Existing open spaces and leisure facilities identified on the Proposals Map will be protected and their loss will not be permitted unless their whole or partial redevelopment would result in greater benefits to the community than retaining that facility. On such occasions the replacement must be provided in close proximity, unless it can be shown that the open space, sport or recreational facility was not required'. EDDC has also endorsed the South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Strategy 2011 which states: Green Infrastructure is seen as an essential requirement in developing a sustainable future for South East Dorset, and will be needed to ensure new development over the next 20 years does not reduce the quality of life of current and future residents, or be to the detriment of internationally recognised environmental assets. It also gave High Priority to developing the quality and usage of the Castleman Trailway, being a key route from Upton Country Park in Poole, northwards to Wimborne and connecting onwards to Avon Heath. Improvements to signage, surfacing, promotion, community use and habitat enhancement as a key greenway for the area. Green Belt Proposing this parcel of land is also contrary to NPPF guidance and the Core Strategy: NPPF 9. Protecting Green Belt land 87. As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. EDDC Core Strategy KS3 Green Belt 8.8 Wimborne and Colehill are set within the South East Dorset Green Belt. The Green Belt between the settlements is very narrow and maintains their separate identity. One of the main purposes of the Green Belt is to prevent coalescence of settlements, so this open area is particularly important to protect. In summary, the proposal to put forward land SW of Blunts Farm: would result in the loss of an area of woodland which is a well-used local amenity, together with a loss of habitat for wildlife (including rare species); would ensure that local residents will travel by car to other locations for recreational purposes, the nearest being two areas of Dorset Heathland " an unsustainable option; conflicts with NPPF Green Belt &amp; Promoting Healthy Communities policy; conflicts with a number of EDDC policies and other documents which the Council have endorsed e.g. Investing in Green Spaces: South East Dorset Green Infrastructure Strategy 2011.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
---	--	--	---	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP115	Disagree	<p>I wish to express my views against the plan to build a waste plant (site reference WP01) in Uddens Woodland. This area is a valuable community resource that would be devastating to all to loose. Enjoyed by walkers, dog walkers, cyclists, riders and more, surely this site should not be the preferred site for a waste plant!?! I grew up, like many others did, exploring these woods and growing very fond of them. It would bring myself and many more people a great deal of sadness and anger to see this woodland turn into a waste plant, polluting the air, destroying habitat and bringing traffic and noise to the area. This woodland is used so much by all the people who live in the surrounding area. Ferndown, Longham, Stapehill, Canford Bottom and Colehill. For the people of Ferndown, Longham and Stapehill, it is a means of accessing the wider recreational area without having to cross Canford Bottom roundabout. For some of our residents they just walk in Cannon Hill South and never cross to the north of the bypass, but for many others it is the only way on foot that they can access a wider area. If this access to our woodlands is removed where else can the people south of the bypass walk? The walk by the Stour is for fine weather only. Otherwise there is Ferndown Common but this is very wet in bad weather and takes as long to dry out as by the river. Cannon Hill South is an all weather walking area. Not only can people walk but they can ride bikes and horses too, wheel chair users are able to negotiate the paths and enjoy a little nature. With almost 6000 new homes planned in the Core Strategy we need more recreational land, not less. The Sustainable Alternate natural green Spaces (SANGS) are all very well but they are not mature natural areas. I hope you will listen to the views of the people of this area.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP118	Disagree	<p>Please can you confirm that there will be no refuse site built within Cannon Hill woods in Colehill.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP121	Disagree	<p>I am writing to you on behalf of my family and many of the residents local to Cannon Hill South (Uddens Woodland) and the proposed Waste Plant for this area. Myself and hundreds of the local residents fiercely oppose this plan to turn the woods from a beautiful countryside retreat to a development that will bring pollution, noise, flies, vermin and mass traffic. I will ensure that all my contacts in the national press and TV are aware of these plans, and if necessary to highlight what is proposed by the council in order to stop this shameful plan to turn a beautiful piece of land into a concrete monster. As you will have gathered from this email, myself and my fellow residents are 100% against this Waste Plant (or indeed anything else similar). And I will fight tooth and nail to ensure this land remains untouched and free of these disturbing proposed plans.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP124	Disagree	I wholly object to this planned development. Such a lovely wooded area with beautiful wildlife. I use it often for walking and photography, cycling and walking my dog, so do many others. Absolutely ludicrous!!!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP128	Disagree	Having read your report on the potential waste plant in Blunts Farm Ferndown, once again you do not appear to care about the Welfare of the Ferndown residents of EDDC. If this project was to go ahead it would probably effect the health of residents of Ferndown this type of Plant should be built in a rural area, not close to housing estates ,this is how they do it in Germany .We would also be overloaded with excessive traffic as .the roads in this area have not been upgraded for 30 years and Ferndown is continually log jammed by the amount of traffic passing through and around it I am also concerned about the , casegenics that will be put into the atmosphere from that huge chimney .This project appears to be the same as the appeal that you lost in 2006 Therefore I would be unable to support this project.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP140	Disagree	We would like to object to using uddens / blunts farm for waste. We are concerned regarding air pollution. Traffic pollution with the additional lorries. Loss of woodland green space wildlife. We object to this near our homes and schools. The page has flooded in the past so unsafe for more lorries.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP162	Disagree	My son attends school adjacent to the land proposed for this rubbish facility and uses the woods regularly for walks, to play, look for insects and have picnics. He came home from nursery telling me about a sign that they had seen whilst out on a walk that day. The sign, according to him, said that "some people wanted to cut down the trees". He felt very passionately about telling them to stop. He has asked me to write a letter to the "naughty people who want to build the tower" Below is Harry's letter in his own words; STOP! I don't want you to knock the trees down. Don't build it because we won't be able to go in the woods anymore or have our teddy bears picnics When the smoke comes out of the chimney all the insects will die. The smoke will make me cough and the rubbish will be stinky and smelly. We play in the woods and find insects. There won't be anywhere for the animals to live because it will be full of rubbish.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP163	Disagree	I strongly oppose the use of this outstanding natural area to burn waste and create a rubbish 'dump'. Not only are the environmental impacts evident with the destruction of beautiful woodland, extra chaos of additional lorries and vehicles on the already over laded A31, fumes, smoke and stench of a tip and furnace, but this site is sandwiched between densely populated areas of Ferndown, Uddens and Colehill. My children attend the Barn Nursery School which backs onto your proposed/preferred site, the health impact greatly concerns us and you should reconsider your site location. We also live within a mile of this site and if you do live locally you will know that there are strong winds in the area due to the topography, we (or our close neighbours in Wimborne, Ferndown & Uddens) will suffer the stench and toxic smoke from the site. By choosing this location for such a huge site, you would be taking away the right of a healthy life for thousands of local residents, not to mention at least 6 schools within a 2 mile radius.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP177	Disagree	We are writing to you to object to the plans for an industrial incinerator with a chimney of 40m height at Uddens Drive A31 near the Old Thatch by Wimborne Rd West. The fallout of this will affect the whole of our area where we live. We both cycle via the Castlemaine railway and enjoy the freedom to do so. The roads around get gridlocked and are already dangerous with the volume of traffic	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016W/P180	Disagree	<p>I am writing to express my concern and opinions as requested in the article I read in the Stour and Avon Magazine Woodland under treat “ people urged to give their views Having lived locally within this area for over fourteen and a half years I feel it is important to express my concerns and explain why I object to Cannon Hill South Woodlands being used as; Waste vehicle depot HRC Bulky waste transfer and treatment facility I believe that many local residents and individuals who use these woodlands on a daily basis will feel as passionately as I do in protecting a peaceful, unspoilt natural environment now and for future generations to enjoy. The thought of this area being spoilt and developed as proposed is unthinkable. A chimney 40m in height polluting the air will have a detrimental impact on the woodland and natural habitats will be destroyed. Local people, dog walkers, cyclists, holiday makers and businesses will no doubt be severely affected and this will in turn impact on the surrounding community. Others comments highlight the importance of recreational space and this is an extremely valid point. The government along with the NHS and many businesses has for an increasing number of years tried to encourage individuals to keep fit and healthy, promoting a lifestyle that combines regular exercise and a balanced diet. By going ahead with these proposals will mean that many people who regularly take pleasure in walking, jogging, exercising, cycling, playing, bird watching and enjoying the woodland will no longer be able to enjoy the tranquillity and breath the fresh woodland air. The friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill have worked as a team over the years to ensure that this area is maintained, equipping it with picnic benches, clearing pathways and keeping it litter free because it is an area that is loved and enjoyed by people of all ages. I hope that all their hard work has not been in vain. I realise that a site needs to be established but would urge you not to earmark Cannon Hill South because of the following; It is the only area similar to Moors Valley that people who live in Wimborne and Ferndown can access by foot and one that provides a relaxed environment “a natural, unspoilt area Increased traffic noise pollution, air pollution. Would impact hugely on an already busy area We need to maintain this beautiful woodland area. The forestry commission have cleared trees and new saplings have been planted It would be devastating to lose such a pleasant woodland area that is enjoyed and loved by a large local population. I do hope another suitable site can be found.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP184	Disagree	<p>I am Technical Director at SMD and having worked in the offices within Ling Road for the last 10 years am extremely concerned by this proposal for numerous reasons: - It is already noticeable the amount of HGV's that travel along ling road causing vibration through the office. The addition of this site would largely increase this and cause considerable discomfort to people working within the offices. - Our opening windows provide natural ventilation and light, these are facing directly towards the proposed site and the considerable smell from a waste site would make this impossible without causing discomfort within the office (I am well aware of this as experience the similar issue when travelling from my home in Verwood along Ringwood Road and the smell of the tip is unbearable particularly in warm weather. - Not only our offices, but also the use of Tower Park as a leisure facility would be adversely affected. People regularly go there for lunch and the hygiene issues the proposed site would create will impact on the family and staff experience when spending time at tower park. - Our office regularly has client visits and this eyesore could adversely affect this. Including parking, traffic and associated access on the local roads due to the massive impact on traffic. - In adverse weather (heavy rain or snow/ice) Ling Road can be treacherous at best. This is bad for small vehicles and would be a huge danger and potential cause of accidents within Ling Road. Only last year the road closed at the bottom of ling road due to an HGV losing control by Acorn Business Park hence getting to work would be impacted not only by the increase in traffic!</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP187	Comment	<p>As a Poole resident I was appalled to learn that Mannings Heath is being considered for a food waste site. I have several clients operating their businesses in very close proximity to the land in question and I can only see it as detrimental to them in terms of acquiring good staff and retaining them, client relationships, and decreased value to their commercial properties. Safe access to their property for themselves and their staff will be threatened with the significant increase in lorry movements, which at times is already an issue. In addition, as a regular user of the leisure facilities at Tower Park I can only see this threatening to one of our very few tourism venues in the Borough of Poole with odour nuisance, threat of increased vermin, and at an elevated position, creating a particularly unattractive visual impact. I wish to log a strong objection to the consideration of this site for future proposals. With extensive numbers of residential properties in close proximity, a high level use tourism venue and many threatened businesses on its doorstep, it is clearly not an appropriate position for the acceptance of food waste acquired from across the county.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP191	Disagree	I would like to strongly object to the proposal to put bulky and residual waste treatment facility, HRC and a waste vehicle depot in the areas of Blunts Farm, land adjacent to Blunts Farm or Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates for many reasons, including: * My family and I use the area for family walks, our friends walk their dogs there and my children have a safe and clean place to ride their bikes. * I use the Castleman Trailway to cycle to Ringwood and Moors Valley due to the fact that it is safe but also because of the beautiful scenery and wildlife you see. If the proposal goes ahead at this site, the increase in traffic will not only pollute the air but will also remove the enjoyment out of this part of the cycle and drive away wildlife. * We moved to the area less than 5 years ago, attracted by the easy access to unspoilt woodland on our doorstep. Since moving, all we have heard is proposals to change this natural resource. * With ever increasing traffic on our roads, can our local infrastructure really support the extra burden this proposal would result in? More important than the infrastructure, will our health suffer as a direct result of increased fumes from both extra lorries and incinerators?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP192	Disagree	It seems that "the powers that be" will only be content when all our green land has been taken away and made into housing estates and factories. What green spaces will be left to enjoy if this plan goes ahead? How are our children ever going to be able to appreciate nature and the great outdoors if all that is left to them is the odd sterile playpark and indoor gyms and swimming pools? This area is full of people who love the outdoor life - they cycle, they take their dogs for a walk, they take their children into the woods to play amongst the trees... There will be nowhere to go if this plan goes ahead. The thought is so depressing. Being able to run, walk and cycle in the woods is a way for many to destress. Take them away, and I feel sure mental health will be jeopardised in the area. At the moment the plantation is a haven from the outside urban world, although you can never really escape the sound of traffic. The moment you leave Colehill, you are faced with endless queues of traffic - the Canford Bottom roundabout, the centre of Wimborne, Leigh Road, the A31. This will only be worsened by the waste plant proposals. The plans will ruin our quality of life and those of generations to come. It is a short-sighted plan which will only serve to lower levels of happiness in a country which is already very demoralised.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP193	Disagree	I am very concerned at the potential loss of this area of woodland as a recreational resource. I have lived in this area for 50 years and Uddens and Cannon Hill were a significant part of my childhood memories. This area is in regular use by lots of local dog walkers and families. In addition to my concern at the loss of this area as a recreational resource, I have even greater concerns at the local roads attempting to manage the additional traffic generated by the creation of this facility. Additionally I am worried about the fumes generated by the residual waste treatment plant. This proposed incinerator would be close to local properties, with the wind being predominantly from the west this means that smoke/fumes would be driven over towards a large area of residential housing. I am totally opposed to this planned development of the area as proposed.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP194	Disagree	Regarding the above application for Incinerator Etc at Uddens Drive. I would like to oppose this development as I think the road infrastructure would not be able to cope with all the extra traffic, also any fumes from the plant chimney could affect us with the wind in the wrong direction. Can you please confirm receipt of this objection?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP195	Disagree	I would like to the many objections to the proposed Waste plant at Uddens Woodland. I use this regularly to cycle with my group along the Castleman trail. The area is in constant use for recreational purposes like rambling, walking dogs and horse riding. The lower part of the access road is in constant use by visitors to the old thatch inn and traders into the industrial estate below the proposed site. This plan is therefore ill conceived with little thought to the volume of traffic and the size of that traffic with bulky carriers carrying the waste. I am sure with some thought a brown field site could be found more central to those requiring waste services rather than in the far east of the county on a green field site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP199	Disagree	I am writing to strongly object to the proposal for a Waste Plant to be erected at the above site. This is the Castleman Trail which is used by many walkers and cyclists, myself included, on a regular basis. This is a lovely scenic woodland in the middle of a built up area, which you are thinking of destroying plus the increased traffic, e.g. heavy lorries, on our already congested Canford Bottom roundabout on the A31. Is the council mad! Are they intent on covering our natural woodlands with air and noise pollution plus vermin? We are being bombarded with houses being built on every spare piece of land in this lovely area. Our small woodland is a place where our community can get away from the constant traffic noise. I plead with the council to reconsider!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP209	Disagree	I write to strongly object to the proposed household recycling centres, bulky waste treatment and residual waste treatment plant at Uddens Woodland/Cannon Hill South/Blunts Farm. I regularly walk my dog through this beautiful area of woodland and often use as a safe access to Cannon Hill Plantation on the other side of the bypass. I frequently encounter walkers and bike riders using this woodland to traverse the Castleman Trailway, some of which have travelled some distance to enjoy the area. It is a well-used community asset and haven for wildlife. The Friends of Uddens & Cannon Hill Woodlands do a wonderful job of maintained the woodland for the whole community's enjoyment. The suggestion of an incinerator with a 40m chimney being constructed on this greenbelt site is abhorrent and totally unnecessary when there are vastly more suitable sites within already industrialised zones. Furthermore, the proposed access via Uddens Drive is not suitable for the volume and type of traffic this proposal would generate. Also, the extra vehicles that would have to use the Canford Bottom roundabout to access the site would make, what is already a continuous situation of congestion most of the time, intolerable. I sincerely hope that the views if the local residents are taken seriously and this proposals is refused.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP212	Disagree	If access is required using the by-pass A31 or old A31 via Canford Bottom the roundabout would need to be redeveloped to handle the enormous extra traffic at a very high cost. Uddens drive a country lane. A cul-de-sac abutted by the by-pass and old A31. Only entrance exits to trading estate and Chestnut grove and the farm. Time money and great effort has been put into making this small triangle of woodland into a leisure facility for the surrounding Ferndown area Prevailing winds blow across towards Ferndown Schools and the population of Ferndown and Stapehill The enormous amount of extra traffic to access this small triangle area would cause stress to those who live and work in the area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP215	Disagree	Any Chimney high enough to present smoke and fumes affecting Ferndown would break the air navigation order covering buildings of tall structures close to Bournemouth airport. Also aircraft flying into any flume from such a sight would draw the fumes into its air conditioning and pressurisation system. Road system in the area is already at maximum capacity	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP220	Disagree	I strongly object to this proposal. This is a wonderful space for people to enjoy being outdoors with their friends/families, cycling, running, dog walking and getting exercise and fresh air. Keep active they tell us - so we do. We use it almost every day and would be devastated if these plans go ahead. In fact, living close by in Colehill, traffic is also a major concern - it's horrendous as it is. Please, please rethink.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP221	Disagree	This green belt land is an essential part of Ferndown, for recreation and natural beauty, and one of the many reasons people love living here. The council/government have already ruined our road infrastructure with the terrible mess they have made over the Canford Bottom Roundabout 'improvements' that have made the traffic congestion worse and has also increased the number of accidents on the road. Surely, it does not take a genius to work out that should this waste plant go ahead at Cannon hill Plantation then the road congestion would be 10 fold and utterly unbearable to the residents and those driving through our town? It is bad enough when all the caravans start coming through in the holiday season but to increase this with the massive lorries belching out disgusting fumes, on top of the pollution that the plant itself will create, will only reduce the value of everyone's properties on top of making driving around Ferndown completely unbearable. I appreciate that the waste plant needs to be built and will be used by all but surely it needs to be in a less populated position that will not impact crowded roads further???	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP225	Disagree	I object to the development of this site for any of the waste related purposes suggested, especially waste treatment with the siting of a chimney emitting polluting gases, for reasons of public health, environmental protection, loss of recreational space and traffic congestion. Considering that Dorset as a county has a relatively low coverage of forest/woodland I believe we should be avoiding any further reduction. Larger and/or connecting areas of wildlife habitat, such as the area in question in Ferndown, are especially valuable to wildlife, greater than the sum of their parts, so to speak. These decent sized areas of woodland also have much increased amenity value. I feel very strongly that this area should be absolutely protected from development. The proposed site is close to a number of SSSIs and similar protected areas, including that of White Sheet just North of the area shown on the map. However, other areas of woodland nearby such as Park Copse (just South of the White Sheet Plantation), which are not covered by these special designations, are also rich in wildlife including many rare and protected species such as dormice and also great crested newts around the pond areas. Also I have heard that there are otters present in the Uddens Water area. I would be concerned about the impact of the fumes from the chimney and also the site drainage into Uddens Water, as well as loss of habitat due to eating away at the edges of this valuable area. Also, as many other people have pointed out, the chimney, if there was one, would be too close to residential areas.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP230	Disagree	Will not want to work near an incinerator due to pollution	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP232	Disagree	We would like to strongly object to the proposal of the above (along with the proposed sand and gravel extraction and also traveller's site). We think that the amount of expected lorries per day would be hugely detrimental to the area swamping the already heavily congested roads, especially Canford Bottom, along, of course, with the cars and vans going there with waste instead of Brook Rd. Can the road infrastructure actually accommodate all this extra traffic? We understand that there would be an incinerator chimney which could obviously pollute the air for miles. Areas where people live, work and go to school, risking breathing problems and health issues for all, making this lovely area not so wonderful any more. We must also not forget the woodland which is loved and used by so many. What a blight on the landscape to have chimney pollution, the heavy continual traffic and the noise when we need more recreational areas for all the proposed housing as planned in the Core Strategy.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

<p>Individual</p>	<p>WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment</p>	<p>2016WP235</p>	<p>Disagree</p> <p>In response to the Additional and Emerging Waste Site Allocations (WP01) i.e. forestry land to the south west and adjacent Blunts Farm, I want to express my objections to the proposal for a Waste Treatment Plant on or anywhere near this area of land. In the original plan I objected to such a plant being sited at Blunts Farm so as this proposed emerging site is adjacent to Blunts Farm much of my comment applies equally to both sites. My objections are based on a number of grounds as shown below: Health and Safety This proposed site is virtually central to the main population areas of Ferndown, Wimborne, and Colehill, along with others further afield such as West Moors and Wimborne which include schools and leisure facilities. It is also directly situated in the woodland amenity areas of Cannon Hill and Uddens which are widely and continuously used for recreation in many forms by local people and visitors to the area. The Castleman Trailway, a major outdoor leisure feature of the county runs directly through this area. No-one can guarantee fume free operation and with the general prevailing wind from the south west (with north easterlies quite common) no-one can guarantee the flow of emissions or the absolute level of pollutants generated from a high chimney. The landfall of pollutants close by would subject residents to long term exposure to low level pollution and in the event of a serious leakage exposure to high level pollution perhaps toxic in nature. Both these scenarios could have a serious and unacceptable effect on the health of the local people. Noise Pollution It is now well known that continuous noise generated by the operations and traffic which would be bound to result from such a facility can have a serious effect on the health of people, and could make life in the vicinity of such a site unbearable. Green Belt Land The land in question is Green Belt and to establish a waste site this would need to be changed. I believe this can only be done as a last resort if all other alternatives have been proved to be unsuitable. I cannot see proof positive in the plan that this is the only possible site available. Recreational Use This area of land has been used for recreational purposes for many years and forms part of the Cannon Hill Woodlands which is recognised by the Forestry Commission (FC) website as a valuable area for recreation. The woodlands are used by the people of Ferndown, Longham, Stapehill, Canford Bottom and Colehill. It is also quite common when walking there to meet people from far afield. The Castleman Trailway is an all-weather track enabling people to enjoy it all year round used by walkers, runners, horse riders, dog walkers, and cyclists. It is an off road alternative for many cyclists going to their work. It is used by a local nursery school as an outside activity area. Picnic tables and benches provided in more recent times persuade people to stop a while and they also encourage older people to use the woodlands. The sculptures created out of fallen/felled wood add to the enjoyment of both adults and children, and some of those working on the industrial estate use the woods in their lunch break. A great deal of work has been undertaken in Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands in conjunction with the Forestry Commission and many more people are using the area for recreation. As a result of this work a number of species of mammals and birds have been discovered - who can tell how many more undiscovered creatures there may be - the adjacent area of Whitesheet is a designated SSSI site. It should be noted also that this work has been encouraged not only by the Forestry Commission but by Dorset County Council and local authorities. In short it is an extremely valuable and well used recreational facility, and it is also a scarce one. With thousands more houses planned in the current local plan, and a further development of Blunts Farm for industrial use, this green space needs to be preserved. There is mounting evidence that experiencing the outdoors and engaging with the natural environment is good for physical and mental health and the area is shown as part of the Open Space provision for Ferndown. Drainage Land drainage is complex in this area and seepage of pollutants is a major concern. Stapehill is also notorious for flooding, another major hazard if waste recovery operations were to take place here. There are concerns that if such a large area of land is stripped of trees and other vegetation flooding could be worse and may lead to other areas of the woodlands being too wet to use in bad weather. Access Denied The road network in the Ferndown area is heavily used on all fronts such as the very busy A31, and the local roads such as Wimborne Road East and West. Traffic is always a problem now and the addition of much more heavy haulage and cars would simply completely overload the roads. It would be highly likely that Uddens Drive would be used to access any Waste Site which would virtually make this road unusable for pedestrians, cyclists, elderly people and children, and wheelchair users who can currently use the woodland pathways. This would result in it being almost impossible to access the remaining woodlands except from perhaps Colehill which is already very busy and no facilities for car parking for visitors to the woods. Inappropriate Impact Buildings and processing plant will have an adverse impact on the area in which it is sited and as such by default will breach most of the considerations in Proposed Policy 12 - Amenity and Quality of Life. Whilst mitigations can be put in place for some of the adverse impacts, some such as air pollution, natural leakage and water drainage are much more unpredictable and uncontrollable. A chimney of the proportions suggested (30 - 40 metres high) would be a blight on the area for miles around and could not be screened by</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
-------------------	--	------------------	--	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
				<p>landscaping or other screening techniques. Ferndown Industrial Estate in which the Blunts Farm site and this extended area will fall is designated an area of light industrial use in the Core Strategy. Many people work here in small industrial units; I think waste recovery could not be considered as light industrial use. At the moment the industrial, residential, and recreational open spaces sit relatively comfortably with each other. This equilibrium would be totally destroyed by the building of a waste site in this area. Conclusion A waste plant such as this should be sited as far as possible from populated or recreational areas where people obviously live, work, and gather together. Cannon Hill Woodlands and the Uddens are becoming more and more recognised as the only viable open land facility available to large numbers of people with diverse healthy recreational interests. Over the years this area of land has been 'targeted' for a number of inappropriate developments but it is quite clear that it needs to be preserved and protected for future generations.</p>	

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WHP238	Disagree	I have just received details of the proposed development at Cannon Hill South to establish a Waste Vehicle Depot, Household Recycling Centre and a Bulky Waste Transfer and Treatment Facility. There is no way I could support this development at this location. This is a valuable area of woodland and heathland which is used by many people each week and supports many examples of rare birds and animals including Nightjars and Woodcocks. The Household Recycling Centre that would replace the Brook Road site in Wimborne would bring 100.000 cars a year to this site. How would these vehicles get there? The idea of all these vehicles using Wimborne Road and travelling via Canford Bottom or Ferndown is untenable, The Canford Bottom roundabout has to be one of the worst in the country and certainly the worst in Dorset. The lack of money invested in that roundabout, leading to the lack of an underpass results in massive queues every morning and evening along Wimborne road which would get much worse, leading to those queues being present most of the day. How many hundreds and probably thousands of man hours a week are totally lost to drivers locked in these queues? We cannot afford to lose this area of important countryside, and while I have no doubt that the development suggested would benefit the county this is certainly not the place to put it.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WHP241	Disagree	We Object strongly to your future plans of the ruination of these special woods, which are an amazing facility for our local community, also the threat to the varied wild life, flora and fauna. DO NOT GO AHEAD WITH THESE PLANS.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WHP244	Disagree	I would like to express my concern over the proposed waste plant at Cannon Hill South. My family and I regularly visit this area of woodland and it is of real value to us. The health, amenity and social benefits of trees and woodland are well documented. This resource needs to be maintained for the benefit of local people. We are also concerned about the impact on traffic as the a31 is already arguably at maximum capacity. My daughter has asthma and the negative impact on air quality is also a real worry for us.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WHP247	Disagree	I would like to object to the siting of the Ferndown waste processing plant. The reasons for my objections are that I use the open space to cycle and walk my dog. I also understand there is the possibility of an incineration plant. I live within walking distance of this plant and am concerned about the health effects and potential smell and fumes arising from this. The traffic is already heavy in this area and the extra traffic from users of the site and the lorries that will be accessing this plant will only add to the congestion.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

<p style="text-align: center;">Friends of Uddens &amp; Cannon Hill Woodlands</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WP252</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Disagree</p> <p>Thank you for giving us this opportunity to respond. We do hope you look favourably on our hopes of keeping our woodland open for everyone to enjoy. We are only going to respond quite narrowly, concentrating on the small triangle of Forestry Commission woodland to the South West of Blunts Farm which was a new site proposed in the Additional and Emerging Waste Site Allocations (WP01). We will refer to it as Cannon Hill South as it is the part of Cannon Hill but to the south of the A31. OBJECTION: THIS IS GREEN BELT So much land has been removed from the Green Belt by the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan. Most of it green fields or allotments, but this site is not only Green Belt it is also an area of woodland heavily used for recreation. There appears to be no very special circumstances to warrant the release of this Green belt land. There seems to have been no comprehensive search for alternative sites in the urban area or alternate brown field sites in the Green Belt. OBJECTION: THIS IS WIDELY USED AS RECREATIONAL LAND The people of Ferndown, Longham, Stapehill, Canford Bottom and Colehill use this patch of woodland. It is very pretty with not too much of it as a conifer plantation. It has been adopted by the local people for decades. It is used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders, wheel chair users and families. Some paths are wet in bad weather but the Castleman Trailway remains an all weather track enabling people to enjoy it all year round. It is the only patch of woodland accessible to the South of the A31 so people do not have to drive to find space to walk. The only other space to the south of the A31 is Ferndown Common (an International Designated heath) which is not only a protected site but is so eroded and impossible to walk in wet weather unless forced to. It is the same for the Stour Valley. It does not have to be flooded to be impassable due to deep mud. The Forestry Commission (FC) website recognises the value of Cannon Hill as a whole for recreation and also mentions our patch; The southern part of Cannon Hill, south of the Ferndown Bypass, is heavily used by residents of Stapehill for dog walking. They are not quite right as people come from much further afield to use it and not just dog walkers, especially since a local community volunteer group have improved access by removing so much rhododendron growth and looking after the paths (with the approval of the FC). It is used by a local nursery school as an outside activity area. Picnic tables and benches persuade people to stop a while. There are also some sculptures created out of fallen/felled wood for the enjoyment of both adults and children. Some of those working on the industrial estate use the woods in their lunch break, vans park up for lunch time. It is very widely used, all this activity has not been recognised. With thousands of houses planned in the current local plan, and a further development of 30 hectares of the Blunts Farm site as industrial use, we need our Green Space. The Draft Sustainability Appraisal fails to mention this loss of amenity to the wider community and how important this woodland is to all of us. The Local Authorities are already looking to revise Local Plans or progress new ones. An additional 700 houses a year has been mentioned. We need to protect Open Spaces for the children. This area could serve as an informal SANG as it is. Please take this into account and protect our woodlands from development of any kind. OBJECTION: FAILS TO RECOGNISE OPEN SPACE PROVISION AND THE VALUE OF GREEN SPACES TO BOTH PHYSICAL AND MENTAL WELLBEING. This is an emerging area of study. Evaluating Health and Wellbeing Outcomes for Community Growing Programmes. We are obviously not trained experts and we do not run community farms, but we do hold monthly community volunteer parties for people to enhance the woodlands, both north and south of the A31. To quote from the introduction, Experiencing the outdoors and engaging with the natural environment is good for physical and mental health. The Community Open Spaces Newsletter 2016, Christchurch and East Dorset Councils, shows all the different areas funded and run by the joint council. We run our Cannon Hill Friends with some funding from both EDDC and DCC, but otherwise just volunteers; that makes us good value for money. The area is shown as part of the Open Space provision for Ferndown, though if I could find it on line, I am sure it must be part of Wimborne's too. OBJECTION: POSSIBLE DISRUPTION TO THE CASTLEMAN TRAILWAY This is such a vital off-road track from Poole to Ringwood with options for cyclists/walkers to hop on or off without using cars/roads to get from A to B. A waste site of any kind would put people off using it which would put more cars on the road. OBJECTION: INCREASE OF TRAFFIC ON LOCAL ROADS. It is highly unlikely that the Highways Agency would allow access directly off the A31. If Uddens Drive is used to access a Waste Site this would add to the appalling problems we already have with Wimborne Road East and West to say nothing of this charming Drive lost to development. Some of the more elderly dog walkers, or those travelling some distance, drive to the woodlands and park. It would be too difficult for them to access any woods remaining if there was too much traffic and the traffic fumes would discourage them anyhow. OBJECTION: TO TALL CHIMNEYS AND POSSIBLE POLLUTANTS The 30 to 40 meter chimney would be visible from miles around, this would introduce a look of heavy industry to a residential area. We have all grown up with Uddens and Ferndown Trading Estates but they have never had the appearance of heavy industry. The prevailing winds from the South West would have the potential to spread pollutants, both chemical and smells, over dense residential areas and local schools. This is</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
				<p>not acceptable to local people. OBJECTION TO SPOILT LOCAL LANDSCAPE It mentions a major landscape concern and then says the development would avoid development of more sensitive sites! Do people not matter? Is this the conclusion we should make? Has there been a landscape assessment? We are already losing 30 hectares of open land. Not all of it accessible as some of it was farmed. We have raised no objections during the Local Plan process as we accepted the need for more industrial land and were informally advised that there would be a wide natural area to form a barrier to protect our woodland, a wild life pond was mentioned (informally). OBJECTION TO POTENTIAL DRAINAGE PROBLEMS Cannon Hill woodlands to the South of the A31 can get very wet underfoot in periods of rain, especially over the western part of the site. There are concerns that if the vegetation/trees are removed over a large area and the area concreted over, then in wet weather any remaining woodlands would be too wet to use. OBJECTION TO THE CONCLUSION In the conclusion on this site it fails to mention the loss of amenity value for recreation and also fails to mention the Green Belt. This summarises our concerns over this emerging site. Although we have only objected to this preferred site to the South West of Blunts Farm, we do not feel that that Waste Sites are suitable in an area of dense housing.</p>	
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WVP255	Disagree	<p>I was astounded to hear about the plan to put a Waste Plant at Uddens Woods. We walk and use the woods every day, these woods are beautiful and have an amazing diversity of plants, trees and wildlife. Away from the ecological issues, most days, traffic on the A31 and Wimborne Road approaching Canford Bottom roundabout is at a standstill most mornings and afternoons/early evenings. Adding lorries to this is just a crazy, ridiculous idea. I cannot believe these beautiful woods are even being considered. Shame on you!!!</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP258	Disagree	<p>I am writing to you to express my disgust and outrage that these beautiful Woods are even being considered for a Waste Site. I worked for several years for East Dorset District Council and have knowledge of planners. In my mind, if they actually removed their backsides from their chairs in their comfy offices from whichever Council they are at and actually walked and strolled around these Woods, they would actually realise what a beautiful Woods these are. Sitting in offices and maybe carrying out a site meeting in their Mini Bus will not give them any idea at all of the beauty and wildlife which live in these Woods. Besides the pollution, and mess which is involved in this so called Waste Plan, there is also the traffic to consider, which again, probably hasn't even been considered along this road approaching the Canford Bottom Roundabout at different times. Using these Woods every day, we do know about these things, unlike some of these Council Planners who really have no idea of these issues. Please, consider other areas around without having to wreck these beautiful woods. We have children and no doubt will have grandchildren within the next few years, I would love to take them for walks up there and show them the wonderful birds and wildlife which exist up there and if only these 'people' who choose these sites would take the time to do this, they may realise what damage they are doing to the environment and our beautiful area we live in. Although, they probably do not even live around here, so this would make no difference to them!!!!</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP262	Disagree	<p>I write to register my objection to the proposed household recycling centre, bulky waste treatment and residual waste treatment plant at Uddens Woodlands/Cannon Hill/Land SW of Blunts Farm. The area of woodland at Uddens and SW of Blunts Farm is a vital community resource. It is a green space for the local community, used by those working on the Industrial Estate, users of the very popular Castleman Trailway, dog walkers, horse riders and bike riders. It paths are also pushchair also wheelchair friendly. The potential for hazardous fumes discharging from the proposed incinerator and 40m chimney in such close proximity from residential areas and schools is also a major concern to public health. Wimborne Road West could not accommodate the proposed quantity of lorries and vehicles accessing the site on top of local traffic without causing gridlock to already heavily congested roads. The proposed access off Uddens Drive is simply not suitable or safe for such volumes of vehicles. Approx. 6000 new homes are planned within the Core Strategy for the local area and we need more recreation land, not less. I cannot see how this proposal can be given the go ahead and can only hope that, for once, the Council listens to public opinion and issues a categorical refusal.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP265	Disagree	<p>I write to register my objection to the proposed household recycling centre, bulky waste treatment and residual waste treatment plant at Uddens Woodlands/Blunts Farm. The proposed use of the land to the SW of Blunts Farm for a waste plant is wholly inappropriate and would be detrimental to the local community. I am a regular visitor to the woodland and a lot of work has gone into making it user friendly and accessible for all. The Friends of Uddens &amp; Cannon Hill Woodlands do an admirable job of maintaining the woodland and all the work is undertaken by local and loyal volunteers. The mature woodland is a positive haven for all types of wildlife. It is also intersected by the Castleman Trailway and this is an important and very popular long distance trail way from Ringwood to Poole, Passing through Cannon Hill South with a safe pedestrian crossing over the bypass. It is used by walkers, horse riders, cyclists and commuters. The proposals for this site also appear contrary to National Planning Policy Framework guidance and East Dorset Districts own Core Strategy regarding protection of the Green Belt. Para 81 "Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land EDDC Core Strategy 8.8 "Wimborne and Colehill are set within the South East Dorset Green Belt. The Green Belt between the settlements is very narrow and maintains their separate identity. One of the main purposes of the Green Belt is to prevent coalescence of settlements, so this open area is particularly important to protect. The proposed plan to construct a waste incinerator and 40m high chimney billowing hazardous fumes towards nearby residential areas and local schools also appear to flout NPPF policies such as; NPPF para 110 " In preparing plans to meet development needs, the aim should be to minimise pollution and other adverse effects on the local and natural environment. Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework Furthermore, the extra vehicles that would have to pass through the Canford Bottom roundabout to access the site would only exacerbate the horrendous congestion problems already suffered by motorists at this bottleneck. The proposed access via Uddens Drive is also not a suitable or safe junction for the volume and type of vehicles this proposal would create. In summary, I object to the proposal on the following grounds; It would result in the loss of an area of woodland which is a well-used local amenity, together with a loss of habitat for wildlife It conflicts with NPPF Protecting Green Belt Land and Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment policies The proposal for an incinerator has serious potential to cause a detrimental effect on the health of nearby residents and children attending local schools The local road infrastructure is not capable of withstanding the volume and type of vehicle traffic this proposal would create I hope that the views of the local people are listed to and this proposal is flatly refused.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP269	Disagree	<p>This proposed site is going to be located in an area of outstanding GREENBELT of woodland and heath. The area is in constant use by walkers, cyclist and horse riders as well as families using the picnic areas. The Friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands do an amazing job of maintaining the area and looking after the area and wildlife. To gain access to this site via the A31 will be impossible during the morning, evening and at weekends due to the traffic jam that the residents currently endure on a regular basis and which is worse throughout the summer, when we become prisoners in our own streets due to the grid lock on the road. At present, sitting in the traffic jam looking at the heath and woodland is preferable to looking at a recycling centre with incinerator with an approx. 40ft chimney, which is not the view to offer visitors to the area. Access via Wimborne Road East would be used to avoid the jam on the A31 and trying to cross the Canford Bottom roundabout which already backs up both ways without the additional traffic trying to drop off waste will become impassable. Any increase of people fly tipping around the area due to traffic jams is also of concern. As previously mentioned in the first consultation document having purchased our property with pylons in close proximity and throughout the area was our choice, but having our first mortgage application refused due to the pylons by Northern Rock (who lent to anyone), it will give problems for future mortgages with pylons and a recycling plant and incinerator all within 250m of a lot of properties. The dust of mineral extraction, heavy goods lorries, more traffic and a loss of green spaces and woodland would be disastrous for the area. Please leave this area alone as we already have an increase in traffic due to the expansion of the industrial estate.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP272	Disagree	<p>While we agree there is a need for a waste treatment site, if this is to include an incinerator we would be totally against this, it is a well-known fact that burning of plastic creates carcinogenic fumes and cannot understand why any responsible person or planning body would even consider it.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP275	Comment	<p>This will be an excellent location for an incinerator and tip if: - Canford Bottom Square is reconstructed as a grade separated interchange.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP276	Comment	<p>My husband and I strongly object to the above project taking place, in view of the toxins released. The main reason being that we are all subjected to high risk of cancers as it is without added risks!</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP279	Disagree	<p>I object to the proposal on the following grounds: (1) As other consultees have already commented, the proposals for this site are contrary to both the National Planning Policy Framework guidance (Para 81) and East Dorset Districts own Core Strategy regarding protection of the Green Belt (EDDC Core Strategy 8.8). This site is located in an area of Green Belt of woodland and heath. The area is in use by walkers, dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders, all of whom currently benefit from using this area for healthy outdoor exercise. (2) As a daily commuter on the A31 and the surrounding area, drivers already suffer from regular gridlock due to the inadequate current design of the Canford Bottom roundabout and Ferndown Industrial Estate roundabout. The local road infrastructure is simply not capable of withstanding the current volume of traffic using it and is definitely not capable of supporting the additional volume and type of vehicle traffic this proposal would create. This point is already acknowledged in the report (p. 65). Encouraging extra traffic to turn on and off of the A31 from/to Udders Drive at speed is not a sensible idea as this is neither a suitable nor safe junction for the volume and type of vehicles this proposal would create. (3) A proposed recycling centre with incinerator with a 40ft chimney will adversely affect local resident's quality of life (housing in this area 87,700 properties) and the pollution and dust will represent a health risk/danger to residents, users of the woodland and the natural environment around it. Having an incinerator this close to large tracts of woodland also constitutes a major fire risk. These points are again in contravention of the NPPF (para 110).</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP282	Disagree	<p>This small triangle of woodland, which is a designated Greenbelt, is These woods are precious to the local people of this area through which runs the Castleman Trailway and the 256 Cycle Route which run from Poole to Ringwood. These woods are used on a daily basis by horse riders, dog walkers, cyclists, (some of which are family groups especially during week- ends and school holidays) walking groups and elderly people enjoying the fresh air and exercise. Many workers from Uddens and Ferndown Industrial Estates cycle or walk through as a safer route from Colehill than using the Canford Bottom Roundabout. 'Friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands' have over the years arranged regular work parties to enhance the trailways and have created 'natural' play areas for children. With donations from members of this group and various grants kindly donated by District and County Councillors they have, in conjunction with the Forestry Commission, constructed and placed many picnic tables and perch benches over the area, which are greatly appreciated by us all. The work by this group is ongoing. A Waste Site so close to the local community would pose a health hazard and encourage vermin. The Wimborne Bypass borders the proposed site and any loose waste could be blown onto oncoming traffic. The volume and frequency of the traffic along Uddens Drive that this development would generate would be a danger to the local community, some of who can only access their property via Uddens Drive. Before you even consider this Woodland as an option please visit the area, come and talk to us and then you will see the reasons for our concerns.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP286	Disagree	I would like to lodge my opposition to the proposal to remove green belt land in Cannon Hill Woods to supply a waste treatment and household recycling plant. Surely there are other sites that are already spoilt that would be more appropriate. Not only are the woods constantly used and enjoyed by ramblers, dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders, they are teeming with wild life including deer, voles, snakes, slow worms, foxes, owls and many other species of bird life . The green belt appears to be constantly under threat and to use woodland that provides a splendid recreational facility for such a destructive purpose as waste treatment seems to be short sighted, especially given the large increase in homes planned for the Wimborne and Colehill area	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP289	Disagree	I am alarmed to discover that once again Cannon Hill South (Uddens Woodlands) is the subject of consultation for: Waste vehicle Depot Household recycling Centre Bulky waste transfer & treatment facility. I accept that the facilities are probably needed and I am not a nimby. However, a lot has been done over the past few years to make good recreational space in the Wimborne/Ferndown area. I know that whenever a new space is developed it is fully used, especially the Castleman Trailway. It also safe guards our rapidly disappearing wildlife. I really do not understand why after creating such a space you now wish to destroy it and scar the area now and for future generations. There must be plenty of suitable sites away from recreational/residential areas that you could use. I am also concerned about the health issues. I suffer from allergies brought on by pollution. That is why I relocated here from the South East many years ago. Whenever neighbours light bonfires I have to stay indoors until the air has cleared. Hence I am concerned about the emissions from a 40m chimney not only for myself but for all the children who attend the local schools within that vicinity.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP292	Disagree	My only comment is that given the standard of planning decisions usually reached by Dorset CC I am surprised that the 100+ft chimney has not been sited a bit nearer to Bournemouth International Airport. Use a bit of sense please!	Noted
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP295	Disagree	I strongly object to the proposed development. Please acknowledge my objection in writing.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP297	Disagree	My objections to the proposals for the site are twofold: - I enjoy the fresh air in my garden. The prevailing winds are from the south-west. The thought of toxic fumes from an incinerator arriving on the wind is appalling. We in Bracken Road are in direct line and on the leading edge of a substantial built up area (I see that assurances are being given that an incinerator will not in fact be built on the equivalent Mannings Heath site - increasing the likelihood of one being built on other sites). - Traffic will be a major snag. I have seen it suggested that 100 lorries will visit the site every day plus more than 250 cars per day from the Brook Road site. A substantial part of these will approach and return via the Canford Bottom system exacerbating its inadequacies - a little extra holiday traffic can already gum up the works. Whether the actual access is via Uddens Road, Ferndown Industrial Estate on A31 (more lights?) it is going to add significantly to the already heavy local traffic.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP299	Disagree	I believe this is not in the best interest of the area or surrounding areas. The noise, congestion and pollution will be uncontrollable especially if this plant is going to be 24/7. Think of the impact on the land, residents and the next generations coming through the nursery school, dog walkers and families using the areas it's just not suitable. My daughter attends the local nursery school and is most upset on the news, as she loves walking and bug hunting, and with her friends enjoying playing with the trees. I feel the area is better used as is it And to be enjoyed as it is. I would also like to comment that Dorset County Council have made this application in a very secretive way as a small A4 poster is not an appropriate form of communication and the poor surrounding residents were not even made aware. This is a very difficult document to access, let alone put comments on, so will probably put a lot of people off commenting. Please save the land from this Waste Plant!!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP313	Disagree	The site would be too close to houses and the increased traffic would cause a lot of problems on the roads. The surrounding area is already too busy and will cause disruption to too many people and businesses.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP314	Disagree	I wish to protest at the proposal to operate a waste incinerator from the Uddens Industrial Estate.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP315	Disagree	I wish to object to the proposal to build a waste incinerator at the Uddens site in the strongest terms.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP316	Disagree	Sir, I understand that DCC intend to agree to the development of a waste plant at Cannon Hill South. Firstly, I wish to record my very strong objection to this or any development of this type in the area. Secondly I wish to registration my disappointment in the lack of information from the council to local people on this important matter. This may have been an oversight or an action plan seen as a way to ensure the least opposition as possible until the project was under way. Either way had it not been for the friends of uddens and cannon hill woodlands, I would not of known about it	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP319	Disagree	I live very close to the proposed site and worry about what this might mean for the area and for the health of local residents including me and my 11 year old son. We currently have 400 new homes being built at the end of the road which will mean increased traffic so with the threat of increased lorry movements to the site as well, the area just will not cope and become gridlocked. We already experience a lot of noise and odours from the Tower Park site due to various business activities and a waste site which would add to this would not be nice to put up with. We have been told there could be an increased pest population and risks of fire. The surrounding heathland already experiences fires each year so I would not want anything to add to that risk, endangering the residents and wildlife in this small remaining area of heathland which we are lucky to have. Please reconsider the location of this site. As a Canford Heath resident, we do not want it here.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP320	Disagree	I object to the proposed inclusion of the triangular piece of Green Belt SW of the A 31 as part of the Blunts Farm area currently in the frame. This precious piece of peaceful woodland/Green Belt is an essential counterbalance to the current Ferndown and Uddens developments and is widely used for recreation including Mountain-biking, Running, Walking and horse riding. Its loss to this possible end use cannot be cost-effective if the external costs associated with its loss are properly evaluated. Please remove this plot from you list.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP323	Comment	<p>Objections to the development in or around Ferndown for Incinerator waste units or waste handling Grounds for objection Pollution fall out for chimneys Short term health concerns Long term health concerns Noise Pollution (DCC have still not built the planned and promised noise barrier running between Ferndown Industrial Estate and Bracken Road / Lesson Drive) Waste litter from deliver lorries and the site itself as seen within other local waste site areas Loss and use of Green belt area Inability of the current road infrastructure to support current traffic let alone the large traffic movements proposed for this development. Significant impact of backed up congestion in the area It is on a critical and well know traffic blackspot with traffic system which does not work Cole Hill roundabout inability to take more large traffic, one lorry blocks each traffic light section which stacks up congestion Residential infrastructure expansion planned over the next 10 years will have a significant impact on existing road capabilities. This will seriously increase current traffic problems. Incinerator plants have already been historically rejected in Ferndown.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP333	Disagree	<p>Firstly I wish to express my frustration at trying to register my opposition to this proposed waste site. Has the council purposeful made it difficult so that people do not register their objections? I live very close to the proposed development and feel let down that the council has neglected to inform residents of this proposal. I have only been informed via social media. A poor show East Dorset Council. I object strongly to the proposal 1. The proposed area is green belt land and is heavily used by families, dog walkers and other areas of the community. We need to protect green belt land as it is very precious even more so with the increased building work of new homes in the area. The Forestry commission and local community ( Friends of sudden Woods) work constantly for free to improve the area for both people and the animals who live within the forest. Waste chimneys will pollute the air (for humans and animals, destroying habitats, poisoning animals and in turn killing off important ecosystems. All our green belt land is being used and not protected it's called green belt land for a reason and should be kept that way, ?grewgregreen. 2 The increased traffic is also a very large concern. Wimborne Road West is a heavily used road as you'll be aware of. Traffic constantly queues along the road often from lunchtime onwards. With increased traffic for this proposed site this will make the road unbearable for residents, commuters and traffic going to the industrial area. The road system cannot cope with added strain. Object.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WVP334	Disagree	<p>I wish to strongly disagree with the proposal for WP01. Firstly I would like to bring to your attention the barriers put in our way to be able to disagree with WP01, if I hadn't have stopped to look at what I thought was a work party poster for Friends of Uddens wood I would not have known about the proposal. As this area no longer receives a free community newspaper and there was no letter drop to alert us to WP01. Secondly the Web site is not the most helpful or mobile device friendly. My objections are. 1. This area has and will be losing green belt areas by the hectare. The go ahead I believe has been given to the solar farm on the other side of the A 31, we still don't know if the traveller site will be built on Uddens wood. The development of Coleshill and surrounding area. There will be green space left between Ferndown and Wimborne. Leading to a sprawling urbanisation of the surrounding area. 2. Since the completion of the beloved Canford Bottom roundabout the traffic from all directions has become a testament to lack of planning. I often see cars queuing to get onto the roundabout past the Thatch pub. As more home are being built on Stapehill road without any road management you will not be able to enter or exit Uddens Drive. The extra traffic that will need to use the Canford Bottom roundabout will only increase the the high volume of crashes and near misses on the roundabout. You can probably check the camera's on the roundabout to see these. The road networks around this are will not cope with the increase of the HGVs. 3. The height of the smoke stack need. If I wished to install a wind turbine or antenna with the same height I can only guess at the reaction I would get from the planning office. But I'm sure the answer would be NO. It just seems as if the rest of Dorset have had a meeting and decided that the Ferndown and Wimborne area are the best areas to nominate for any proposed developments that must be done.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Forestry Commission	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP344	Disagree	<p>The position of the Forestry Commission has not changed since our letter of 12th February 2016 and the points outlined in that letter still stand and are re-iterated below. We object to the inclusion of Blunts Farm as a site for a household recycling facility and even more to it as a site for a waste vehicle depot, a bulky waste transfer/treatment and/or residual waste treatment facility. As indicated previously, we would be keen to consider a local biomass CHP energy scheme to help support the on-going management of the significant areas of heathland and the lack of any market from the products of this management as part of a scheme to provide energy to the businesses within the area to be developed. There will be a need to make the difference between a biomass energy scheme and a municipal waste energy from waste plant clear in the plan as both will be considered a waste treatment or residual waste treatment facilities. The prime reason the site was taken out of the Green Belt was to allow a supply of much needed land for employment purposes hence it being identified for the provision of B1 (Office and Light Industrial), B2 (light industrial) and B8 (Warehousing and Distribution) as a natural extension to the Ferndown and Uddens Industrial estates. There has never been any intention for the land to be used for waste purposes along the lines you have identified. The Forestry Commission, East Dorset District Council and Ferndown and Uddens Improvement District have all worked together on a common goal to enable Blunts Farm to be used in the future for employment purposes as a natural extension to the existing industrial estates. There is an opportunity to provide modern, well designed industrial space which is currently not available at Ferndown or Uddens Industrial estates. This would in turn help some of the older properties to be re-developed and improved. The proposal to use up to 5.5 hectares of the developable area of the site would greatly undermine the remainder as an attractive location for industrial users and is likely to 'blight' the development. This is compounded by the triangular nature of the site making large areas undevelopable. There is also the presence of a SNCI on the property together with the need for an adequate ecological buffer on the western and northern boundaries. As the land is allocated for employment purposes, we would expect that arguments would need to be submitted with any proposed development stating how the waste disposal site will create jobs in the areas, as it is not a labour intensive use for the land and not compatible with the modern, well designed industrial space that is proposed on the site. In addition, there is a requirement in policy FWP8 (Blunt's Farm Employment Allocation, Ferndown) that the site be subject to a detailed development brief subject to public consultation. As the public appear to be against the development of a waste site in the area, it would be difficult to develop a strategy that would be acceptable to the public. Although there is the possibility of extending Nimrod Way to access the site in the future, this has still not been confirmed or agreed and there is uncertainty with respect not only to the access but also to the layout of any site. Uddens Drive is the current access but is unlikely to be adequate for the development of the entire site for employment use. The uses you propose would result in the whole of the development being less attractive for the intended use as employment land. The deleterious impact on the neighbouring businesses and residential properties remains the same. It's noted that the Draft Plan now includes the extension of the area of search to include the rest of the Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates, where they may be opportunity to redevelop an appropriate site or extend the existing facility operated by The Dorset Waste Partnership within the timeframe covered by the Waste Plan. This is more in line with the National Planning Policy for Waste (October 2014) giving priority to the re-use of previously developed land. Consultation responses have been consistent to those received during the Gypsy Site process undertaken by the County in respect of the area of land to the west of Blunts Farm which is part of the severed Cannon's Hill Plantation and still currently within the Green Belt. This remains a valuable local asset and therefore not suitable for the scale and extent of potential uses outlined in the Dorset Waste Plan consultation. Despite the inclusion of the site in Background Paper 2 published in June 2015, the Forestry Commission has always objected to the inclusion of Blunts Farm for use as a site for waste management or disposal facility. Previously the objection of the landowner to the inclusion of the site has been used as a reason for discounting sites. As we object to the proposed use of the site for waste management or disposal, with the exception of a biomass energy scheme, the proposed allocation will not be deliverable in the short to medium term and therefore casts doubt on the soundness of the plan.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing a preferred site to meet the needs identified. A separate report has been prepared to respond to the issues raised. However, the WPA authority has been unable to find a suitable alternative site to Blunts Farm and the adjoining Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estate to develop a HRC to serve the local community.</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP347	Disagree	<p>We are writing to place on record our many concerns at the thought of a Waste Plant complete with incinerator and possible 40m chimney being built on land south of the A31, known locally as Uddens Woodlands. To build such a plant in that very sensitive area is completely in the wrong place, as not only would it deprive local people from using the woodlands as a place of enjoyment and for walking ones' dogs (thus exercising), it would also destroy the Castleman Trailway that runs from Poole to Ringwood, which again is a source of enjoyment for many people. Another huge point which should be taken into account is all the extra traffic (100+ lorries daily has been mentioned, plus all the extra cars should Brook Road Centre be closed), which would add to the already congested roads in the area and especially at Canford Bottom roundabout, which at times is gridlocked. Our final concern is from fallout fumes from the proposed siting of a 40m high incinerator chimney, which could jeopardise fresh air for miles. Also, in hot weather the smell from all the waste would be awful and would certainly increase the risk of vermin and flies contamination. Surely, it is possible to find a more suitable site that would not cause so much distress to the many people who live in the surrounding area of Uddens Woodlands. An acknowledgement of this letter would be appreciated.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP351	Disagree	<p>I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the possibility of using the Canon Hill South site as a huge waste plant. I live opposite the woods and frequently use the lovely woods for walks and taking my grandchildren cycling. There are far too few places to go walking through woodland, therefore, the current ones must be protected at all costs. The traffic problem due to the new large roundabout is dreadful, can you imagine what would happen if another 100 lorries a day were to take place. The Castleman Track is used daily by numerous walkers and cyclists. I urge you to find a more suitable site as a matter of urgency.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP354	Disagree	<p>I object to any and all waste plans for uddens woods Ferndown it is a well-used and well-loved woodland in the green belt .apart from the traffic problems this will cause, you will also cause pollution for up to five miles around the area . their are 16 home's within 100 meters,675 home's within 250 meters and 101,000 home's within the five Miles these are not my figures they are the councils. So strange the council does not include this information in the consultation info!!!. Also a children's nursery school within 80 meters of the site and a farm with horses that would be a few feet away the other side of the fence. Incineration will harm not just the animals but all of us too. Incinerators do not burn off all the waste around 20% will be fly ash which would have to be removed and buried in landfill the fly ash is very toxic and would transported past our homes. The consultation info leaves out much info that is relevant to the area the councils way of hiding it and getting it through quickly shame on them !!!..please don't destroy this woodlands for your profit!</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP355	Disagree	I object strongly to the proposal for a waste plant at Uddens Farm on several grounds. Access via the A31 - an already congested area is going to cause more issues as traffic increases significantly - particularly lorries delivering waste products. The proposed facilities will be taking away a much valued amenity area used by countless people. It is a key community resource, a green space, it's used by people on the Castleman Trailway, dog walkers, horse riders, bike riding, children's play, wildlife and general walking. Around 675 properties lie within 250m of the Blunts Farm, with a further 101,000 homes within a five mile radius. Pollutants from smoke generated by an incinerator will blow across the residential area as the wind blows predominately from that direction towards the housing estates. Is there going to be an open discussion where people are invited to view the proposals being put forward and ask questions?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP358	Disagree	We are writing to strongly protect against the above proposal. Whilst we appreciate that on-one wants a huge waste plant in their own backyard, the proposed area is totally unsuitable for the following reasons. Staplehill is an attractive residential area of green belt and any form of waste treatment centre would constitute a serious health hazard, not just for residents but also for employers and employees working on the local industrial estates. There are also a number of schools in the immediate vicinity. The area south of the A31 (Uddens Woodlands) which contains the Castleman Trailway and an area of established woodland with picnic tables is used extensively by local residents. Families walk with children, dogs are exercised, adults and children cycle and we all need access to the wider recreational area of Cannon Hill. There is no other recreational provision in the immediate area (and it is now widely accepted that there are great health benefits associated with walking outdoors). This means that we will either have to get the car out and add to the traffic problems, or try and negotiate the Canford Bottom roundabout by foot, which is extremely hazardous. Furthermore, and possibly most importantly, access to this site is totally unsuitable. The infrastructure would not support the additional 100,000 cars currently using Brook Road. Plus possibly more than 100 lorries a day. Whilst the Canford Bottom roundabout works for traffic travelling along the A31, the route for local traffic is very complicated and few visitors to the area understand how to negotiate the roundabout. We use this roundabout several times a week, and on virtually every journey someone is either in the wrong lane or fails to move when one of the many traffic lights change - or worse still moves when the light is red as they are confused by the sheer number of traffic lights. Visitors to our own house have on occasion gone round the Canford Bottom roundabout twice as they have become totally disorientated and found themselves unable to safely change lanes. Large lorries moving across lanes completely block the lanes and force cars to switch lanes in order to move round them which is very unsafe. The A31 is a very busy road at all times, but particularly at weekends and holiday time, consequently traffic uses Wimborne Road East and West as a cut through resulting in traffic backing up from the Canford Bottom roundabout for approximately a quarter of a mile on many days, particularly from lunchtime until early evening on Fridays. Traffic approaching Canford Bottom from Ham Lane already use Staplehill Road as a cut through in order to avoid the roundabout. Staplehill Road is an attractive semi-rural residential lane which could not sustain further traffic. Confusion on the roundabout is why very few residents actually use the pedestrian crossings to cross the roundabout and access Cannon Hill Woodlands. You literally take your life in your hands. This is why we need to access Cannon Hill via the footbridge over the A31 from Cannon Hill south. Why would you even consider using an attractive woodland area in a very pleasant part of the Dorset when there are alternative sites away from residential areas where commercial waste could be incinerated in a discreet manner> Would you please acknowledge receipt of our letter of objection. Thank you.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP361	Disagree	I strongly object to the proposed building of a waste incinerator on this site. As a Ferndown resident living in relative close proximity to the proposed site and already suffering from both noise and air pollution from both the Cobham and Uddens industrial estates; I consider it totally inappropriate and unacceptable to proceed with further industrial expansion of these sites; in particular the introduction of a facility that will only serve to significantly reduce further the quality of life of the local populace. Whilst accepting that Incinerator Plants are a 'necessary evil'; the proposed location for this plant is wholly unacceptable and must not be allowed to proceed further.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP360	Disagree	I object to any and all waste plans for uddens woods it is a well-used and well-loved woodland. This site would cause massive traffic problems. The pollution caused by an incinerator would be harmful to the animals that live in the woods many of which are protected and also the general public. Incinerator smoke plumes generally disperse over five miles, now council figures state that 101,000 homes are within five miles of the site, 675 homes are within 250 meters and 16 homes are within 100 meters. Also 80 meters away is a children's nursery school plus a farm with horses is a few feet away the other side of the fence. All of which is left out of the consultation information which is very biased towards the uddens woods site, I Wonder why! This has been done to get this site through quickly and quietly shame on you councillors. Also incinerators do not burn off all the waste around 20% is left as fly ash which has to be removed and buried in landfill where is that going to go. Also planning rules state you need a very special reason to build on green belt so what is that reason!! I would like to see the woods protected for further generationally to come bet I am not the only one!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP362	Disagree	I very strongly oppose the building of a residual waste treatment plant at Uddens. Although I do not live adjacent to Uddens I walk my dog in the woods every day together with many other walkers and dog lovers. I feel that the proposed plant is too close to the trading estate and which also has a large residential area. I am sure that the fumes from a plant such as this would be quite toxic and not conducive to people's health and safety. I myself suffer with COPD and I am sure that it would not be helpful for me to continue to walk in an area that obviously would be contaminated by fumes, not to mention the heavy traffic that would not be good for the area, which is always congested and much worse at certain times of the day.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP363	Disagree	I have noted the proposal for a residual waste treatment facility on the land to the SW of Blunts Farm. I strongly disagree that this is a suitable location for such a facility. I object on the following grounds: 1. I believe that it is unjustifiable to locate such a facility in such a heavily populated area. Note should be taken of the topography of the area, the height of the chimney will cause potentially dangerous fumes to blow over the whole of Colehill. 2. The facility would be located near to the already heavily congested road network around Canford Bottom roundabout. 3. The facility would result in the loss of very important recreational facilities that are extensively used, particularly by children attending the Barn Nursery. There must be much more suitable locations for this facility within the County.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP366	Disagree	I am horrified at this proposal to site a waste refuse facility on this beautiful area of woodland, this is an area used by people from Ferndown, Longham, Stapehill, Canford Bottom and Colehill. With almost 6,000 new homes planned in the core strategy for this area we need more recreational land not less.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP367	Disagree	Please stop this, it cannot happen! The siting of a 40 metre high incinerator chimney on this site would ruin fresh air for miles causing health issues for the people of Ferndown, Longham, Stapehill, Canford Bottom and Colehill.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP370	Disagree	I wish to state my strong objections to the proposals for a waste disposal plant and incinerator at Blunts Farm and Uddens woodland .As a resident of Colehill for nearly 40 years I am appalled at the prospect of this scheme on the doorstep the traffic .noise smells air pollution would be unbearable. Dorset has already one of the highest number of lung diseases in the country and having the opportunity of walking in the Cannon Hill Plantation and seeing the wildlife and vegetation is the only thing that gives me respite from the already congested Canford Bottom Roundabout. I sincerely hope that this proposal will be rejected and I am joining the friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands and we will do everything we can to maintain some quality of life for the residents of this area .	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP371	Disagree	We have lived in Ferndown for nearly 40 years and regularly walk our dogs across Cannon Hill Plantation. We cannot believe that consideration has been given to this green belt area of natural beauty being utilised for a Waste Deposal Plant and associated facilities. The impact of additional traffic would be a nightmare as the Ferndown bypass is inadequate and the Canford Bottom roundabout is an absolute nightmare. In the spring there are several species of birds nesting and the area is also used by cyclists and horse riders. We appreciate that no one wants this facility near them but we would hope a better alternative can be found that has less disruption to the lives of local residents.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP375	Disagree	I am writing to object to the planning permission for the new recycling and incinerator site being built - great concern as to the effect it will have on health with the pollution from the incinerator burning plastic etc. causing cancer, as so close to homes and schools. Please don't let this go ahead!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP380	Disagree	I wish to object to the proposed siting of an incinerator and waste disposal site at Uddens. Wimborne Road East is already congested and despite the modifications to the Canford Bottom round about traffic in the area is a major issue. This proposal will bring many heavy commercial lorries into the area with significant and unacceptable consequences. Traffic volumes will increase, the nature of the vehicles will change with consequent detrimental increase in emissions and congestion will ensue. The site is close to a significant residential area and the effect will be felt by those residing in the whole of Ferndown. The effect on the environment from such a plant will harm our surrounding area. This plan should be shelved at the earliest opportunity as it is not in the best interests of the residents of Ferndown.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP383	Disagree	Reference WP01. Proposed subject matter. My wife and I would like to add our names to the many hundreds of protesters you will have already received with regard to the proposed misuse of a public amenity. We have lived in the Colehill area for nearly 50 years and apart from inevitable housing development, it has always been a wonderful experience to enjoy the surrounding areas of natural beauty such as Cannon Hill and Uddens woods. It would be a non-returnable countryside rape of this area which would not only eliminate the facilities available to walkers, horse riders and others who just want to relax between shifts at Ferndown Industrial Estate, but the prospect of the whole of the Bournemouth/Poole and East Dorset conurbation bringing its waste for incineration or transfer is a deplorable concept. We have already had to put up with the total waste of money in the form of the "Hamburger Roundabout" designed to allow traffic to get to the Olympic Games at Weymouth more quickly which has resulted in huge traffic problems. Now you are suggesting allowing even more lorries and cars onto the surrounding roads, particularly from Wimborne if Brook Road is closed. We are not aware as to how Christchurch/Bournemouth/Poole get rid of their waste at the moment but we have not heard of any problems so would this proposal be a forerunner to the giant Unitary Authority we hear rumours about which would be enable every local council to dump their rubbish in someone else's back yard. In this instance on an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. "Fly Tipping" is illegal. Please acknowledge receipt of this e-mail.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
The Barn Nursery	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016W/P386	Disagree	<p>I definitely disagree. I am horrified at the very thought of this proposal of a waste plant being developed in Uddens Woodlands -Canon Hill south. I am the owner of The Barn Nursery School which has been in existence for 42 years. There are 45 children on the register ages 2 -5 years. The Nursery is located at Stapehill Farm which has a common field boundary to the proposed waste site. The children delight in a Forest School Club experience in Uddens Woodlands which provides a natural education, by using the woodland's resources it meets the development matters of national curriculum - the Early Years Foundation Stage. It has been commented in our recent successful Ofsted inspection as how beneficial it is to be able to use these rural and natural resources. Therefore my main concerns and reasons are: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The 40 metre chimney omitting fumes which could have an adverse effect on the young children's health.</li> <li>2. Odour and pests from the rubbish piles waiting for clearance/disposal.</li> <li>3. Immediate danger of heavy vehicles directly passing the nursery entrance - there is approximately 80 car movements daily transporting young children to and from the Nursery. Consequently would parents feel they could send their young and vulnerable children to a Nursery School with such possible health hazards and danger on the doorstep. This could be closure of a very popular, thriving and unique to the local community - farm based Nursery School. I do you will consider my comments and look forward to hearing your reply,</li> </ol>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016W/P389	Disagree	<p>Thank you for informing me of the proposal of the waste management site in Uddens Woodlands - South Cannon hill Plantation. I would like you to take my points into account from this consultation. I strongly disagree. I have been farming at Stapehill Farm and my father before me. Over many years I have seen the increasing residential development which has left my farm and the woods as a rural oasis in this area of search - a well valued recreational resource for the ever increasing local community. During this time I lost land and many acres of woodland were lost due to the Ferndown Bypass. My reasons are of disagreement:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Stapehill farm has a common field boundary with the proposed waste plant site - it is so close to the site what will the detrimental effect on my farm land be?</li> <li>2. Fumes , noise and light 24/7.</li> <li>3. Farm animals could be effected grazing on contaminated grass from the neighbouring proposed waste development. Would the waste plant also cause me a rat problem?</li> <li>4. Traffic on Uddens Drive will be intolerable - will it be a hazard as I take Farm Vehicles in and out of my entrance.</li> <li>5. I am very concerned of the health hazards to my family.</li> <li>6. Considerable devaluation of my property. I do hope you take my points into serious consideration,</li> </ol>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP392	Disagree	<p>I am writing to disagree with the above proposal to put a waste plant and incinerator on the woodlands south of Canon hill Plantation " Uddens Woods. The reasons for the disagreement which I hope the planning officers consider are:- The Uddens/Ferndown site is Green Belt Land. It is a popular recreational amenity for local residents using the Castle Main Trailway for cycling, horse riding and dog walking. It is the entrance to the Canon hill Plantation. The footpaths have been used for over 50 years. The woods are a haven to wildlife "nesting birds, deer, badgers, foxes and the protected species of smooth snakes. With the ever increasing surrounding suburbs it is really important the wildlife have an area of safety. What other towns have this on the doorstep. I work at The Barn Nursery which is based at Stapehill Farm and is adjacent to the site. The Barn Nursery is a rural nursery with a strong outdoor ethos. The Nursery school children are aged 2 " 5 years we use the potential site as part of the children's learning " in a forest school club. Uddens woods is just the right distance for the children to walk. These visits to the woods provide such a range of learning and discovery "a wonderful outdoor classroom. Not only do we use the woods but the meadows on the farm adjacent to the site. We would welcome any planners and councillors to come and visit our nursery and see for themselves first-hand the learning our nursery children achieve. I also use the woods for recreation walking my dog and baby in a pushchair daily. It is a short walk from where I live in Coppice Avenue, in Ferndown "the woods have good pushchair access and natural shade unlike Ferndown Common and St. Georges Park. The further congestion this would bring, as a resident of Ferndown working in Uddens. I already spend much time in traffic jams along Wimborne Road West. Secondly, at the moment beyond Uddens Trading Estate, Uddens is a quiet cul-de-sac. The Nursery School entrance is up a quiet lane next to Uddens woods, will the amount of lorries to the waste site cause a hazard to the parents bringing their children to Nursery. The incinerator " this is perhaps the biggest concern and why this site would be unsuitable " how safe is the incinerator to be placed next to a children's Nursery school, grazing farm animals and many residential homes in Uddens, Stapehill, Colehill and Ferndown. I hope this brings some important issues why this site should not be used for a waste plant and incinerator. It is a beautiful place which is green belt for a reason to protect it from the already built up surrounding area. We have already lost woods for the Ferndown Bypass. Please do not take any more for this proposed site. Thank you for taking the time to read my letter in this consultation,</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP397	Disagree	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed incinerator. This was previously debated at great expense to the tax payers some years ago, and then a traveller's site was proposed for this area. I would like to ask why can any attractive green area not just exist, for the enjoyment and pleasure of the local community and the benefit of nature - why does it have to be on some plan, often brought up again after years have passed? Yes, waste is a big issue and we do need to plan, but we do already have 3 waste areas, Hurn, Longham and Brook Road in Wimborne. Surely it is possible to extend one of these to increase capacity, rather than build one on green belt land. Previously we were advised that the site would have lorries accessing it, approximately 200 per day, which would be 400 extra trips in or out of the area. The capacity would be such that the waste from Dorset alone would not meet its capacity, and it would be possible to generate revenue by also processing waste from outside the county. Do we have the road infrastructure to do this? I would strongly suggest we do not, as any Friday after midday the roads in Ferndown can be a solid mass of traffic, adding significantly more housing (at the Staplehill Abbey site and other sites) and the increase in the number of large lorries can only add to this existing problem. Given that it is so close to natural areas, residential areas and Hampreston First School I think this proposal is highly unsuitable from an environmental perspective, it's unknown what the long term health implications of such an incinerator could be. Previously it was mentioned that this technology is new, and not enough data has been gathered about it to know if this is the best option for this site. I recall a party of councillors travelled to Germany to visit similar installations and there was a court case involving residents and the council. Surely enough public money has been spent on those past proceedings, it seems farcical to be embarking on the same road again. The woodland has recently been enhanced as a community resource with picnic benches and a lot of clearing has been done, there is the Castleman Trail Way, a cycle trail, lots of people walk dogs and ride horses or simply walk and enjoy the wildlife. Such green oases are few and far between in our ever more developed environment. We should look to protect these areas and enhance them. I urge you to look again at this plan and to check the suitability of other sites or different options within Dorset. Ferndown, Wimborne, Staplehill and Hampreston deserve better.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP400	Disagree	<p>I am writing concerning the proposed waste plant at Uddens Woodlands. I walk in Cannon Hill plantation everyday and it is beautiful you see the changing of the seasons, there is a lot of wildlife and research has shown that walking in woods has mental health benefits. All these things will change if a waste plant is on our doorstep. It could bring animal pests and spread disease to the wildlife. The air will be polluted from the 40m proposed chimney and increase congestion on already busy roads. The Canford Bottom roundabout at busy times is a nightmare and you want to put more Lorraine's into the mix. Why does Brook Road need to be closed and why are we taking waste from Poole and Bournemouth? I don't want a waste plant on my doorstep!</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP404	Disagree	As a member of the friends of uddens woods, I was recently helping out on a work party event. This was a number of days before we received news of the waste plant proposals. Throughout the whole day we all commented on the number and range of people using the beautiful space that we were all working on. Walkers bike riders picnickers with children running around and helping us, searching for the bat boxes that we installed years ago .children a few years older searching out for the one that has their name on it. Horse riders marvelling at the improvement we have made to their bridle ways. A true community space .Since we heard the news every evening we take our walk we look around and cannot imagine the space being taken from our community and being replaced by business and traffic. Working together on these woods has been an absolute joy and brought people together. The woods provide both physical and mental health for swathes of the Cole hill and Ferndown communities and this should not be compromised. The damage to the wildlife of the area doesn't bear thinking about and the increased traffic which is already at breaking point makes this option really untenable. Any backlog of traffic will immediately impact canford bottom causing more frustration for locals and holidaymakers alike. I would like to state clearly that I object to this proposal because it will utterly spoil the fragile environment ant mental wellbeing of all who use the area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP407	Disagree	I would like to object to the proposed site at Cannon hill ref WP01. As a resident I am extremely concerned with regard to this wholesale industrialisation of my neighbourhood. As far as I can tell if this goes ahead there will be a huge increase in traffic and what is currently an outstanding and historical greenspace enjoyed by a whole community will become a concrete hell. It has taken me so long to object because I cannot really believe that anyone would honestly consider doing this to a recreational area that is so well used and needed by the wider community. But it seems this is the case and yet again I need to take the time to protect our precious woodland. An area that the whole community has invested time energy and passion in preserving, through our membership of the friends of uddens woods. I object on the grounds of traffic pollution. Noise pollution. Contamination of a former green belt site and on behalf of the wildlife and humans that need this space.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP410	Disagree	Destruction of woodland and recreational facilities. Eyesore Traffic already heavy on A31 Unsuitable exit Uddens Drive and Wimborne Rd west for increased vehicles "heavy and cars Impact on residential properties	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP413	Disagree	We were very sorry and alarmed to hear of the proposal of closing Brook Rd and concerned about the now proposed site from Blunts Farm to Cannon Hill South to establish several ideas. Cannon Hill South us an all-weather walking area, ride likes, walk dogs and horses etc. I understand there are almost 6000 new homes planned and so more recreational p[laces are needed not less.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP416	Disagree	Uddens Woodllands " Cannon Hill South Please register my objection to plans at the above site for Waste vehicle depot HRC Bulky waste transfer & treatment facility Probably to include commercial waste Probably to include an incinerator Probably to include import of waste from all over Dorset and beyond My main objections are Destruction of green belt woodland Destruction of amazing biodiversity Destruction of wildlife Environmental pollution Emissions, smells and contamination Health and safety hazard Traffic and congestion " on al already overloaded A31 " especially the Canford Bottom Roundabout I objected to the earlier plans at almost adjacent Blunts Farm the latest proposal is even closer to my property. The Blunts Farm site was turned down "I quote from Community Magazine 5 May 2006 Controversial new waste treatment facilities are not to be built in Ferndown. A government inspector has rejected a proposal at Blunts Farm on the edge of town because of its possible impact on green belt land It is not 2016 " nothing has changed This site is too close to people's homes in Ferndown, Stapehill and Colehill	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP420	Disagree	Until recently I lived in Cannon Hill Gardens. While I was living there, there were various planning proposals put forward -mobile phone masts, a camp for travellers and gravel extraction. And now it is suggested that it would be a suitable site for waste handling. This is green belt woodland used by an awful lot of people, walkers, dog walkers, horse riders, mountain bikers, on a daily basis. It is also home to a wide variety of flora and fauna. On what planet can this area be considered suitable for this kind of development? It is so unfair on local residents who have had years of worry over previous plans. This proposal would be life changing for so many people. There must be a better place. Also, this plan completely ignores the disaster that is the relevant stretch of the A31. I have driven from St. Ives to Wimborne this morning. It took very nearly 40 minutes!! Thanks to the sheer weight of traffic and the very slow clearing roundabout at Canford Bottom. To deliberately force more traffic on to this road would be madness and of course a lot of traffic would start using the lanes through Uddens. It seems to me that local planners will not be happy until a pretty town like Wimborne is completely spoiled. Congratulations. It won't be long!!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
W H White LTD	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP431	Disagree	<p>Site WP01: The proposed Wider Ferndown Area of Search “ Emerging Preferred Site Notwithstanding the objection from the landowner, there is no physical reason why a residual waste treatment facility could not be integrated within the allocated Blunts Farm employment area. There are numerous examples of energy plants being located within employment areas “for instance Viridors energy recovery facility at Marsh Barton in Exeter. In WHWs view they are entirely compatible and complementary. WHW recognises that sites must be genuinely available and deliverable. Whilst, it is clearly the landowner’s prerogative to determine whether the site is available, the default position should not be to simply look at adjoining land “particularly where that lies within the Green Belt and should be afforded a degree of permanency. There would appear to be little justification for releasing this particular site from the Green Belt “it is not previously developed land or tied to an existing waste management facility. Given that there is a need for one additional strategic facility and, putting aside the Site Control Centre, three other sites are identified, there would (even acknowledging the need for choice) appear to be an overriding need. Should this be ill-founded, one might reasonably expect a sequential approach to be followed looking at non-Green Belt sites and latterly alternative Green Belt sites before determining whether the release of land SW of Blunts Farm is appropriate. It is my opinion that the Green Belt in this location meets at least four of the tests set out at paragraph 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework, namely: To check unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another (in this instance Ferndown and Wimborne / Colehill); To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land). Thus, it is far from clear that the site would be preferable from a Green Belt perspective.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP433	Disagree	<p>I wish to make comments regarding a waste disposal plant being installed so close to a built up area which contains a large population of elderly people in bungalows which lie west if the proposed site. We will suffer air pollution affecting our health. Also unable to have windows open during warm weather. Being a driver of a vehicle the congestion on our local roads from lorries in both directions bringing in waste and extra cars from Brook rd. site being closed. The value of our property will drop and finding buyers will become difficult when they find out about the proposals. I moved from Winchester in 2006 and at that time an incinerator in Chandlers Ford near Southampton was closed down because of air pollution so to build another one to cause air problems to people’s health.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP441	Disagree	<p>Wimborne deserves better, continually being assaulted by planning and proposed developments. Does the green belt still exist, please clarify. How much more do we have to put up with, please leave us alone.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WHP443	Disagree	It is almost beyond belief that The Dorset County Council are yet again determined to frighten the daylight out of all the residents in East Dorset. Over the last 16 years, we have had to fight again and again, against the takeover of our Green Belt woodland. This includes gravel extractions and Travellers site and now this waste incinerator and household dump for Bournemouth and Poole and local area. In each case, we have voted in thousands to keep Colehill and Uddens woods, as a most treasured recreation area. Friends of Colehill and Uddens woods, have enlisted so many volunteers to help look after the woodlands. What impact are these new proposals going to have on the added traffic on local roads and the infamous A31?. Maybe the members of the Council are unaware of the gridlocked A31, morning, noon and evening. This also includes Ringwood Road and Wimborne Road.. All the added lorries will have a severe impact on the road network in our area. Somehow the title, Dorset For You, used by the Council for communicating with the people in Dorset, now has a very hollow ring to it.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WHP444	Disagree	I am totally opposed to this area being used as a waste disposal area. It is a beautiful green belt area used for recreation by children on their bikes, dog walkers, horse riders, joggers, nature lovers and for family walks through the forest. It is a much loved area and used by local people. The road traffic around this area is already bad enough; this site will make things even worse. Once again Please don't destroy our Forest	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WHP445	Disagree	I am totally opposed to this area being used as a waste disposal area. It is a beautiful green belt area used for recreation by children on their bikes, dog walkers, horse riders, joggers, nature lovers and for family walks through the forest. It is a much loved area and used by local people. The road traffic around this area is already bad enough; this site will make things even worse. Once again Please don't destroy our Forest	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WHP449	Disagree	Reference the Draft Waste Plan Update - Additional and Emerging Preferred Waste Site Allocations near Ferndown. An incinerator plan was proposed several years ago and with public backing was declined. So why should we now have the waste plan here. For the rest of Dorset to use such a facility surely Winfrith would be more central? The area is already congested with traffic and with the extra building of more and more houses this is going to get worse. The roads around Wimborne are the same with proposed houses on the Cranborne Road and Magna Road which I believe is 5,000! We do not need this type of waste plant anywhere in Dorset at all. The infrastructure is not good enough to cope and why should be be contaminated with the pollution that will come from the chimney. Before this goes any further maybe the public should be notified in a more prominent newspaper. We didn't want the last waste plant so don't want one now. If the companies are approached regarding the packaging on goods and forced to cut this down there will be less waste. So please do consider those that have to live here especially the children. I would be interested to know why more people are not aware of this being proposed	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP451	Disagree	I am writing to register my objection to the proposal for a waste plant at Uddens Farm on three specific grounds. Traffic congestion. Access via the A31 - an already congested area is going to cause more issues as traffic increases significantly - particularly lorries delivering waste products. Loss of green space. The proposed facilities will be taking away an amenity area used by local people. It is a key community resource and an important green space. Potential Health impact Around 675 properties lie within 250m of the Blunts Farm, with a further 101,000 homes within a five mile radius. Pollutants from smoke generated by an incinerator will blow across the residential area as the wind blows predominately from that direction towards the housing estates. Is there going to be a public consultation about this application where people can ask questions?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP452	Disagree	I feel I must add my word to those of many others. To use cannon hill as waste disposal is just a terrible spot. Cars and lorries will be coming and going all the time, and to have a large chimney there is almost beyond my comprehension. The traffic is already very bad, what with holiday makers throughout summer, local traffic etc. . . We already we have the noise of roundabout traffic day and night in the summer. Surely there must be many sites away in country, where not so many live, if we have to get rid of our rubbish, that way? With respect ,I hope your office will take account of how we all feel	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP454	Disagree	1. Having seen and experienced the regular traffic congestion / chaos at the current Brook Rd site, and the regular gridlock at the Canford Bottom (Hamburger) roundabout, I see nothing that says that the effect on traffic flow and the implications of these proposals have been fully evaluated and plans made to negate the additional impact. Stationary traffic will also impact on air quality / pollution. 2. In my business role as an advisor on implementation of the Environmental Standard ISO 140001 I would like to know whether a comprehensive study has been done into, and what the proposals are to minimise the impact of the dust, smell, noise, fire and any toxic material on the local habitat. There is also the question of what will be put in place to comply with Legal obligations to prevent ingress into local soil or water courses. Ironically, the existing Brook Rd and Longham sites are adjacent to rivers with little or no site drainage, and as far as I am aware no regular testing for accidental or gradual release to the water course at these points. On the question of fire, there have been a number of recent serious fires at Landfill sites in Dorset - St Leonards/ Verwood Rd, and today Wareham. While this is not a Landfill proposal, any fire would have a devastating effect on the trees and vegetation around the proposed site. That is to say nothing of the damage to the nearby industrial estate or impact on the A31. 3. While the prevailing winds are SW any easterly will mean that residents in Colehill, less than 1mile away, are in risk of suffering from smells and fallout from any incinerator / chimney. According to my SatNav the difference in height between the proposed site(s) and my locality is 80-90 feet. A 40m chimney, at times of high barometrical pressure, that's when we normally get easterly winds, could mean any residue or smell would be pushed down to our level by the time it reaches us here a mile or so away.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

<p style="text-align: center;">Christchurch and East Dorset Councils</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WPP459</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment/disagree</p> <p>The following sites are proposed in the Draft Waste Plan “Additional and Emerging Preferred Waste Allocations 2016 for residual waste treatment. The representations set out below deal with these proposals and other waste uses proposed through the Draft Waste Plan as they affect sites in Christchurch and East Dorset. The Draft Waste Plan proposes that where sites are being considered for a mix of waste uses these sites would be the subject of a flexible waste allocation. This approach is not appropriate as it introduces uncertainty of impacts including the extent of transport and environmental impacts and loss of employment land. This also creates uncertainty for the master planning of sites Blunts Farm and Woolsbridge employment allocations. Detailed objections to employment land loss are set out below relating to Blunts Farm and Woolsbridge Industrial Estates. In respect of these two sites the draft waste plan ignores the requirement set out in the NPPF to meet local needs for economic development and the provision of employment land. The NPPF states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable economic development. The three dimensions to sustainable economic development are economic, social and environmental, with the economic role defined as:- contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure. The NPPF sets out the Government’s commitment to securing economic growth to create jobs and prosperity and the significant weight that should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system. Planning should operate to encourage sustainable growth and not act as an impediment to it. Amongst the core land-use planning principles included in the NPPF is the expectation that planning should pro-actively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs . WP01: Ferndown Area of Search: The Ferndown Area of Search comprises the following sites: Land South West of Blunts Farm (Situated in the Green Belt) Blunts Farm (Draft Waste Plan) (30ha) Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estate (61.56ha) This area of search is being considered in the Draft Waste Plan for the following uses: Residual Waste Treatment including Energy Recovery (4ha) Household Recycling Facility (HRC) (0.5 “ 1ha) Waste Vehicle Depot (0.3 “ 0.5ha) Bulky Waste Transfer / Treatment (at least 1ha) It is noted that the draft waste plan considers the area of search as suitable for a HRC/Depot/Bulky Waste management facility and that if only a limited amount of land is available preference would be for the development of an HRC. Policy KS5 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 80ha of employment land to come forward in Christchurch and East Dorset over the plan period to meet projected requirements for B1, B2 and B8 employment uses. Policy FWP8 of the Core Strategy allocates Blunts Farm (30ha) for employment uses, which includes B1, B2 and B8 uses with some ancillary support services for these employment uses. Therefore, the proposed waste uses for Blunts Farm are not appropriate or consistent with the adopted development plan. The Blunts Farm site is of strategic significance for South East Dorset and is forms part of a key market centre for industrial development. The entirety of this site is required to deliver Core Strategy employment land requirements, which is also supported through the Workspace Study 2012. The Workspace Study identified a requirement for the Bournemouth and Poole SSCT of 173ha to be delivered between 2011 “ 2031, which is matched against an employment land supply of 150ha. In this respect, the site is needed to address employment land requirements for the South East Dorset area and the proposals for waste facilities will prejudice the council’s ability to deliver projected requirements for employment land. The local authorities of Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole are currently updating the Workspace Strategy and this site remains part of an industrial centre which is required to meet the employment land needs for the Eastern Dorset Housing Market Area. The Waste Plan ignores the adopted Core Strategy and evidence requirement and inappropriately only refers to national waste planning policy. The Councils are currently considering the preparation of a Local Development Order (LDO) for blunts farm which would be progressed in accordance with the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan. The range of uses to be permitted through the LDO would include B use class employment with some ancillary development and waste uses would not be within the scope of the LDO which would apply to the whole site. Blunts Farm is within the land ownership of the Forestry Commission and it is noted that they have objected to the proposed waste uses on this site. In this respect, it is considered that the proposals for Blunts Farm are also undeliverable and this will not meet the tests of soundness in terms of being Effective. The Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estate is a strategic employment site located adjacent to Blunts Farm that includes a Local Plan allocation (Policy FWP2 Land East of Cobham Road) for 8.48ha is one remaining site to be developed for B1, B2 and B8 uses. The Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estate comprises predominantly businesses within B1, B2 and B8 uses and it is important that this existing stock of employment land is not eroded so as to prejudice the councils ability to meet Local</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
--	--	---	--	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
				<p>Plan employment land requirements. Land to the South West of Blunts Farm has also been identified within the area of search which is located in the Green Belt. The waste uses proposed are not appropriate development in the Green Belt and it is not considered that very special circumstances exist to support an allocation in this location. It is also considered that development in this location will affect the purposes of the Green Belt in eroding the strategic gap between Ferndown and Wimborne. As set out in previous representations, the councils support the improvement / replacement of the Wimborne Household Recycling Centre. The Council considers that the facility should remain in its existing location which is central, convenient and sustainable. Should a totally new facility be required, the Council supports the sites at West Moors Petroleum Depot (ED04), Little Canford Depot (EDO5) or the Police Headquarters site at Ferndown (ED06) subject to the proposal being acceptable in terms of its impact on the Green Belt. The councils are concerned about the traffic impact of the range of uses proposed particularly given the proximity to the A31 Strategic Road Network. There is a need for a robust transport assessment to be undertaken to determine the precise impact and mitigation required.</p>	
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP465	Disagree	<p>I strongly object to the new waste and recycling plant being sited at land near Blunts farm Ref WP01. It would impact on important woodland and be a loss for future generations, I use the trails through this area regularly.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP471	Comment	<p>There is great unhappiness in East Dorset at the proposal for a Household Recycling Centre with bulky waste and treatment facility on the Uddens and Cannon Hill woodlands. There appear to be no special circumstances to warrant the release of this Green Belt site just off the A31 and several of our Members have asked me to draw your attention to their strongly held feelings about this matter. The site has been used for many, many years by walkers, cyclists, horse riders, dog walkers and others all the year round. It is also used by a local nursery school as an outside activity area. Access to the proposed HRC either from the A31 or from Uddens Drive would be difficult and add to the already severe traffic congestion in this area.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP481	Disagree	I wish to place on record my objection to the proposed suggested site for a Residual waste Treatment centre at WP01 Ferndown. Having lived at my current address in Forest View drive Stapehill since December 1966 and have seen the development of both the Ferndown Industrial Est. and that at Uddens at first hand. This Industrial expansion over the years has provided many jobs and this is to council and business credit. However I object to the fact we lose this open and well used area for walking, horse riding ,cycling etc. The fact it may well be supplied with waste from " surrounding" areas Bournemouth, Poole and may be others that is not something I wish to see. Bournemouth etc. should deal with their own waste not push it over their boundary and on to others. Bournemouth always try to hand others the sticky end of the stick, re.travller sites who will get their portion should those plans reappear.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP484	Comment	Very concerned as a parent of a young child that they could be potentially breathing in poisonous waste particles in the daily air they breathe whilst either at pre school, school, at the playground or in their own back garden. The site of this incinerator would cover all these areas. A very poor thought out plan indeed and not widely publicised. I would object strongly.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Chestnut Grove Residents Association	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP488	Comment	The residents of Chestnut Grove are unanimously against the use of the Area of Forestry Commission Land South West of Blunts Farm (within the Green Belt) for any part of the Waste Plan. To say that we viewed the proposal with disbelief is an understatement, particularly following findings of the government inspector some years ago on a similar proposal, who agreed with local residents that this was not a suitable site for such an operation. In more recent times we had the plans for a Gypsy & Traveller Transit Site in the same location. This resulted in a 6,000 name petition being submitted. When will the council accept that this woodland is a community asset of great importance. It is regularly used by dog walkers, ramblers, cyclists, horse riders who would otherwise be forced towards the sensitive Lowland Heathland sites of Holt Heath, Ferndown Common and Slop Bog. It is a key mitigation site. Our residents have close links to the Friends of Uddens & Cannon Hill Woodlands who have spent many voluntary hours working in conjunction with the Forestry Commission and Dorset Countryside Ranger Service to improve this woodland for the benefit of the local community, users of the Castleman Trailway and woodland wildlife. Picnic benches, perch benches, all weather paths, noticeboards, area maps and interpretation boards, bird & bat boxes are part of efforts that have gone in to making the woods the welcoming and accessible area they are for children, the elderly and infirm alike. We are not a NIMBY group and accept that the Blunts Farm site will eventually be developed, ideally though as an extension of the Industrial Estate creating much needed growth and employment opportunities. We understand access would be from the more appropriate Nimrod Way. The destruction of the triangle of woodland (South West of Blunts Farm) known as Uddens Woodland or Cannon Hill South, for any form of development would be totally unacceptable to us.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP492	Disagree	I would like to make my objection known for the proposed additional waste site at WP01 an area that is linked to Cannon Hill Woodlands. This is currently an area of natural beauty and habitat to wildlife. Not only would this proposal strip, the area of a little gem of woodland, it would have a disastrous effect on the community. The increased traffic to the proposed site would cause traffic gridlock to what is already a very heavily congested traffic area (Canford Bottom Roundabout) which is already gridlocked many times throughout the day!! Adding to noise and air pollution for the area. The vermin and fly contamination is another factor for concern, especially as it is close to housing and schools. Also the access being denied to the Castleman Trail Way, is an issue as it is used by many walkers and cyclists who live locally and also tourists. I feel there must be a more appropriate site that causes less impact on our environment.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP511	Disagree	Disagree most emphatically - traffic, pollution, loss of amenities.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP513	Comment	I am very concerned about the idea of waste treatment within the vicinity of working and living areas of Ferndown. My concern is on community health grounds, particularly where treatments involve any emissions into the atmosphere. Repeatedly, society is told that such things are safe, but too often the converse turns out to be the case. What are the current "reassurances" and science on this aspect?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP524	Disagree	These are my objections to this proposal: NO on transport re: A31 + Canford Bottom Roundabout + Old Thatch junction NO on transport re: adding to delays + extra traffic volume + too many large lorries on Canford Bottom Roundabout + private cars with trailers at Canford Bottom Roundabout NO on pollution re: emissions + smell + vermin NO on amenity re: loss of green belt + impact on leisure facilities NO on location re: site is not central for a strategic facility NO on environmental impact re: too much housing too close + schools + businesses + other workplaces nearby This site is totally unsuitable and should be withdrawn.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP532	Disagree	<p>Thank you for your letter advising us of the details of the proposed Waste Plan. I wish to register my objection to the proposal of a Waste Centre at Ferndown Industrial Estate/Uddens Woodland. I was surprised at this proposal, as such a similar plan has been rejected previously and the salient points of that are still valid. The destruction of greenbelt was not considered appropriate previously, and National Planning Policy Framework supports its retention. The environmental impact of this proposal would be devastating; the pollution from incinerating waste risks the health of local people, of which there are many as the site sits alongside and between many residential properties, The Barn nursery, and within approximately one mile range of Hampreston and Ferndown Schools. In addition to gambling on the impact of toxins and potential carcinogenics being discharged into a residential area using unproven technology, there are obvious quality of life issues- the inevitable smell, noise and dust created by this scheme. The destruction of Uddens Woodland would be a shameful waste of an irreplaceable local resource, a valuable habitat and a much loved area for recreation which will be even more important in the future when more housing stock is added to the area as planned. Ferndown Industrial Estate/Uddens seems here to be recommended as a good site for its transport links. Whilst this may have been the case in the past, it is clear that the vast overdevelopment of the industrial estate and the unsuccessful alterations to the Canford Bottom roundabout have left the area of Stapehill and the A31 in a regular state of congestion. This proposal invites significant traffic from the general public, in addition to large waste vehicles, whilst not having the infrastructure to support it. The Industrial Estate should be reserved for employment land, for which it was designed, which we have been led to believe is a priority, hence the recent destruction of habitat for a protected lizard species to create the Cobham Gate development. Drainage in this locality is a problem and would be likely to create a particular issue at the Uddens site. Residents of this area will continue to resist projects which are detrimental to the life of the families and elderly people who live here. I strongly urge you to think about the future wellbeing of our children and our community, and reconsider the inclusion of Ferndown Industrial Estate/Uddens in the Waste Plan.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP531	Disagree	<p>I oppose to any waste site in Uddens woods. It is too close to residential &amp; commercial area. There are number of sports facilities for children near the proposed site. Pollution from any waste site &amp; additional traffic would have adverse effect on children. A31 &amp; all the surrounding roads are congested on a daily basis and are not able to cope with additional traffic. The proposed site is within green belt which needs protecting as it's an important habitat &amp; recreation area for the community.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP533	Disagree	I would like to register my objection to the proposal for the following reasons: The pollution and environmental impact of a waste centre and incinerator would be damaging to the large local community, in which this site is nestled, as well as in the wider locality, affecting homes, schools and pre-schools. Toxic fumes and potentially harmful carcinogenic pollutants generated by an incinerator would devastate the local area, as well as the dust, smell and noise it would create. The destruction of habitat, greenbelt and valued local amenity woodland at Uddens Woodland would be an unforgivable loss to our community. Additional traffic on an already strained road system would add unnecessary pressure on the local network. Drainage at Uddens Woodland would be problematic for development. I feel the Uddens/Ferndown area proposed is inappropriate for this type of scheme, and would cause significant harm to this residential family area. I urge the council to reject this site for the Waste Plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP547	Disagree	Re. WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment and WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Residual Waste Treatment Specifically - Traffic congestion "i.e. in an area that is already heavily congested with private, commercial and holiday traffic the proposals will significantly increase traffic volumes. Apart from the general congestion there will be impacts on air pollution, noise, accident levels and the general resultant deterioration of the quality of life and quiet enjoyment of the area by its residents. It should also be considered that there are already several residential developments in progress in the area (and more are planned!) and consequently there will be a significant increase in the local population with associated vehicles which will compound the current congestion issues. Impact on Roads " the roads in this area are far from well-maintained with potholes and crumbling verges etc. " the increase in traffic volume and notably heavy commercial lorries carry waste to and from the site will result in ever faster breakdown of the road surface and its general integrity. Impact on the environment and proximity to housing and schools " the effects of the proposals which incorporate Bulk Waste Management and Residual Waste Treatment will be smell, discharges into the atmosphere (via chimney), seepage into ground and water table, litter pollution, vermin (rodents and foxes), seagulls and other scavenger birds (i.e. noise and guano) plus dust and noise. Do you know what carcinogens and toxins will be produced and what p Loss of green belt "enjoyed by ramblers, walkers, dog walkers, wildlife including rare species e.g. Sand Lizard, Adders, bats and an abundance of native flora! Line of Sight "the proposed chimney at between 70 and 100 mts will be visible for many miles and will be a blight on the horizon for many people. Impact on Property Values "clearly those properties close to and on route to these proposed sites will be devalued because of the mess, smell, noise, congestion etc. Quiet enjoyment of the surrounding areas - Residents in the immediate and surrounding areas will suffer diminution in the overall quality of their environment and loss of the quiet enjoyment that is currently being experienced. Additionally, vulnerable groups such as infants, pregnant women, aged residents, those with respiratory conditions etc. will be at increased risk because of the general pollution that will result from these proposals	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Natural England	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP619	Comment	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment/ Bulky Waste Treatment/ Household Recycling Centre & Depot The identified area of search raises a number of concerns, there are existing high levels of public access in parts of the site which would be displaced by any proposal, potentially onto nearby protected heathlands. An assessment under the Habitats Regulations may be required. In addition there are known to be records for both species of rare reptiles and likely also to be bats in the woodland as well as SPA birds such as nightjar. An assessment would need to be carried out unless a narrower AOS was defined with much reduced impacts. To the north is a county wildlife site and adjacent SSSI and specially protected site, these should be excluded from the AOS.	Your helpful comments are noted and will be considered further when developing the preferred site. As suggested the SSSI will be removed from the Area of Search if this site is to be retained in the final Plan.
Highways England	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP860	Comment	This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. Comments remain the same. This part of Dorset has congestion issues and a robust transport evidence base will be needed to accompany an application to demonstrate the impacts and any mitigation as necessary. It is understood that an objection has been received to development on this land from the landowner and a wider area of search is now being considered for allocation to provide greater flexibility for the following waste facilities; - Waste Vehicle Depot - Household Recycling Facility to serve Wimborne/Ferndown and surrounding areas - Bulky Waste transfer /treatment and/or residual waste treatment facility It is hoped that the Waste Planning Authority will work with Highways England in developing preferred sites in the most appropriate locations.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Wimborne Minster Town Council	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP875	Comment	At the Planning & Environment Committee of the Town Council held on Tuesday, 26 July 2016 the following resolution was passed: RESOLVED that no objection be offered to the waste disposal unit being located at Blunts Farm provided that it will be a modern facility comparable to that at Swanage.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

<p style="text-align: center;">Individual</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WP857</p>	<p>Response of the East Dorset Environment Partnership Please note all references to the Local Plan relate to the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan, adopted April 2014</p> <p>1. HRA Screening 1.1 We note the HRA Screening report (updated June 2016) and the findings (p9-10) that the sites WP01 and WP02 have been assessed as needing further consideration as the likely significant effect on European sites is uncertain. We disagree with the suggestion that no is an appropriate assessment (Appendix 2 p35) as it has failed to consider the displacement of informal recreation from the land to the SW of Blunts Farm.</p> <p>2. Sustainability Appraisal 2.1 HRC Table 1 p100-108) 2.1.1 This displacement of informal recreation is identified in SA Objective 2 (though we suggest that the extent of its use and impact of its loss are underestimated). Because of its proximity to heathland and wetland SSSIs and the SNCI, we disagree with the Positive assessment of ED03 (Woolsbridge).</p> <p>2.1.2 Objective 4 .There is drainage from both Blunts Farm and the Ferndown Area of Search to Uddens Water, part of the Moors River SSSI system. A spillage on the Ferndown Industrial Estate some years ago resulted in huge ecological loss from which it has never recovered.</p> <p>2.1.3 Objective 5. Please see below for comments on high water table of the Land SW of Blunts Farm based on personal observation of EDEP members and local resident's reports.</p> <p>2.1.4 Objective 15. The Land SW of Blunts Farm would have a negative impact on the transport network if access were from Wimborne Road West. Details of the AADT are given below.</p> <p>2.2 Waste Vehicle Depot p114 "121 2.2.1 Objectives 2 and 4. Impact on biodiversity and ground and surface water depends on proper pollution control measures being installed, managed and monitored. There is drainage from both Blunts Farm and Ferndown Area of Search to Uddens Water, part of the Moors River SSSI system. A spillage on the Ferndown Industrial Estate some years ago resulted in huge ecological loss from which it has never recovered. The Moors River is the subject of a restoration plan (Natural England/Environment Agency)</p> <p>3. The Residual Waste Site Identification Report (January 2016) has not included any reference to the Land SW of Blunts Farm so appears not to have been assessed.</p> <p>4. WP01 Ferndown Area of Search. Land adjacent to Blunts Farm and the wider Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estate</p> <p>4.1 We note that our comments on Policies, Vision, Objectives and Spatial Strategy have not been addressed in this Draft Waste Plan update. We would appreciate confirmation that they will be taken into consideration in the Pre-submission Draft.</p> <p>4.2 Our general comments and recommendations on East Dorset Waste Site Options do not appear to have been considered: this included the need to correct distances to towns and villages.</p> <p>4.3 Land to SW of Blunts Farm</p> <p>4.3.1 EDEP objects to the inclusion of the triangular area of Green Belt land to the SW of Blunts Farm.</p> <p>4.3.2 It is in the Green Belt so its inclusion in the Waste Plan would be contrary to Government Policy and would not be found sound at EiP. The Green Belt boundary was revised two years ago with the adoption of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan. NPPF 81 requires LAs to plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of Green Belt such as looking at opportunities to provide access, to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation, to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity  . The proposal conflicts with NPPF 80, 81 , and 89 .</p> <p>4.3.3 Local Plan Policy FWP8 requires significant landscape buffers within the northern and western parts of the Blunts Farm site. By removing its role as a buffer, development of this area would be contrary to policy.</p> <p>4.3.4 The Local Plan identifies that the strategic highway network in this area suffers from congestion. Both DCC and Highways England advised in 2015 that they require a robust transport evidence base, impact assessment and mitigation. In 2014 the AADT at Stapehill was 9,000 with a further 10,100 using Ham Lane to avoid the Canford Bottom roundabout. Any publicly accessible facilities here would be likely to attract not only the current Brook Road vehicles but others from a far wider catchment particularly if only one such facility were to be available to East Dorset residents.</p> <p>4.3.5 Loss of this land to development and any increase in traffic would result in significant adverse impact on the local community of Stapehill including residents, the nearby nursery school and thriving businesses on and adjacent to Uddens Industrial Estate due to increased noise, odour and traffic as well as loss of an important very well used recreational amenity. This would be contrary to Local Plan Policy HE3 .</p> <p>4.3.6 Uddens has already attracted high quality businesses (at least one has an international customer base). Together with the Public House there were threats of closure and moving out of the area by some businesses when a Gypsy and Traveller site was proposed for this site. Impact on local business and other employment opportunities must be taken into consideration. Risk to the local economy should be a criterion.</p> <p>4.3.7 The Barn Nursery School is accessed via Uddens Drive and this is also used as a recreational route to access the Castleman Trailway, Uddens and Cannon Hill. There are no pavements. Any additional vehicular access via Uddens Drive would impact on this. The Castleman Trailway is a flagship route for local recreation and sustainable access from residential areas to employment sites across the District. The site provides significant and important screening of the A31 from Stapehill, Stapehill Nursery, other private land and numerous footpaths and rights of way including E36/11 and E42/28 both of which link to E42/55.</p> <p>4.3.8 The Forestry Commission website confirms that the site is heavily used for dog walking. In recent years</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
---	--	--	---	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
				<p>they have actively encouraged its increased use for informal community recreational activities, with regular volunteer work parties clearing invasive non-native Rhododendron and encouraging the growth of native British trees and ground flora, making and installing picnic tables and wild play equipment and dens in cleared glades. The site is well used by local residents, the Barn Nursery School and also by people from the industrial estate and further afield. Children and dogs are able to run and play freely. This reduces pressure on the nearby internationally designated heathlands. Fig 1. Forestry Commission Map showing picnic sites and benches, Ferndown, Stour and Forest trail (black and white), Castleman Trailway (purple and white), other public rights of way (green) and footpaths across the woodland (dotted black). 4.3.9 Local Plan para 14.15 states, The provision of attractive, accessible and functional open space is important for the wellbeing and health of residents and the support of valuable wildlife. The Councils seek to ensure that local residents have access to open space to meet their needs. Para 14.16 states, The provision of large open spaces and green infrastructure also serves to divert recreational pressure away from the sensitive Dorset Heaths. These paragraphs transpose into local policy the requirements of NPPF 73. Were the site to be progressed it is likely that it would require an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations: as identified in para 1.1 we do not consider the magnitude of displacing informal recreation from this site onto the Dorset Heaths has been addressed. It is a much valued oasis of calm in this otherwise heavily urbanised and trafficked area. 4.3.10 There would be huge adverse impact on the adjacent smallholding which has been in the same family for six generations and always managed sustainably. 4.3.11 The water table in the area is high. This was exacerbated by the construction of the bypass and there are local records of the Castleman Trailway being calf deep in water. Loss of the trees on site would raise the water table. SUDs are not achievable in such conditions. Construction of a split level facility for an HRC would require continuous pumping of ground water which would need to go somewhere. It is unlikely to comply with Local Plan Policy ME6 or, because of groundwater issues, to be viable. 4.4 Land on the Ferndown Industrial estate 4.4.1 EDEP would not object to an HRC/Transport Depot on the existing Ferndown Industrial estate provided that: i) It is sited at the Eastern end of the estate with easy access to the Ameysford Roundabout, ii) there is no risk of spillages or other groundwater pollution which had such devastating effects on Uddens Water several years ago and from which the river ecology has still not recovered, and iii) any bulky waste or residual waste treatment facility considered for this site should also be confined to areas of the Ferndown Industrial Estate that are least ecologically sensitive and have least adverse impact on residents.</p>	

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP767	Disagree	<p>We are writing to express our total objection to the planned use of the area to the south of the A31, known as Blunts Farm and Uddens Plantation, as being suitable for any form of waste disposal, be it incinerated, land fill, or as a transitional depot (i.e. a depot where waste is brought by the general public for movement by skip to elsewhere).</p> <p>1. The site is Green Belt. We should not need to enlarge upon this objection, but it seems that Colehill and Wimborne Minsters Green Belt is regarded as being handy for massive house building and rubbish dumping. This over-riding of GREEN BELT policies MUST CEASE. A planning application by a resident adjacent to this green belt to erect a conservatory for the use of a disabled family member was refused on the grounds that it was too close to the green belt, but it seems that a large industrial building and enormous chimney is OK 2. The site is far too close to family homes, and at least 5 First Schools are within 5 miles of the site. There is bound to be emissions and pollution from any incineration process. The normally prevailing west wind will take this across residential Ameysford, and the alternative easterly winds, which are becoming increasingly frequent, will take it across residential Colehill. Any waste disposal involving incineration should be sited well away from any residential developed site. 3. Access to this proposed site by the convoy of bulk lorries, commercial vans and domestic vehicles is totally unrealistic. Whatever access to the actual site is provided will have to be from either the A31 or from Wimborne Road West, at Stapehill area. As the waste would be predominantly from the west, i.e. Dorset, Poole, Bournemouth, it will all have to negotiate the Canford Bottom Roundabout. This roundabout has for many years been not fit for purpose , and since its improvement in 2012 has been even more of a nightmare. It is already unable to cope with the current level of traffic. 4. This is much used recreational green belt area and once taken can never be replaced. For how much longer can we sustain this oh it's only a little bit, there's plenty more attitude. One day it will ALL BE GONE! 5. Why should the people of Ferndown, Stapehill, Colehill, Wimborne Minster have to make provision for the disposal of the waste from Poole and Bournemouth? We urge you to take notice of the comments above and reject this proposed desecration of yet another piece of Wimborne/Colehill Green Belt.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Individual</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WP742</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Disagree</p> <p>Now aged 96 and having lived adjacent to the proposed site since 1923, firstly at Stapehill Farm, then The Bungalow (now Carinlea) and for the past 75 years at Pinewood, I am most concerned as to the legacy I shall leave for future generations who would be unable to enjoy the woodlands if this development were to take place. As I am unable to send high tech correspondence myself, I have asked my daughter and neighbour at Gralin, Mrs L J White, who also holds my Power of Attorney, to include my name on her comments letter, already received earlier this morning. Consequently what now follows is a copy of her letter, but which echoes my views entirely. Obviously it was my father who originally farmed the land and I was the small girl who ran through the woods to school at Colehill: - We write as the residents living immediately adjacent to the proposed site and sharing a Right of Way over it to access our fields. In the early 1920s my Grandfather first held Commoners Rights to graze his cattle from Uddens to Colehill and in that time, up to his death in the 1960s, various Right of Way paths were established. These have continued to be utilised by my family and also the general public using the area for recreational purposes since. The Castlemain Trailway has simply enhanced a pathway first established by my mother, now aged 96, as she made her way to school at Colehill from the age of three. Currently the sixth generation of our family lives here. Accordingly, as the residents who know it best, we would expect that the following comments/objections are taken into account. <b>OBJECTION: DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT OF SITE SUBJECT TO HIGH WATER TABLE</b> In my Grandfathers day the site was Common Land and did not support the volume of mature trees now established. Consequently the land was very wet. Water drained down from the area subsequently known as Blunts Farm, across the then entrance to Uddens House known as Uddens Drive and onto the proposed site. Lacking trees to drink the huge volumes of water following the natural lie of the landscape, it then made its way to his own land which, in those days, was also poor common land. Consequently it drained from there via natural underwater pathways, onto the railway line. The railway had constructed their own systems for managing the huge volumes of water naturally making its way onto it from the surrounding area and accordingly, had a system of drainage and channels which were dug up and removed when the railway was no longer utilised. Even with the vast amount of mature trees now established on the proposed site, our land remains wet. Inspection will show that most of our field is actually moss and not grass. There is a pond in our woodland corner which fills throughout the winter or wet weather, overflows into our field and eventually, finds its way via underground pathways on its historical journey. The Water Board would confirm our meter is under water six months of the year and the water table is very high even in dry weather. We are unable to keep our pigs outside throughout the winter months as their higher plot turns into a mud filled swimming pool. We have major concerns that, with the removal of mature trees on the Blunts Farm site for industrial development, coupled with similar preparations to establish the Waste Unit adjacent to our land, much of our land will inevitably become waterlogged. When the Canford Bottom roundabout was built, apparently unforeseen problems with huge amounts of excess water created considerable money and time to manage. This problem will inevitably worsen again if a new tidal wave of unmanaged water finds its way across the area and follows the natural lie of the land towards it, with the extra costs that will involve. The building of Ferndown By Pass created many underwater springs as the water sought to re-establish itself and these will still require management. If the intention is to simply build a bund around the site, massive roofs and hard standing regularly generating potentially millions of litres of water without proper drainage, a swimming pool effect will form within it and engulf surrounding land. We have grave concerns that this would be to the detriment of our land, causing it to be unusable at best, and compromising our house at worst. We would seek your reassurance in writing that this massive volume of water and its management has been taken into consideration. <b>OBJECTION: INSUFFICIENT CIRCUMSTANCES TO DOWNGRADE GREEN BELT</b> For genuine reasons the whole area, including our land, has been designated Green Belt for many years. Originally White, our land has been re-graded to Green over time and we are happy with that restriction. However, swathes of land have been removed from the Green Belt by the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan. Most of it green fields or allotments, but this site is not only Green Belt it is also an area of woodland heavily used for recreation. When there appears to be no very special circumstances to warrant the release of this Green Belt land, can you please reassure us that a comprehensive search for alternative sites in the urban area, or alternate brown field sites took place and despite this amateurs perceived appearance to the contrary, no suitable site was identified especially when three of the five sites within the Consultation have actively requested it? <b>OBJECTION: INCINERATOR CHIMNEY FUMES, ASH AND POLLUTANTS</b> Installing an incinerator of sufficient magnitude to process waste from such a wide area will inevitably produce a mass of pollutants. The prevailing winds from the South West would spread chemical and unknown potentially carcinogenic or harmful fumes over dense residential areas and local schools. Whilst doubtless being assured this will not be the case, we would point out that the dangers of asbestos, smoking and other previously</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
---	--	--	---	---

accepted pollutants were originally assured but time has proven otherwise to the detriment of the health of thousands meanwhile. Most local people will remember the gentle aroma from time to time of coffee beans roasting back in the days of Keith Spicers factory on the Ferndown Industrial Estate, but the installation of a massive industrial chimney will ensure the dispersal of fully toxic fumes, no matter how well treated they may be, to a much wider community. How can we be assured as to the safety aspects of such an installation given that even a quick check on Google reveals a frightening amount of negative activity surrounding them? We also question what facilities would be in place to remove the resultant ash safely when transporting it through busy residential areas? **OBJECTION: ADDITIONAL OVERWHELMING VOLUME OF TRAFFIC AND ACCESS** As already mentioned the mass increase in commercial and private traffic accessing the site will impact hugely on roads already gridlocked for large parts of time. We feel the use of Uddens Drive as the main access for vehicles would lead to abject misery for those living and needing to travel along Wimborne Road East and West, both for volume of traffic and polluting fumes. Those of us living off Uddens Drive have, for decades lived happily alongside the traffic generated by Uddens Trading Estate and have only rarely encountered issues with it. We all recognise that Uddens Drive is totally unsuitable in its current rural form to support the amount of traffic which would be generated and still allow ease of access to our homes/work places. Local roads are a totally unsuitable access to support this project. **OBJECT: COMPROMISE OF RECREATIONAL LAND** The people of Ferndown, Longham, Stapehill, Canford Bottom and Colehill use this area of woodland which balances pathways and a plethora of wildlife and fauna. It has been adopted by the local people for decades and is used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders, wheel chair users and families. Some paths are wet in bad weather but, by building up the paths, the Castlemain Trailway remains an all-weather track enabling people to enjoy it all year round. It is the only patch of woodland accessible to the South of the A31 so people do not have to drive to find space to walk. The only other space to the south of the A31 is Ferndown Common (an International Designated Heath) which is not only a Protected Site but is badly eroded and hazardous to walk in wet weather. Equally, the Stour Valley does not have to be flooded to be impassable due to deep mud. The Forestry Commission have worked closely with the Friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands for the past few years to enhance the area and create a community volunteer group, which they have supported with the aid of Grants and input to monthly work parties. Consequently the already busy footfall has increased dramatically and from a wide catchment area, giving it a valuable potential SANG function. Both EDDC and local Council Grants have helped to support the woodland schemes. The Barn Nursery School regularly uses the area to the benefit of its children who thereby nurture a love of natural open spaces and experience the joy of freedom, fresh air and exercise. The area is already shown as part of the Open Space provision for Ferndown but these Plans fail to recognise Open Space Provision and the value of Green Spaces to both physical and mental wellbeing within Evaluating Health and Wellbeing Outcomes for Community Growing Programmes. May we assume there has been a properly prepared landscape impact assessment? **OBJECTION: CASTLEMAIN TRAILWAY ACCESS COMPROMISED** With the Castlemain Trailway running through the site, it encourages not just the fitter and more robust forms of exercisers transferring to the North side of the Forestry, but the children, elderly or disabled users who enjoy a smaller, calmer and the perception of safer gentler usage of the woodland. The picnic tables and natural play areas are in constant use throughout the seasons and are enjoyed by some of those working on the Industrial Estates, along with vans parking in Uddens Drive in their lunch breaks. All users enjoy the sights and sounds of the plethora of some rarer and protected wildlife and fauna. We can only imagine the Castlemain Trailway would be shifted alongside some enormous bund with a few trees strategically planted for decoration, to allow access to the footbridge crossing the A31? This is NOT a solution as the admitted 100 lorry and potential 540 car journeys daily with the transfer of Brook Roads 100,000 apparent annual use, will deter all but the most hardened enthusiasts prepared to run the gauntlet of traffic and pollution to seek it. Meanwhile, the potential for most other current users would be to seek further outlets and would inevitably make their way to other local areas already listed as being under threat/protection. **OBJECTION: MASSIVE POTENTIAL INFLUX OF VERMIN AND SMELLS** As smallholders running livestock freely on the land adjacent to the proposed site, we have a constant campaign to manage vermin and therefore have massive concerns as to the inevitable increase the Waste Plant will undoubtedly generate. We know ourselves that simply putting down a few rat boxes and keeping them filled with poison, is insufficient to eliminate even a small problem. Given the inevitable fetid smells which will generate from the site, the rat problem would pale alongside the potential influx of flies to the area as they are impossible to control, much less eradicate. To magnify that potential to such a level renders it impossible to give assurances that the horrendous prospect of fetid smells actively encouraging plagues of rats and flies to the area is truly horrific and we are well aware that there are no reassurances able to be given that this problem would, or even

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
				<p>could, be managed sufficiently to stem concerns. OBJECTION: INCREASE OF NOISE AND LIGHT POLLUTION It is inevitable that the area being used 365/24/7 will increase both noise and light pollution to local residents. Whilst we have all happily tolerated the odd bangs and crashes generated from the local Industrial Estates over the years, this has never been an issue. However, the inevitable noise and light pollution constantly generated will take yet another toll on the health and wellbeing of local residents already struggling with the issues listed and having no escape. What provision has been made to reduce the impact of noise and light pollution both on local residents and the abundant night foraging wild life? CONCERNS: CONCLUSION We would question the need for any waste disposal facility of this magnitude in one area and the wisdom of spewing potentially harmful fumes over an area filled with schools, residents and businesses, clogging up roadways and risking disease and pollution. However, when other sites have been put forward by their owners and already include a suitable infra structure, we fail to understand why Uddens has already been listed as the Preferred Site and are concerned there seems to be an element of Pre-Determination despite there being a large number of factors against it. The planned mass destruction of an amenity enjoyed by the wider community is a clear and important harm on many levels. It also appears to take little or no consideration of a raft of its own Criteria and contradicts its own previously published Representations to the detriment of the environment, residents from both the local and wider area and those already going about their daily lives commercially. We would ask that you reconsider the many and varied environmental issues and the very real cost implications of waterways being managed appropriately.</p>	
Wessex Water	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP760	Comment	<p>There is an existing 700mm diameter public water main which borders the southern extent of the site. There must be no construction within 6 metres of this main; protection measures to be agreed during and after construction. Connections to public foul and water supply services are available in the adjacent Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estate. Surface water will be treatment appropriately on site and discharged to local watercourse with approval from the appropriate Authorities. There must be no surface water connections to the local existing public sewerage networks.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP785	Disagree	I and my family are opposed to the location of the bulky waste treatment facility including an incinerator in Cannon Hill. We live in Colehill, and I work on the Ferndown Industrial Estate. Although I do see the benefit or relocating the facilities of Brook Road to the proposed site which is potentially more accessible and encouraging to recycling. If the development as proposed goes ahead, the chimney and fumes of the incinerator chimney will add pollution to Colehill and Wimborne including proposed new housing developments to the NW of Wimborne. Further land is already at a premium around Ferndown Industrial Estate and Uddens Industrial estate where there is a lack of land available to be developed for industrial purposes. Following the vote to leave the EU we should be maximising the investment in industrial land for manufacturing to export not using the land to burn our rubbish	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Ferndown & Uddens BID Ltd	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP590	Disagree	The Ferndown & Uddens Business Improvement District (BID) represents the 350 levy paying businesses that are based on the Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates. The BID came into effect on 1st September 2014 following a vote by potential levy payers supporting the aims of the BID Business Plan. Key amongst those objectives was the ambition to raise the profile of the estates as a place to do business. The BID objects to the variety of Waste allocations in the Ferndown area of search. The proposals are contrary to, and inconsistent with the main strategic policy objectives of the local authorities, the Ferndown & Uddens BID and the local area that seeks to develop a more prosperous economy in that: The scale of the cumulative Waste facility proposals for the Ferndown area are excessive and will amount to around 1/4 of the total allocation of Blunts Farm. This site was only taken out of the Green Belt and allocated for employment purposes because of the overriding need to provide additional (not replacement) employment land. The development of all the proposed waste uses in the Plan materially change the character of that site making it less attractive to quality employers to invest and provide the high value jobs sought by the local authorities and the local population. It is understood that the development of a Household Recycling Facility is the greatest priority for this area of search. In this context the development of such a facility is particularly highlighted. The development of such a facility on the existing and allocated employment sites would be inconsistent and incompatible with the fundamental policy that seeks to encourage a more prosperous economy. The use and, in particular, the number of vehicle movements attracted by such a new facility would be detrimental to the operation of the existing businesses on the estates many of which are large, high quality employers with international reputations and export importance. The location of such a facility would set back the collaborative objective of businesses on the estates, expressed through the establishment of a Business Improvement District, of raising the image of the estates and likely discourage future investment, much of which can be expected from abroad. Businesses working together with partner organisations recognise the need to reverse the implied view that industrial estates are the "dumping ground" for those uses that are considered difficult to locate elsewhere but rather are major assets for the community as locations for employment that house modern businesses that are valued and encouraged to invest to improve productivity and increase the opportunities to provide high quality jobs. A new Household Recycling Facility, based on the historic information from the existing site in Wimborne, can reasonably be expected to generate around 250,000 car and van movements a year with a large number of additional lorry movements. The infrastructure on the existing industrial estates is not designed to accommodate such a large additional number. This is a reflection that the estates have developed piecemeal fashion over the last 60 years as the estates with no master-plan and inadequate parking to meet demand. As a result informal parking on the majority of roads is required to ensure the basic operation of businesses. There is no capacity to accommodate the stacking of vehicles on the highway wishing to gain access to these sites which is a feature of this type of facility.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP715	Comment	I read with disbelief about the proposal to locate a household recycling centre, a bulky waste transfer and waste treatment facility with a 40metre chimney blowing carcinogenic material over the area, on land comprising Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands, Dorset. This unspoilt area of green belt Woodland and open area is enjoyed for quiet recreation by many people of all ages. In addition, it provides home and shelter to many species of wildlife. Access could only be off the A31 Ferndown bypass or the Wimborne Road West both busy routes. The volume and type of traffic this proposal would generate would make these roads even more difficult for residents and through traffic. Bearing in mind the proximity of this proposed site to residents, Ferndown and Uddens Industrial estates and the Canford bottom roundabout, I believe this proposal must not become a reality.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP696	Disagree	The north-east part of this proposed site includes the whole of SU00/060 Ferndown Bypass Site of Nature Conservation Interest. This site comprises dry and wet heathland/acid grassland mosaic habitat running between the bypass and the dismantled railway line. This habitat is fragile and vulnerable, and the site forms an important link to the nearby Slop Bog and Uddens Heath SSSI. Dorset Wildlife Trust wants to see the whole of the SNCI removed from the proposed site, and with a buffer to ensure no adverse effects on the SNCI from future waste transfer/treatment facilities on the site. It would be preferable if the whole of the triangle of land between the old railway line and the bypass from the southern boundary of the SNCI north-eastwards were removed from the proposed site. If opportunities arise during the term of the plan for a waste facility within the existing Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estate, DWT would welcome this, and regard it as much preferable to development of the land to the south-west within the area of search, at Cannon Hill Plantation, which is Green Belt land containing mixed plantation woodland, and therefore clearly of considerably higher wildlife value. Additionally the displacement of the considerable amount of informal recreation which is practiced on the land to the SW of Blunts Farm would have the potential to impact upon the nearby internationally designated heathlands sites.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised Further thought will be given to removing the SNCI from the Area of Search and the provision of an appropriate buffer.

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP888	Comment	<p>WP01 Ferndown area of Search &amp; Blunts Farm, (originally WP ED02): Chapters 5, 6 &amp; 10 in the Update On the whole, we in EDFoE are pleased with the Officers response to comments on this site. We agree that house prices are not generally a land planning issue but all social, environmental and economic issues should inform the underlying strategy, as they are the starting point for sustainable development. Please exclude the following areas: The area to the East of Blunts Farm, marked in brown on your map as an area of nature conservation interest (SNCI), between the A31 and the disused railway (not marked on your map but it divides the industrial estate from Blunts Farm). This plot is of importance to nature and is close to the Slop Bog/Uddens Heath SSSI. We welcome the planner's intention to protect this area, to include a buffer to it and to link it, if possible, to the SSSI. Please also exclude any land to the West of Uddens Drive; this is green belt and should remain so. If East Dorset Council and the Forestry Commission succeed in having it withdrawn from the green belt, then it should be light commerce, not waste management. Incineration Waste burning must not happen in this area. As we pointed out in our response to para 1.1, we are strongly opposed to any waste burning on the site but if the WPA permits this, it should be in conjunction with CHP. We do not oppose pyrolysis &amp; gasification and we support anaerobic digestion of (mostly) uncontaminated organic waste. We are happy with a link to Uddens Way but feel that access via Nimrod Way is better.</p>	<p>Consideration will be given to the removal of the SNCI and the Green Belt land from the Area of Search in the final Plan.</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP680	Disagree	<p>I have a number of concerns regarding the plan and the effect it will have on the areas adjacent to the proposed site. Road congestion, with regular traffic jams' is already a serious problem in Wimborne Road East/West and Ferndown bypass both leading up to the Canford Bottom roundabout. The access requirements to the new site by many thousands of extra vehicle journeys each year can only exacerbate the congestion problem. This could reach unmanageable levels if the Brook Road site is closed. I understand this could mean an extra 100,000 car trips from Wimborne across the roundabout the new proposed sites. National road networking authorities spent millions of pounds on the Canford Bottom roundabout. This project was paid for to improve the flow of the heavy traffic load through Ferndown to the west country especially at holiday times. This national project was to benefit the local area as well as the national as a whole. It seems perverse that a localised plan to massively increase traffic volumes at this roundabout should frustrate this national planning. To avoid the roundabout, a large proportion of the traffic from Bournemouth, Poole and Christchurch could use Stapehill Road as a short cut through to Uddens Drive. This road is very narrow and currently has a vehicle weight restriction imposed on it. However, a substantial increase in car traffic on this road would be dangerous. This would not only apply to the residents but the many visitors to national tourist attraction at Knoll Gardens. Traffic trying to cross Wimborne Road West to Uddens Drive would cause much congestion as well as increasing the possibility of car accidents considerably. A new set of traffic lights could of course make it safer. However this would increase traffic congestion considerably in Wimborne Road West. There would now be two sets of traffic lights within 100metres of each other. The East Dorset area has the largest population of people aged over 65 in the country. The higher health problems and service requirements of this elderly population already places a great burden on local services and the NHS. Extra traffic can only worsen the level of bad air pollution in the area. This must adversely affect the fragile health of this older population many of whom have respiratory problems. Not only will this cause distress to local residents but put an intolerable extra burden on the already overstretched local services. In Wimborne Road East, we have one of the larger school sites in Ferndown. During the 40+ week academic year, both early morning and mid-afternoon there is a steady flow of young people walking beside and crossing the road. Whether the road crossing is controlled or made recklessly, the danger of accidents offered by extra traffic movement is apparent and well documented. I understand a number of young people suffer from asthma and related health problems which will be detrimentally affected by increased air pollution. Within the proposal are plans to build an incinerator with accompanying 40 metre chimney. The prevailing wind in the area is west, right across the heavily populated areas of Ferndown. Smell and pollution are a known feature of these incinerator sites. The operation can only be viable if it operates 24 hours/7 days a week. Apart from the smell and pollution created by such an operation, the noise pollution across a heavy populated area like Ferndown for 24 hrs a day would be totally unacceptable for community living. The prevailing wind would further accentuate these problems to the Ferndown population further increasing health and social problems in the area. The population will not be able to negate these negative problems by recreational activity. One of the major recreational areas south of the A31 will be swallowed up to accommodate the proposed plan. Residents will thus not only lose access to the Cannon Hill and Uddens site but the safe access to wider recreational areas reached by use of this site. No absolute guarantee can be given with regard to the control of vermin. It is stated that the waste will be kept within buildings and the walls would act as a barrier and deterrent to vermin movement. Householders for many centuries have tried to stop vermin entering and leaving their homes at will. It is highly unlikely that the proprietors of the waste site will be any more successful. Surrounding the industrial estate is green belt land and this could act as a breeding site for the vermin. How far the vermin will travel after they mature is very much a matter for conjecture. I trust the points raised by myself and others will make the waste planning team consider that the environmental and health impact of their waste plans in the proposed WP01 area are too great to consider as a viable option.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP724	Disagree	<p>We live within the proposed affected area of the new treatment plant at Uddens Wood. We live on an unmade road with no speed limit that links Wimborne Road West and Stapehill Road as we are close to the junction to the industrial estate our road is regularly used as a cut through. All the residents in the road object to this situation and are very concerned that the added pressure on the roads adjacent to the industrial estate will just increase the pressure on the roads in the area and therefor adding to the pressure on the residents in Award Road. As things stand at the moment, the pressure on the road system between 7.30am and 9.15am and 4.30 and 6.30pm means all the road system is completely blocked. By adding this recycle plant to the area it will mean that there will be no break from the traffic jams for the whole day and increased pressure at busy times. The residents maintain this road and we cannot control the amount of traffic and the speed they drive, there are families with children and elderly residents that live in the road which will make it increasingly unsafe to walk and drive in the road.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP609	Disagree	<p>There is no road capacity to take this proposed development. No more development without infrastructure. It is in no way acceptable to residents, whom are supposed to be the council's customers.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Individual</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WP591</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Disagree</p> <p>The proposed use of this site is entirely without merit. 1. Inadequate transport links The A31 is notorious throughout Hampshire and East Dorset for congestion and accidents. Especially at commuter time and during the holiday season, the A31 barely copes with the weight of traffic on it and long queues can build up, especially between the David Phipps roundabout and the Canford Bottom Roundabout (CBR) “exactly where this sites extra traffic would be concentrated. I notice, looking at Dorset County Councils twitter feed today (for the first time), that there are constant tweets about accidents and delays on the A31. So DCC should be aware that the A31 makes this proposal unworkable. The CBR has long been a bottleneck. Improvements were made in 2012 with the installation of some 70 sets of traffic lights to support the redevelopment of the CBR into a hamburger junction with the A31 through the middle and local roads circulating the outside. In spite of this, long queues still build up particularly on the A31, on the carriageway of Ham Lane from Longham to the CBR and on the carriageway of Wimborne Road West from Ferndown towards the CBR where I have observed long queues stretching back past Uddens Drive even in times of otherwise light traffic, when the opposite carriageway moves freely “and this happens at unpredictable times, not just during the rush hour. This situation will not improve. In 2012 I asked the Highways Agency if they would return after completion of the CBR junction; test queue lengths against the shorter projected ones they had modelled and published; and tweak the junction to make sure queue lengths actually matched the projections. The answer was, No. Residents from Wimborne and Colehill (including the planned, large housing developments) would be driving round the CBR in huge numbers to get to a HRC and then trying to get out of Uddens Drive, turning right towards the CBR to get home. This would be an almost impossible task, whether traffic is moving or stationary on Wimborne Road West. An added problem is Stapehill Road, which joins Wimborne Road West virtually opposite Uddens Drive: the combination of the three roads is already recognised as a danger point, and adding in so many extra vehicles would be unwise. Anyone who lives and travels in this area knows that the road network here is at breaking point. Nobody who understood this would propose the development at Uddens. It must go elsewhere. 2. Proximity to housing, workplaces, nurseries, etc. It cannot be right to put tips and incinerators so close to settlements. The associated unpleasantness and health risks (smells, noise, vermin, airborne pollution, possible toxins, etc., as well as spoiling the landscape) mean that any such facilities should be sited where the fewest people will be affected by them. The site at Uddens is surrounded by Colehill, Wimborne, Ferndown and Longham, as well as smaller settlements such as Stapehill and Hampreston. As well as a lot of housing, there is an industrial estate, schools, pubs, farms, garden centres, etc. near the site. In a rural county like Dorset, there must be places where few if any people will be affected by the health risks associated with waste disposal: waste facilities should be sited there. 3. Destruction of a community amenity The site at Uddens Woods (referred to in this document as land SW of Blunts Farm) is not some random, disused area ripe for development. It’s a mature forest, part of the Cannon Hill and Uddens Plantation, the two parts of which are linked by a bridge over the A31. It’s been a recognised community resource for more than 30 years, used by thousands of people for activities as diverse as dog walking, rambling, cycling, horse riding, photography, painting, birdwatching and simply for the enjoyment of being in the countryside. The local community support the forest by joining regular work parties organised by the Friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands, in conjunction with the Forestry Commission, to improve the plantation for residents use. There’s a trailway through it. For many people, the forest is the reason we chose to live here. It’s the only amenity we have; we need this amenity, and there is no reason to put waste facilities here when they could just as easily go elsewhere. In planning terms, if this is taken away, people will have to get in their cars to find other open spaces to use, which will also increase pressure on those spaces. 4. Use of green belt land The forest at Uddens forms part of the Green Belt and therefore should not be touched. The argument for using Uddens Woods is very peculiar. It seems to go: We wanted to put the waste facility on Blunts Farm, but that was green belt, so it was disallowed; now Blunts Farm is no longer green belt, so we want to put it there, but the owner said no, so we want to put it in Uddens Woods. BUT UDDENS WOODS ARE GREEN BELT, TOO! This makes no sense whatsoever. It’s my understanding that if green belt land like this is taken away from a community, the community must be given similar land of equal or greater value as an amenity. Where are you going to find the same area of mature forest rich in biodiversity, right on our doorstep, to give to our community? You can’t. This proposal must be disallowed. 5. Destruction of a forest rich in biodiversity The plantation supports an amazing array of wildlife, including protected species such as bats. The fauna in this area include deer, squirrel, bat, mouse, vole, shrew, grass snake, slow worm, frog, toad and many different types of birds, dragonflies, butterflies, moths and beetles. Walking in the woods, one sees an amazing number of different fungi. It would be criminal to destroy this habitat and kill off all of this wildlife. Let’s not have any box-ticking nonsense about reptile surveys and the like. It would simply be wholesale destruction,</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
---	--	--	---	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
				<p>and it must not go ahead. 6. Local residents not informed of these proposals I only learned of the proposals and the consultation from an article in a local community magazine. There was no personal notification from Dorset County Council, even though I live next to Cannon Hill plantation and a couple of minutes away from the CBR. On seeing the article, I looked at the News page of the council's website and only found articles about Weymouth and two items exhorting people to cycle and to walk in the woods with their children "both activities which many people here love to do in Uddens and Cannon Hill Woods. To me this was the height of hypocrisy. I've seen no posters, leaflets, notices on lampposts, meetings or roadshows about this. DCCs news-sheet Your Dorset arrived last week and I can't find anything in that. The only publicity I've found is multiple tweets about commenting on the Waste Plan- and that's because today I was trying to find anything DCC had said about it, for the purposes of this comment. I feel the council has failed in its duty and acted unfairly towards residents. 7. Previous proposal disallowed A similar proposal was disallowed in 2006. This document makes no mention of the history of this proposal, and there is no acknowledgement of the strong local opposition to the previous proposal. 8. Proposal is contrary to government guidelines Considering Uddens Woods, this proposal is contrary to many sections of the governments National Planning Policy Framework, including #69 Planning policies and decisions; should aim to achieve places which promote opportunities for meetings between members of the community who might not otherwise come into contact with each other; safe and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas. #70 To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should; guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs #73 Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. #74 Existing open space; should not be built on; #75 Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. #80 Green Belt serves five purposes: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; — to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; — to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; — to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and — to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. #81 Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. #83 Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. Please summarise as: Transport links in this area already at breaking point and will not be improved. Residents and workers health and enjoyment of homes/workplaces would be adversely affected by smell, noise, pollution "facilities should be sited away from centres of population. Proposal would mean the destruction of a green belt forest rich in biodiversity which has been a much-used, well-loved community amenity for 30+ years. Local residents not adequately informed of these proposals. Previous proposal disallowed amid strong local opposition. Proposal is contrary to government guidelines on community resources and the green belt.</p>	
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP649	Disagree	<p>Proposal for Waste Management Site - Ref ED02 Blunts Farm - near Ferndown Industrial Site I had hoped to make my objection to this proposal using the dedicated website but I encountered difficulties so I am submitting a written statement. I wish to concur with the enclosed letter from the Stour and Avon Magazine dated 1/7/2016 entitled 'Diplorable Proposal' written by Derek Bradbury of Wimborne. I wish to object to this proposal myself, on the grounds that: a) the waste handling facility will add traffic to the already busy A31 which is often congested in this area. b) this area is Green Belt and covered in trees currently c) this facility will contribute noise and pollution into the atmosphere close to those people working in the nearby Ferndown Industrial site.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP903	Disagree	<p>I do not believe that any development that impacts on Cannon Hill and Uddens woodland areas should be allowed to proceed. These are areas that are very precious to residents who use the plantation for recreation and to enjoy the wonderful heathland and biodiversity that both offer. Both should be protected against any form of industrialisation. Building waste handling facilities so close to housing and to people's place of work is unacceptable and will create an environment harmful to health and wellbeing. The access to the proposed sites is totally inadequate. The A31 is a notoriously busy road, suffers from severe congestion and is often the scene of accidents that cause road closures as well as long tail backs. Developing waste disposal sites here will increase the number of heavy vehicle movements going in and out of the site many times a day, 6 days a week. On top of that will be the domestic traffic using the recycling centres, many of them travelling significant distances to get there. It really is about time DCC started taking notice of the views of local residents whose lives will be disrupted by the proposed developments. People are tired of having these plans foisted on them when the overwhelming majority object. We all know we need good waste sites but the ones proposed at Cannon Hill and Uddens Plantations will do far more harm than good. LISTEN TO THE RESIDENTS WHO LIVE HERE AND WHOSE LIVES WILL BE EFFECTED!</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP800	Disagree	<p>RE Waste Plan - Ferndown Area. Including but not limited to Residual Waste Treatment, Bulky Waste Management, Household Recycling Centre, and Waste Vehicle Depot. From a Shareholder, owner, occupier, and executive director of Marden Edwards, 2 Nimrod Way, East Dorset Trade Park. I must strongly object to all the Waste Management options proposed for Blunts Farm and adjoining area. I have a duty of care for around 200 employees, and I take their Health, Safety, Welfare, and commute very seriously. If any development of Blunts Farm or adjoining area compromises their Health &amp; Safety, Welfare or Commute, or hinders our business in any way, then I shall need to consider moving the business. Before summarising my objections, I should point out that throughout every document you refer to the Ferndown Industrial Estate. To be factually correct, it is actually East Dorset Trade Park that is adjacent to Blunts Farm. The council sold the land at premium prices to select large business, with very strict development rules to ensure a prestige and upmarket feel to the area. It is not an Industrial area, and all the proposals for Blunts Farm would be inconsistent with the original objectives. Blunts Farm also being on a hill would make it an elevated eyesore. Traffic congestion is already atrocious in the immediate vicinity of East Dorset Trade Park and Ferndown Industrial Estate. The double yellow lines are not enforced, and the sections where there are no double yellow lines, such as outside Arena Business Centre, are magnets for accidents due to the narrowing of useable road on a junction - especially for large articulated lorries. This is already a hazard for employees, customers, visitors, goods in and out, and our fleet of business cars, vans and lorries. I would encourage cycling BUT the East Dorset Trade Park and Ferndown Industrial Estate are not safe for cyclists - even with current traffic loads. It should be noted that the infamous Canford Bottom roundabout is also close by, and would struggle with any extra traffic. There is also another significant development off of the Ferndown Industrial Estate that will put extra pressure on the local highways. It would appear that there are many uses being considered for Blunts Farm and adjoining areas. I am assuming that you still have and will refer to the objections raised about 10 years ago, as they are still all valid. I have taken the opportunity to attach details of one such objection [ours] that still applies and needs to be taken into consideration again. It must be stressed that the East Dorset Trade Park and Ferndown Industrial Estate has a high density of people during the day, which is when Waste Management activities are likely to be busiest. The prevailing wind direction is such that Blunts Farm and adjoining area is immediately upwind of the East Dorset Trade Park and Ferndown Industrial Estate. All toxic air pollution, particulates, chemicals, and smells would permeate and saturate all the business, adversely affecting the Health, Safety and Welfare of all employees in the area. Not far away are several pubs with gardens, schools, several retail stores and housing. I am concerned that not only would this unnecessarily eat into the green belt, but there are SSSIs and waterways to take into consideration. In the same way that I am concerned about air pollution affecting my employees and other people's health in the area, I am also concerned that pollutants will get into the waterways. Please also give some thought to effects of Brexit [business development and populations] and ongoing waste management education, as it is likely that any waste projections need to be adjusted. Do remember that statistics and promises by developers tend to be based on perfect and best case scenarios, which are probably rarely if ever achieved. Watercourses and air will get polluted through carelessness, neglect, accident and vandalism. The affects tend to be accumulative and can't be reversed. In a time when we are trying to protect the environment, inhabitants and people, we can't have a development in an area which jeopardises them. There must be sites that aren't green belt and aren't going to adversely affect so many people in the vicinity every day. It is unlikely that the decision makers will personally have to suffer, but please give some thought and consideration to those that will have to spend their life worried about what serious harm will come to them.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP555	Disagree	This area is part of the green belt and is the lungs of the country. It should be protected as a matter of priority. It is the home to a large number of different types of wildlife and plants. We should be protecting them before they become extinct. The woods are used by a large number of people, both young and old, in a diversity of ways. They are making this an asset to our community by providing seats etc. It would bring more large lorries and cars onto an already busy roads. This part of the A31 is on traffic reports several times a day as being very slow moving and any more lorries and cars would add to the problem. The junction onto the A31 is very dangerous and the site of fatal accident. A tall chimney will send bad smells over all the houses nearby and waste will attract vermin of all kinds. Leave Cannon Hill alone. It is an asset to Dorset as it is.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP581	Disagree	As a Ferndown Town councillor, I'd like to strongly object to the proposed site at Blunt's Farm. Many local residents have expressed concerns about noise, pollution, smells and traffic. Local roads will not be able to support the increased traffic levels. There are also concerns about the implications for public health on building an incinerator in a populated area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP589	Disagree	This is an unspoilt area of green belt woodland and open areas which benefits the local community as well as providing a habitat for many species. We need to protect such areas for future generations. Traffic would increase to an already busy area and there would be implications for the Canford Bottom junction which already struggles to cope in busy periods.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WVP604	Disagree	<p>I completely disagree with your proposals for a waste plan for this area. In Section 5 WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' you have said that "The Ferndown area is well located for a strategic site to serve the needs of Bournemouth Dorset and Poole ..." Following on you have said "Key Development Considerations - TBC" why is nothing further written here?? - Further information is therefore required. Ferndown is not "well located". It is not in central Dorset, but is within East of the County, so how can it be acceptable to bring in traffic from North/West Dorset? The extra time lost in transporting waste to Ferndown from North Dorset is so short sited and the additional traffic costs/fumes surely should be considered. From your map in point 4.4 I note all the Strategic Waste Facilities (Blue) are all to the East of the County - why??? I disagree with all aspects of the WPO1 proposals - Bulky Waste transfer/treatment, Residual Waste Treatment, HRC and Waste Vehicle Depot. There are several reasons I disagree with the waste proposals: - a) Traffic/Roads With an already choked road network, more so in the summer months, which has exasperated by the Canford Bottom "roundabout" which has caused such problems instead of easing/helping the local traffic as many HGV's and lorries avoid using the bypass and come through Ferndown, which cannot cope much longer with this. The access proposed through Uddens would not ease this situation and why would you not propose the access via the A31 - because it is ill planned. b) Forest/Heathland and many habitats and recreation area Local development is not permitted within specific distances of SSI's so how can a waste plant be acceptable?? Why would you even consider green belt when other areas could be looked at? It is so important to keep these areas safe from industrial development, when so many people use Cannon Hill Woodlands. There are many nesting birds and reptiles that have habitats in this area. c) Employment within Ferndown Industrial Estate. You say "the WPA has been made aware that as Blunts Farm is developed business currently located at Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates may choose to re-locate to Blunts Farm, opening up opportunities for the development of a waste facility." The key point is "may choose". Many companies will not relocate and some have other sites in other areas of the Country so will simply close their Ferndown site. The local employment will fall for local residents. How can this be acceptable in such uncertain times?? EDDC and DCC must take into consideration all the views and comments made during this consultation. There should also be a well-advertised public meeting to address some questions not answered.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP607	Disagree	<p>I completely disagree with your proposals for a waste plan for this area. In Section 5 WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' you have said that "The Ferndown area is well located for a strategic site to serve the needs of Bournemouth Dorset and Poole ...". Following on you have said "Key Development Considerations - TBC" why is nothing further written here?? - Further information is therefore required. Ferndown is not "well located". It is not in central Dorset, but is within East of the County, so how can it be acceptable to bring in traffic from North/West Dorset? The extra time lost in transporting waste to Ferndown from North Dorset is so short sited and the additional traffic costs/fumes surely should be considered. From your map in point 4.4 I note all the Strategic Waste Facilities (Blue) are all to the East of the County - why??? I disagree with all aspects of the WPO1 proposals - Bulky Waste transfer/treatment, Residual Waste Treatment, HRC and Waste Vehicle Depot. There are several reasons I disagree with the waste proposals: - a) Traffic/Roads With an already choked road network, more so in the summer months, which has exasperated by the Canford Bottom "roundabout" which has caused such problems instead of easing/helping the local traffic as many HGV's and lorries avoid using the bypass and come through Ferndown, which cannot cope much longer with this. The access proposed through Uddens would not ease this situation and why would you not propose the access via the A31 - because it is ill planned. b) Forest/Heathland and many habitats and recreation area Local development is not permitted within specific distances of SSI's so how can a waste plant be acceptable?? Why would you even consider green belt when other areas could be looked at? It is so important to keep these areas safe from industrial development, when so many people use Cannon Hill Woodlands. There are many nesting birds and reptiles that have habitats in this area. c) Employment within Ferndown Industrial Estate. You say "the WPA has been made aware that as Blunts Farm is developed business currently located at Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates may choose to re-locate to Blunts Farm, opening up opportunities for the development of a waste facility." The key point is "may choose". Many companies will not relocate and some have other sites in other areas of the Country so will simply close their Ferndown site. The local employment will fall for local residents. How can this be acceptable in such uncertain times?? EDDC and DCC must take into consideration all the views and comments made during this consultation. There should also be a well-advertised public meeting to address some questions not answered.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP612	Disagree	<p>The proposed location of a waste treatment plant with incinerator is not appropriate for Blunts Farm and certainly not for the green belt land to the SW of Blunts Farm for the following reasons: Risk to health from air pollution affecting numerous residential areas in the immediate locality due to prevailing winds. Loss of green belt forest which is continuously visited, enjoyed and maintained by a large number of local residents and visitors. The area is habitat for a variety of wildlife including protected species of bats. There is no reasonable access for waste vehicle traffic. The local roads are already overwhelmed with traffic from the industrial estates and passing traffic on the A31, with large queues forming for Canford Bottom roundabout during all peak times. This will be exacerbated by any additional traffic and increase the risk to health of local residents from increased exhaust emissions.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP616	Disagree	I strongly object to the new waste and recycling plant being situated near Blunts farm ref WP01. Not only do I find the proposal a blatant contradiction of government restrictions on the use of green belt land, it would clearly be damaging to local residents use and enjoyment of said land as well as financially limiting the development and prosperity of the local area. Any such plans privately would constitute a public nuisance.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP629	Disagree	We are very disappointed that this proposal is being reconsidered. The site is due west of Ferndown in the direction of the usual prevailing winds. This would bring airborne smells and pollution directly to our homes. This is before we consider the impact on the already hopeless road system. Try to go either down ferndown bypass or Wimborne road west. Or try the Wimborne bypass in either direction! On 90% of occasions you need to allow at least an extra 30 minutes for your trip. Add a waste recycling site to this and it will just be gridlock. Do not proceed with this site as it will overload an already saturated road system.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP654	Disagree	Re: development proposal to build a Dorset wide transfer station and waste incineration facility at Cannon Hill south (preferred site) or south west of Blunts Farm & Uddens plantation. We found out about this proposal only a few days ago, not by being respectfully informed but from reading the letters to the editor page in the Blackmore Vale Magazine. We strongly object to the proposals for the following reasons: 1. Noting that these facilities are intended to serve Dorset as a whole and that income from small traders and leisure facilities are important for local jobs and local taxes, anything that obstructs what is already an inadequate road network cannot be good for Dorset. 2. To consider placing such a large waste incinerator facility so close to such a highly and expanding populated area, with all the risks of combustion effluents, given the regularity of the westerly winds descending on the population, including schools, nurseries and old people's homes, etc., we consider irresponsible, particularly at a time it is nationally recognised we need to support and enhance the health of the younger and older generations. 3. The loss of rare species such as wild orchids and beautiful special woodland which is vital for walkers, dog users, cyclists and horse riders etc. to keep healthy, plus the mobility of wild species moving between wooded areas to east and west. 4. When the wind is in a westerly direction, especially in the autumn, we note that the area of special scientific interest called Slop Bog is liable to be contaminated from combustion effluents, without the apparent consideration for the inevitable drop in property values in the area, can local people expect to be compensated financially should this dreadful proposal go ahead. Thank you for taking our comments on board.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP658	Disagree	<p>Regarding the recent proposal to establish a Waste Vehicle Depot, Household Recycling Centre and a bulky waste transfer and treatment facility on the green belt Uddens Woodland area would add serious problems to an area that is mainly residential. Wimborne and its surrounding area are already fast disappearing under bricks and mortar with a huge amount of building in the pipeline. A smelly noisy waste dump of this scale will be one more horror in what was a lovely area to live in. Any woodland is hugely valuable to people and wildlife alike, and therefore should be preserved. The volume of traffic crossing the Canford Bottom roundabout is already causing huge problems with vehicle noise and exhaust fumes. If a waste dump is sited in the same area the infrastructure would be totally overwhelmed by many extra lorries and cars visiting the site daily and gridlock would ensue. As for the fallout fumes from the huge chimney blanketing the area, it does not bear thinking about. Ask yourselves, please, would you honestly want to live in such an area? Please please preserve this woodland and find another site for such a large facility. It is so important to us who live here and absolutely vital to our precious and fast declining wildlife.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP661	Disagree	<p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Draft Waste Plan Update which I have recently viewed on the internet but prefer to make my comments by letter. I appreciate the need for a more substantial waste/recycling plant as we producing more products and packaging which require, where at all possible, to be disposed of in a more environmentally friendly manner. I would however ask the question as to why the Uddens Industrial Estate has been 'earmarked' as an alternative to the previously suggested Blunts Farm site. It is my concern that the Uddens site would result in a huge increase in traffic on an already busy road - Wimborne Road West - which I understand the bypass was built to relieve. It does so, to a certain extent, but I am assured that many satellite navigational systems do not consider the bypass as an alternative to driving through Ferndown on either of its two roads. I feel that large vehicles would increase the traffic on Wimborne Road West detrimentally to Ferndown and feel that the previously suggested site, Blunts Farm, some 8 yrs ago, would be far better served by the Ferndown bypass to divert traffic from populated areas. I, in the most strong terms, also object to the proposal's inclusion of an incinerator. It is acknowledged that waste incinerator systems produce a wide variety of pollutants which are detrimental to human health. Incinerators release TOXIC METALS, DIOXINS, AND ACID GASES. Burning plastic is recognisably carcinogenic and it would be highly irresponsible for DCC to proceed with this proposal. Our children and our grandchildren will suffer from the ill effects of an incinerator on or near the environment in which they live and which the council is bound to protect for generations to come.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP664	Disagree	As a resident of Stapehill, I wish to strongly object to your proposal for an industrial incinerator and waste treatment at Uddens Drive. The woodlands are used for recreation for the people of the local area and should be developed for this use not waste disposal. The traffic on Wimborne Road West is often jammed from Canford Bottom roundabout (whoever thought this up?) all the way back to the Old Thatch. There are numerous accidents at this crossroads, a waste lorry nearly killed me last week! So I'm certain increased traffic and lorries are inappropriate. Green Belt building at Stapehill Abbey will impact this traffic flow and strain local resources. I cannot see any benefit in employment for the area. I therefore object.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP667	Disagree	I have viewed the information contained on the website re the above waste plan but prefer to send a written response. I understand and accept the need for a new waste/recycling plant although I would ask why this site has been chosen in place of the Blunts Farm site. The Uddens site would result in a huge increase in traffic on an already busy road, Wimborne Road West, which the bypass was built to relieve. It does so admirably and I do not understand why it is deemed appropriate to increase the traffic on Wimborne Road West when an appropriate site is already identified and which would be served by Ferndown bypass. However, my main objection to this proposal is the inclusion of an incinerator. It is acknowledged that waste incinerator systems produced a wide variety of pollutants which are detrimental to human health. Incinerators release TOXIC METAL, DIOXINS, AND ACID GASES. Burning plastics is recognisably carcinogenic and it would be highly irresponsible for DCC to proceed with this proposal. Our children and our grandchildren will suffer from the ill effects of an incinerator on or near the environment in which they live and which the council is bound to protect for generations to come.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP671	Disagree	As a retired consultant physician, I read with great concern that the woodland area at Uddens Drive south of the A31 near the old Thatch and accessed by Wimborne Road West, is the present County Council's preferred site for the development of an industrial waste treatment centre. This includes a 70-100m high chimney for the incinerator. I cannot believe the County Council expects to execute this. I oppose most strongly for the following reasons: 1. This land is part of the green belt woodland south of the A31 forming part of the Cannon Hill/Uddens Plantation. Loss of land which currently promotes better health through cycling and walking activities. 2. Biodiversity and plants and animals. 3. The site is very close and adjacent to residential and workplace areas. 4. The prevailing south/south west winds will distribute particulate matter and fumes to these area in (3) and beyond. 5. The passage of additional heavy lorries through residential areas, increasing traffic flow on an already very congested A31, Canford Bottom roundabout, Uddens Drive, and Wimborne Road West. To avoid heavy traffic flow and A31 congestion, lorries would take alternative routes through residential areas with associated increases in noise and pollution. 6. As a physician, I strongly object because of the potential adverse effects on health caused by diesel fumes; particulate emissions from the incinerator, fumes from same and increased traffic noise. All these are known to affect health and are detrimental. This site is completely unsuitable. The Council needs to rethink.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP677	Disagree	<p>Proposed Waste Plan for Ferndown (Blunts Farm and associated area) Site Ref. WP01 I am writing to register my objections to the proposed plans for waste at the above site. I have looked at the overall plan for Dorset and noticed as usual that nothing on the scale proposed for Ferndown is listed anywhere else in the county. Do you think that because it is mainly an elderly population that we do not care or you can slip this under the mat as your attempts at notification are laughable. I have been informed that Facebook and Twitter will carry the latest news. They are not the tool of information for most people and even the younger generation would not think to check the plans via this method. You state that after exhaustive searches these sites have been selected for suitability. How can anyone think it suitable to impose a site of this scale on the edge of a growing town and pollute the air quality for the population? The traffic around Ferndown is already gridlocked on many occasions and the addition of 100,000 plus vehicles for a Household Recycling Centre plus the waste vehicles returning frequently to offload their collections will create more congestion. Air pollution from these vehicles will also affect the health of local residents who often walk along the routes taken. The HRC along with the recycling, sorting, building, will create an environment for vermin and the smell from so much rubbish will make life very unpleasant for residents nearby. It is also proposed for an incinerator again to deal with the waste for the whole of Dorset. This was stated to be totally unacceptable in the last plan in 2005/6 by the Government Inspector and nothing has changed. This would not be conducive for anyone planning to open a business on the Trading Estate. It beggars belief that anyone could possibly think this is a good idea. The only place for a super waste site is far away in open countryside away from any residential population. We have more than enough open space in Dorset or will it be too near Dorchester. It appears that when any undesirable site is required be it a gypsy site or waste disposal, then Ferndown is first choice. Until the plans are more explicit then our objections are of a general nature but these will be firmed up at the next stage.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP712	Disagree	<p>There is already Hilliards Waste Disposal unit near the A31 end of the estate Whittle Road, causing an enormous amount of disruption, rubbish and traffic behind caterpillar business. The area is filthy and very unhygienic without any extra lorry delivery. The queues of traffic reach the full length from the Ringwood Road roundabout to Canford Bottom roundabout NOW, and trying to get out of Cobham Road Industrial Estate is ridiculous at present. Without even considering holiday traffic.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP718	Disagree	<p>More heavy lorries. Exhaust fumes. Smoke from chimney plus smells. Schools in the area. House prices will drop. I do not think an incinerator should be built in an urban area. What about the health of the public.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP721	Disagree	Ferndown Industrial Estate already has a privately owned recycle centre, causing huge traffic congestion and rubbish scattered along the road to the site. We cannot accept more traffic from Dorset, Bournemouth and Poole on the roads, used by school children, cyclists and elderly. Currently traffic jams can cause a 10minute journey to take up to one hour as well as schools and residential properties within the one mile radius. IT is unacceptable and unnecessary to accept the rest of the south coast waste just because the council may make some money out of it and solve their immediate problems. Whilst making these plans out of the public eye. I have only found out these proposals this month (July) and met no-one who knew about these plans in West Moors or Ferndown.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP733	Disagree	Since your last try about a waste dump and high chimney 70-100m high, so much has happened in Ferndown and Wimborne. Many homes have been built, more people and cars on the road, care homes have been built - one near the site. So many planes going over Ferndown large and small. The roads around here won't stand for big lorries, they are in a bad state. We have school in Ferndown and so many children. They are our future, and so is their health is our priority.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP743	Disagree	My wife and I object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to site a Waste Disposal Unit at Uddens, near Colehill. I know we are not the first to object so you will be aware of the public outcry at the destruction of this woodland with its habitat, wildlife, walking and cycling amenity. Also the pollution that will affect the local community in so many ways. And finally, the access is along A31 approaching the Canford Bottom Roundabout. Have you ever experienced the traffic there? What lunatic on the council thinks it is a good idea to add to it with vans and trailers full of waste, rubbish and all sorts of junk? A better location must be found for this WPU if it is necessary to build it.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP744	Disagree	<p>I would like to object to the proposed waste facilities on Blunts Farm or on the Ferndown &amp; Uddens Estates. The scale of the proposals for the Ferndown area are excessive and will amount to about 1/4 of the total allocation of Blunts Farm. This site was taken out of the Green Belt and allocated for employment purposes because of the overriding need to provide additional (not replacement) employment land. The development proposed will change the character of the site, reduce the area available and make it less attractive to employers to invest and provide additional employment. The development of a Household Recycling Facility on the existing and allocated employment sites would be inconsistent and incompatible with encouraging the local economy. The use of such a new facility would be detrimental to the operation of the existing businesses on the estates. The location of such a facility would set back the collaborative objective of businesses on the estates, expressed through the establishment of a Business Improvement District, of raising the image of the estates and likely discourage future investment. A new Household Recycling Facility, based on the historic information from the existing site in Wimborne, can reasonably be expected to generate around 250,000 car and van movements a year, with a large number of additional lorry movements. The infrastructure on the existing industrial estates and adjoining roads is not designed to accommodate such a large additional number. This is a reflection that the estates have developed piecemeal fashion with no master-plan and inadequate parking to meet demand. As a result informal parking on the majority of roads is required to ensure the basic operation of the businesses. There is no capacity to accommodate the stacking of vehicles on the highway wishing to gain access to these sites, which is a feature of this type of facility.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Cats Protection	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP745	Disagree	<p>Cats Protection owns and operates a cat re-homing centre (Ferndown Homing Centre ) at Cobham Road, Ferndown Industrial Estate On behalf of the Charity I wish to make the following comments as part of the consultation process because our premises are within the 250m zone mentioned in your letter of 25 May 16. We have concerns that the impact of a waste site being located at Blunts Farm may include :- a) Additional traffic, leading to traffic congestion on roads serving Ferndown Industrial Estate. b) Potential visitors to our facility being put off from coming because of said traffic. c) Deliveries being delayed because of the additional road traffic. d) Noise, dirt and dust caused by the additional traffic and congestion being potentially detrimental to the health and well-being of our staff, volunteers, visitors and the cats in our care. e) Odours and flies arising from the waste facility's activities causing problems for the cats in our care. f) The possibility of occupiers on the Ferndown Industrial Estate having to relocate, either through their current operation becoming untenable or through an element of compulsory purchase in order to provide an access road to the proposed waste site, and the costs arising therefrom. Cats Protection understands the need for modern waste treatment/transfer facilities and ancillary facilities and is indeed a producer of waste at its Homing Centre and shops in the County so we are not suggesting that there should be no additional waste facilities. However we should be grateful if the above comments could be considered as part of the consultation so that whatever waste facility may result is designed and situated to take account of its eventual locality and neighbours.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP748	Disagree	<p>I understand that there is a proposal to develop a waste disposal including incinerator at Uddens to take both residential and commercial waste. I wish to register my objection to this proposal. My objections are based on increased traffic in the area, heavy lorries using local roads and the environmental impact on residential area nearby. The local infrastructure is not able to support this proposal and it is sited too close to the residential area of Ferndown.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WVP749	Disagree	<p>I am writing regarding the above and the fact that DCC has indicated that Cannon Hill/Uddens Plantation is a preferred site. Aside from the glaring fact that this is GREENBELT land and is close to homes, schools and workplaces, it is also a much used local amenity by families and individuals for a variety of activities such as walking and cycling. Aside from the fact that these promote good health, the above is also a fantastic area for wildlife including deer, lizards, snakes, slowworms, birds etc as well as the trees, plants and fungi. To place a waste site in this location is not only abhorrent but no consideration appears to have been given to the actual access issues. Anyone who has ever tried to negotiate Canford Bottom will be fully aware of the fact that there is absolutely no way that this junction will be able to cope with any more traffic making its way to the above proposed site. The roads are wholly unsuitable for the increase in traffic which will obviously include HGV vehicles. Furthermore the majority of vehicles accessing this proposed site will have to make a perilous right hand turn on the A31 on a single carriageway which will in turn cause considerable delays to those in the queue behind. There has already been a fatality at this junction. There is also the issue of noise and pollution. As a resident of East Dorset, I am completely disgusted that this area has been identified by the County Council to take in waste for Dorset especially as we are not a unitary authority. Additionally there are far more suitable sites in Dorset; many of them closer to Dorchester. Is this a case of DCC not wishing this to be in their 'back yard'? Year in year out DCC identifies this area for yet another destructive proposal be it travellers sites, mineral extraction etc and year in year out we are forced to write and counter these proposals with points which are completely valid and which do not change. Once these latest proposals are hopefully thrown out (no pun intended) could DCC please leave this area of GREENBELT alone?!</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WVP750	Disagree	<p>I really must object most strongly against any sort of recycle and incinerator plant at Uddens. Ferndown, Colehill and surrounding areas have a large number of retired and young families for whom this could be disastrous from a health perspective. I have had a hospital stay in the past with breathing problems, and know only too well what an inhaled toxic substance can do. The amount of extra traffic this would cause would make a very busy area even more congested. The traffic is already at a standstill at times and the junction at the Old Thatch is already quite dangerous. I am sure there must be a more suitable site which would not affect local people as this would.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP751	Disagree	<p>There is a touch of deja vu about this proposal, although it has this time been moved to an even more ridiculous site. Notwithstanding all of the objections raised over the previous plan, what has materially changed to make this one any less of another blot on the landscape? Crossing to the south side of Uddens Drive is a further encroachment into what should be preserved as recreational space for the local population and a significant and unnecessary sprawl of industrial development which has hitherto remained to the North side on the Blunts farm land Just to highlight:-</p> <p>1 Pollution With the prevailing wind direction, residents in the Ferndown area are directly in the firing line, with the local schools also being affected by both air and noise pollution</p> <p>2. Access Hardly a straight forward issue I respectively suggest</p> <p>3. Congestion Any additional volume added to the existing Uddens trading estate , Old Thatch Inn and local traffic would further worsen the build-up onto and off of the main Wimborne Road East creating a potential accident in waiting</p> <p>4 Natural Habitat The loss of a significant area of woodland for such an environmentally suspect development seems questionable and would destroy the enjoyment of the Castleman Trailway which is actively promoted and maintained at not an insignificant cost to the local taxpayer. In summary it appears that the council has gone for a land grab by over extending its ambitions for the development of Blunts Farm. If they gain approval for this proposal then nowhere will be safe from the creep of land for industrial use</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP753	Disagree	<p>I would like to make my objection known for the shocking!! Proposed additional waste site at Cannon Hill Woodlands a current area of beauty and habitat to natural wildlife. Not only would this proposal strip, the area of a little gem of woodland, it would have a disastrous effect on the community. The increased traffic to the proposed site would cause traffic gridlock to what is already a very heavily congested traffic area (Cannon Hill Roundabout) which is already gridlocked many times throughout the day!! Adding to noise and air pollution for the area. The vermin and fly contamination is another factor for concern, especially as it is close to housing and schools. Also the access being denied to the Castleman Trail Way, is an issue as it is used by many walkers and cyclists who live locally and also tourists. I appreciate your time in considering my objections to this obscene proposal.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP757	Disagree	<p>I am writing concerning the proposed development of Uddens Woodland which has been earmarked to become a waste plant with incinerator. I also understand that Brook Road recycling centre will close. I am extremely concerned about this development which is in the vicinity of Canford Bottom and Stapehill Housing areas and a threat to our precious woodland in greenbelt thus destroying more natural habitat for wildlife and replacing it with an industrial eyesore. Furthermore the obvious problems such a development will cause to the occupants of the local area are: 1. Large increase in local traffic - 100,000 cars a year diverted from Brook road, 100 lorries daily receiving waste from other areas. 2. Large increase in traffic and noise pollution - This will result in even more misery at Canford Bottom Roundabout with further extensive traffic delays and gridlock. The noise from Canford Bottom roundabout and the A31 has already increased significantly since the recent clearing of gorse on the road boundaries. Removal of more woodland will vastly increase noise pollution in the entire area. Bringing more misery to locals. The Core Strategy for 6000 new homes will also significantly increase the traffic problems in the Canford Bottom area if the waste plant is sited in Uddens Woodland. 3. Environmental pollution - Fumes, invisible gases and potential smoke from incinerators and the proposed 40m high chimney will pollute the atmosphere bring potential health hazards to the large local population and wildlife 4. The wonderful walks and bridleways around the Castle man Trailway will be severely compromised further reducing enjoyment of the local area. 5. Another recreational and walking area lost - access to wider Cannon Hill via the bridge over the A31 will be lost denying locals and horse riders any recreational walking / hacking areas. 6. Another eyesore- The chimney and waste plant will be visible for miles, once again destroying the natural beauty of the area. 7. Reduced local recreational areas - the area is desperately short of recreational areas. This plan simply adds to the problem further. Whilst I appreciate that waste sites are needed and siting them is never easy, this proposals negative affects to the local population and greenbelt are far too great to be ignored. A better solution must not found that does not cause so many issues some of which I have listed above. I am also extremely concerned that this proposal has not been more widely notified to locals to raise awareness and elicit a greater understanding of public opinion on the matter.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP758	Disagree	<p>I am writing concerning the proposed development of Uddens Woodland which has been earmarked to become a waste plant with incinerator. I also understand that Brook Road recycling centre will close. I am extremely concerned about this development which is in the vicinity of Canford Bottom and Stapehill Housing areas and a threat to our precious woodland in greenbelt thus destroying more natural habitat for wildlife and replacing it with an industrial eyesore. Furthermore the obvious problems such a development will cause to the occupants of the local area are: 1. Large increase in local traffic - 100,000 cars a year diverted from Brook road, 100 lorries daily receiving waste from other areas. 2. Large increase in traffic and noise pollution - This will result in even more misery at Canford Bottom Roundabout with further extensive traffic delays and gridlock. The noise from Canford Bottom roundabout and the A31 has already increased significantly since the recent clearing of gorse on the road boundaries. Removal of more woodland will vastly increase noise pollution in the entire area. Bringing more misery to locals. The Core Strategy for 6000 new homes will also significantly increase the traffic problems in the Canford Bottom area if the waste plant is sited in Uddens Woodland. 3. Environmental pollution - Fumes, invisible gases and potential smoke from incinerators and the proposed 40m high chimney will pollute the atmosphere bring potential health hazards to the large local population and wildlife 4. The wonderful walks and bridleways around the Castle man Trailway will be severely compromised further reducing enjoyment of the local area. 5. Another recreational and walking area lost - access to wider Cannon Hill via the bridge over the A31 will be lost denying locals and horse riders any recreational walking / hacking areas. 6. Another eyesore- The chimney and waste plant will be visible for miles, once again destroying the natural beauty of the area. 7. Reduced local recreational areas - the area is desperately short of recreational areas. This plan simply adds to the problem further. Whilst I appreciate that waste sites are needed and siting them is never easy, this proposals negative affects to the local population and greenbelt are far too great to be ignored. A better solution must be found that does not cause so many issues some of which I have listed above. I am also extremely concerned that this proposal has not been more widely notified to locals to raise awareness and elicit a greater understanding of public opinion on the matter.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP765	Disagree	<p>1. Why choose a site in a green belt area, when this type of land is the life blood of mankind? There are various other options available, for example, land between the access road to the current Ferndown / Dorset Police station and the Ferndown by-pass is unused and has reasonable access through the Ferndown Industrial Estate or the Ferndown by-pass. Golf is officially becoming a sport that is becoming less popular, so parts of the Ferndown Golf course should also be assessed for suitability. Once again this area has good access and no shortage of land. 2. Companies on the Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates deal with multi-national retailers who would take their business elsewhere as soon as there was any mention of this type of development close to where they are having products produced or packaged. This was stated when the previous Waste Local Plan was proposed. An instant way to deprive Ferndown of employment and further business opportunities.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016W/P766	Disagree	The proposal for an additional Waste Site allocation at Uddens and Cannon Hill woodlands is viewed by C.P.R.E. Dorset with great concern. It would be a violation of an important and irreplaceable piece of forested green belt which is: A well used recreational area, the only one of its kind available to the population of N and W Ferndown A major recreational site worked on by well established local groups for the last 40 years under the supervision of the Forestry Commission and with the support of D.C.C. The site of a long established trail going all the way from Poole to Upton Park. There is simply no replacement in the immediate vicinity of Ferndown for this beautiful, traditional, well used and well supported piece of green belt. The search for a suitable site for a new waste facility should look elsewhere.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

<p style="text-align: center;">Individual</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WP769</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Disagree</p> <p>Introduction This submission is made on my own behalf. I am a local resident familiar with this part of the Uddens and Colehill Plantations, which are an integral part of the amenities of Wimborne and Ferndown. I have lived in Wimborne since 1988. I have practised as a Local Government Planning Officer for East Dorset District Council and as a Planning Consultant and have approximately forty years' experience as a Chartered Town Planner and Surveyor. I was one of the lead officers involved with English Nature (now Natural England) instrumental in the introduction of the interim heathland policy and have also extensive experience in relation to the interpretation of Green Belt policy. The Plan (extract below) is inaccurate in that it fails to show the right of way at the west apex of the land linking through to the south-east corner of the site. In practice there are several paths through the woodland, which are also not shown on the drawing as provided. Summary of Objection It is my submission that the plan would be found unsound in respect of this allocation because: The proposed site is in statutory Green Belt and no very special circumstances exist to take this proposed allocation out of the Green Belt. The site is well used by both residents and workers from the adjacent industrial estate and therefore already operates as a Suitable Alternative Natural Green space (SANG). Further survey information already exists (and copies I understand are with the County Council) to strongly suggest that dog walkers and horse riders using this land would use, in the alternative, Internationally designated heathland and therefore on a precautionary basis the proposal, would be bound to fail an appropriate assessment under the Habitat Regulations. The sites proposed allocation is directly at variance with prevailing policies at National level and of the County and District Council concerning access to countryside and associated health welfare policy. Green Belt Policy The site appears in the Draft Plan as a convenience as it has been offered by the Forestry Commission. That is not a criteria which meets with National Policy. Section 9 of the NPPF, Protecting Green Belt land clearly sets out the framework and the process for Planning Authorities when considering proposals against a statutory Green Belt allocation. There are plainly no very special circumstances in this case. Indeed the Waste Plans own assessment of the situation nullifies an extension in to the Green Belt. It is advised that: the WPA has been made aware that as Blunts Farm is developed business currently located at Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates may choose to re-locate to Blunts Farm, opening up opportunities for the development of a waste facility. The uses proposed are entirely appropriate to an industrial estate and if, for example the County needs to replace the Brook Road facility it should plan to buy an existing allocated site. The alternative would be to find a damaged brownfield site in the Green Belt. As set out in the plan the allocation is unsound. Conservation Regulations Assessment and Appropriate Assessment under the Habitat Regulations. In relation to the European dimension of Heathland protection the proposal must fail an appropriate assessment under the Habitat Regulations at the planning application stage. The woodland is currently providing a strong open space function, (equivalent to a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace function in Heathland DPD terms, although not formally identified as one). It absorbs large numbers of regular walkers; particularly dog walkers as well as horse riders, who use it as part of a longer route south of the A31(T). These users will be largely displaced by the adverse impacts of the proposal and will have to find alternative places to ride horses and walk their dogs. It is likely that some will find nearby Heathland an attractive alternative. It is a certainty that the precautionary principle used in the judgement when making an Appropriate Assessment for this plan or project will have to accept that this is a realistic position and the scheme will thus fail. It is not possible to visualize a satisfactory mitigation in this context because of the key linkages back to the Castleman Trailway. To enlarge upon the horse riding aspect and the potential damage to the International site of Holt Heath, the existing horses ridden from Stapehill Farm, and other sites with horses in the vicinity, will have their option to ride on the south side of the A31, using the marked bridleway effectively blocked by the proposal. It is, therefore, reasonable to expect that riding north over the accommodation bridge will inevitably become the most attractive route with the internationally designated Heathland as an objective beyond. It was precisely this concern that, in part, led East Dorset District Council acting with Natural England to take enforcement action against the owners of Bedborough Farm on Uddens Drive immediately north of the A31(T). The planning appeal decision dated 16 April 2010 deals (pages 12 to 16) with the nature conservation aspects of a proposal for additional livery. Copies of the relevant section are appended and the parallels are obvious. However, in the case of this waste site proposal the damage to the Heathland is potentially greater because dog walkers will also be likely to divert too. Horse riders visiting Uddens from further south, from around Longham and Dudsbury may well prefer to ride over Ferndown Common. The Conservation Regulations Assessment Screening Report completely omits consideration of the potential for proposals to dislocate existing walking and riding recreational uses around sites. If the site will fail an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitat Regulations, which this site undoubtedly will, then this should surely be screened out now. I expect you will receive many representations precisely on this point about its open space use from members</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
---	--	--	--	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
				<p>of the public which will, in itself, be proof that is it a proposal clearly contrary to Habitats policy. The proposal is therefore unsound. The proposal as set out is fundamentally flawed and therefore unsound in this context. Bridleway and Pedestrian Access, Health and Well-being. One of the fundamental flaws in identifying this site is an assumption about the manner of its use. The woodlands are an integral part of the landscaped route of the Castleman Trailway. It is used by walkers, walkers with dogs and horse riders. The majority of these users are local. It is this leisure/open space use that is threatened by the proposal. The County has policies supporting the Trailway and East Dorset District Councils Corporate Plan and Core Strategy policies promoted jointly with Christchurch, identify that attractive places are important to all residents and have a significant impact on their sense of well-being. There are a number of companion policies about health being linked to outdoor activity also in this context. Making better use of the countryside is about improving bridleways and footpaths. This proposal flies in the face of this strategy as placing a waste site here effectively blocks this flagship trailway in which officers and Members of both Councils have invested time, effort and finance to improve. One of the joys of this woodland is that the paths, which are not signposted as the trailway, add to the amenity and give variety. Unusually, the woodland here is valuable to those less fit and able as the paths and rides are largely dry and level. It is therefore beneficial, for example, as an area where wheel-chair users may get out-doors. The NPPFs section on Promoting Healthy Communities underscores the link between making recreational activity such as walking and riding an integral part of positive town planning due to its health benefits. In this section at paragraph 75 it is advised that: Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. Local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users! The proposal conflicts with this strategy.</p>	
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP770	Disagree	<p>I wish to put my objection forward for the proposed waste sites at Cannon Hill and Uddens in Ferndown. This is very close to the town and we already have enough pollution from the 3 busy main roads which envelope us residents of Ferndown. Please let me know how we can get this stopped.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP773	Disagree	<p>I would like to register my protest against the Waste Plant being sighted at Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands. I am sure there are better places that could be utilised rather than this much used land. Also I understand that this will bring more heavy traffic through Ferndown. I understood that local policy was to revitalise Ferndown and cut down on the number of heavy goods vehicles coming through the town? I did try to access website to protest but found it too difficult to find!</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP774	Disagree	<p>Proposal re waste depot and recycling centre in Cannon Hill Plantation, Cannon Hill &amp; Uddens Woods We write to object to the proposal to transfer the Household Recycling Centre from Brook Road to Cannon Hill Woods and to object to the proposal to site a Bulky Waste Transfer and Treatment facility there. These activities are not suitable for a greenbelt site and completely out of character with the surrounding area. There will be a loss of amenity space used by the residents of Wimborne and Ferndown. The A31 is already highly congested, with long traffic queues even outside holiday seasons. The junction of A31 and Uddens Drive is already an accident blackspot. The increase in traffic would inevitably increase the number of accidents and the combination of lorries and holidaymakers risks a significant increase in the severity of accidents. There would inevitably be increased traffic, including lorries, on the local roads around Colehill, which already faces increased traffic from the proposed residential developments on Burts Hill. In addition to congestion, this means an increased risk of accidents in an area with several schools. The increased congestion and slowing of traffic, and the number of lorries will have an adverse impact on air quality in a residential area supplied with several schools. There will be an adverse impact on the environment and on wildlife.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP777	Disagree	<p>I am writing to comment on the proposed Draft Waste Plan , and in particular sections 5, 6, and 10, which relate to Land at Blunts Farm Ferndown and Land West of Blunts Farm Ferndown. Whilst I appreciate there is a need for waste handling, I would like to point out that the location of these proposals is not appropriate. The road network in the vicinity is woefully inadequate for current traffic levels. There are already plans for 1000+ new properties in and around Wimborne, and Poole Council have plans for 5000 new homes near Merley which will mean at least 6000, and very possibly 12000+ extra vehicles using the A31 and Wimborne Road. The Canford Bottom roundabout is gridlocked at many times of the day, and traffic queues from West Moors on the A31 west to Lake Gates west of Wimborne. Traffic also queues from Ferndown Industrial Estate on Wimborne road through to the Canford Bottom roundabout. The woodland in the proposed development area is GREEN BELT and should not be developed. There are hundreds, probably thousands, of people using this space, from children to elderly people. They use it for a variety of activities from dog walking to horse riding and cycling. Children use it both informally, and as part of group activities involving organisations such as Scouts. In particular, the children and elderly may not be able to use a different area as their transport options are limited. The area provides valuable recreation and fitness space which improves the health and mental wellbeing of local residents. I have seen a wide variety of diverse life in this area, everything from deer to reptiles. There are many species of small creatures too. The woodland and farm area provide a great site of biodiversity. There are residential areas very close to the proposed sites, and they will be at risk from pollution and noise during construction and ad-infinitum during the operation of the sites. I trust you will note these points and look at alternative sites.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP779	Disagree	My wife & myself are totally against having a waste site in our vicinity! We live approximately 1 mile from the proposed site & find it quite abhorrent that this could happen.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP780	Disagree	I object to your proposals on the following basis: 1. The A31 is already at and over capacity on a regular basis; if the road were dual carriageway as far as Bere Regis without that stupid hamburger roundabout, joining up with the excellent dual carriageway from there to Dorchester, this point of objection may not stand. 2. Additional housing around Wimborne and Colehill will in any case be problematic where traffic congestion is concerned and the road infrastructure has not been addressed; a waste facility at Uddens will only add to the grief which so many of us are experiencing. 3. The wooded area is important where retaining the natural habitat is concerned, allowing this wooded and swampy area to act as a natural 'sponge' where rainwater attenuation is concerned and trees to help the environment, additionally it is used by locals for recreational purposes, cycling etc. Do not attempt to destroy this Green Belt woodland. 4. For us Wimborne residents it won't make sense from an environmental point of view for us to be involved in travelling further to get rid of our waste - the Brook Road facility should be maintained and improved. 5. If you want a Dorset wide facility, do so in the middle of the county - Dorchester!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP781	Disagree	I am writing to complain about the proposal of a waste plant in Cannon Woods. I walk my dogs in these woods and take my children here to learn about local nature. It is disgusting to think that these would be destroyed and the thought that there will horrific fumes as a result. Please put this elsewhere and not destroy an area of natural beauty.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP782	Disagree	I am most concerned about the proposed development of a waste disposal plant at Uddens and Cannon Hill woodlands. People pay to live in this area in order to gain relative peace and quiet further away from the conurbation, and to enjoy green space, which is vital to wellbeing. Because of this, many families with young children live here, using the woodlands for recreational purposes. The proposed development would inhibit access to precious woodland, which should not be destroyed. I understand that it also comprises greenbelt area which surely by its nature should be protected. The even more worrying factor is the pollution which such a development could bring- noise, traffic and air pollution with the presence of an incinerator. This would inevitably be harmful to health. While I understand that waste needs to be disposed of, it should be done so in a clean and environmental way which does not threaten health or wildlife. This proposal is really worrying to local people and I was truly saddened to hear about it	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP786	Disagree	I am a resident of West Moors and a regular walker on the Castleman Trail. The section through the Uddens Woods is currently blighted by the noise from the A31, however, at least the noise from the road is constant white noise and a necessary evil. Recently I walked to Poole over Canford Heath and I was struck by the noise from the Waste processing plant on the heath. Unlike the steady low frequency road noise, the facility on Canford Heath was punctuated by heavy machinery and particularly the sound of reversing vehicles. These sounds carried over a huge distance covering almost the entire heathland. By contrast, the road noise from the A31 is quickly absorbed by the vegetation. The experience on Canford Heath was so poor that I doubt I shall repeat it. While I can appreciate the necessary planning for the long term future planning and I can see that there are obvious advantages to placing the necessary expansion of the Waste facilities next to the existing noise of the A31, but I strongly urge that decision makers to take into account the characteristic of the noise which the facility which is planned for Uddens Plantation before a bad decision is made.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP787	Disagree	I am writing concerning the proposed development of Uddens Woodland which has been earmarked to become a waste plant with incinerator. I also understand that Brook Road recycling centre will close. I am extremely concerned about this development which is in the vicinity of Canford Bottom and Stapehill Housing areas and a threat to our precious woodland in greenbelt thus destroying more natural habitat for wildlife and replacing it with an industrial eyesore. Furthermore the obvious problems such a development will cause to the occupants of the local area are: 1. Large increase in local traffic - 100,000 cars a year diverted from Brook road, 100 lorries daily receiving waste from other areas. 2. Large increase in traffic and noise pollution - This will result in even more misery at Canford Bottom Roundabout with further extensive traffic delays and gridlock. The noise from Canford Bottom roundabout and the A31 has already increased significantly since the recent clearing of gorse on the road boundaries. Removal of more woodland will vastly increase noise pollution in the entire area. bringing more misery to locals. The Core Strategy for 6000 new homes will also significantly increase the traffic problems in the Canford Bottom area if the waste plant is sited in Uddens Woodland. 3. Environmental pollution - Fumes, invisible gases and potential smoke from incinerators and the proposed 40m high chimney will pollute the atmosphere bring potential health hazards to the large local population and wildlife 4. The wonderful walks and bridleways around the Castle man Trailway will be severely compromised further reducing enjoyment of the local area. 5. Another recreational and walking area lost - access to wider Cannon Hill via the bridge over the A31 will be lost denying locals and horse riders any recreational walking / hacking areas. 6. Another eyesore- The chimney and waste plant will be visible for miles, once again destroying the natural beauty of the area. 7. Reduced local recreational areas - the area is desperately short of recreational areas. This plan simply adds to the problem further. Whilst I appreciate that waste sites are needed and siting them is never easy, this proposals negative affects to the local population and greenbelt are far too great to be ignored. A better solution must not found that does not cause so many issues some of which I have listed above. I am also extremely concerned that this proposal has not been more widely notified to locals to raise awareness and elicit a greater understanding of public opinion on the matter.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP790	Disagree	We are residents of stapehill and are concerned about the effects on the surrounding area by pollution in the air from increased traffic and emissions from the plant as well as the loss of the woodland. Therefore we would like to lodge our objection to this development.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP792	Disagree	Being a disabled person in Ferndown I have got really annoyed the way bus routes have been cut causing many holdups, buses hold more people than cars. If you live in Ferndown it's not just week-end holdups but every day. Bearing in mind the way Dorset has ignored the problems even though they have had many objections, I think DC need to remember all the extra vehicles involved transferring Waste so far, let alone the actual site is not good thinking. Being aware the 'not in our backyard' is a problem that applies to Dorchester as well as Wimborne The Council have a duty to consider every aspect of this - no fobbing off - and use common sense, not ruining lovely Dorset. My next move will be writing a letter to Stour and Avon, then onto the new Minister of Transport. The country loses millions of pounds disrupting working days. Transport is one of life's essentials. There are many very angry people here. Resident for 5 years I do not know areas too well but I wonder where 'Listening Dorset' came from - have not seen evidence of this - it takes a lot of time to protect what you believe in, and people have lost heart. We actually need to support each other and keep the pot boiling. It does not happen, we are too near Hampshire making us almost in the middle of nowhere and not important.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP793	Disagree	I wish to object to the proposed site as this will ruin a beautiful woodland which we have enjoyed for years	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP795	Disagree	I wish to strongly OPPOSE the Incinerator being built in the Ferndown area In case you need my reasons for objecting to the Incinerator they are as follows. 1) The remains of what is left over still has to be got rid of. There is no proof that this is as yet done safely. 2) There is evidence that there is toxic fumes in the area around for mile that can cause Cancer and also the long term health issues. 3) The quantities of Lorries that it will bring to the area, is totally unacceptable. The roads cannot cope with it. 4) Fact Cornwall Council regretted the one built at St Dennis , not long after it was up, they now agree it was a mistake ! 5) Not enough has been done to make people in the whole area aware of this , newspapers are not read by the majority anymore , I do not believe the Council has made a great enough attempt at giving people the opportunity to object as thousands don't even know about it . This in itself is a huge injustice 6) Not enough has been done to promote more recycling and educate people. Its changes all the time and needs to be updated.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP796	Disagree	This email is to object to the above proposal at Uddens and Woolsbridge, due to the toxicity and environmental pollution as well as the increased traffic and noise.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP798	Disagree	I am writing concerning the proposed development of Uddens Woodland which has been earmarked to become a waste plant with incinerator. I also understand that Brook Road recycling centre will close. I am extremely concerned about this development which is in the vicinity of Canford Bottom and Stapehill Housing areas and a threat to our precious woodland in greenbelt thus destroying more natural habitat for wildlife and replacing it with an industrial eyesore. Furthermore the obvious problems such a development will cause to the occupants of the local area are: 1. Large increase in local traffic - 100,000 cars a year diverted from Brook road, 100 lorries daily receiving waste from other areas. 2. Large increase in traffic and noise pollution - This will result in even more misery at Canford Bottom Roundabout with further extensive traffic delays and gridlock. The noise from Canford Bottom roundabout and the A31 has already increased significantly since the recent clearing of gorse on the road boundaries. Removal of more woodland will vastly increase noise pollution in the entire area. Bringing more misery to locals. The Core Strategy for 6000 new homes will also significantly increase the traffic problems in the Canford Bottom area if the waste plant is sited in Uddens Woodland. 3. Environmental pollution - Fumes, invisible gases and potential smoke from incinerators and the proposed 40m high chimney will pollute the atmosphere bring potential health hazards to the large local population and wildlife 4. The wonderful walks and bridleways around the Castle man Trailway will be severely compromised further reducing enjoyment of the local area. 5. Another recreational and walking area lost - access to wider Cannon Hill via the bridge over the A31 will be lost denying locals and horse riders any recreational walking / hacking areas. 6. Another eyesore- The chimney and waste plant will be visible for miles, once again destroying the natural beauty of the area. 7. Reduced local recreational areas - the area is desperately short of recreational areas. This plan simply adds to the problem further. 8. Loss of natural habitat for wildlife including rare lizards and bats. Whilst I appreciate that waste sites are needed and siting them is never easy, this proposals negative affects to the local population and greenbelt are far too great to be ignored. A better solution must be found that does not cause so many issues some of which I have listed above. I am also extremely concerned that this proposal has not been more widely notified to locals to raise awareness and elicit a greater understanding of public opinion on the matter.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP799	Disagree	I wish to voice my strongest possible objection to the proposed MBT/Waste transfer station at the site south of Blunts farm, Ferndown. The loss of further woodland and the impact of the increased amount of traffic in an are already struggling under the weight of traffic congestion area is simply unacceptable for the purposes listed. Add this to further emissions from burning (albeit treated) waste in an area where the prevailing wind would blow this directly across 2 schools is simply ludicrous.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP808	Disagree	<p>I write to object to the proposals to change the use at Cannon Hill/ Uddens plantation development as part of your waste development plan. I am concerned on several levels: * The closeness of the area to residential properties and the proposed 70 - 100 m high chimney. * The plans that it will cover many issues and thereby be a much larger facility than the current Brook Road. * That this is a green belt area upon which you will be encroaching with has an amazing biodiversity for all to benefit from and cannot be replaced. In an era when we have a responsibility to care for the environment for the sake of our children this is very short sighted. * In addition I have grave concerns about the traffic congestion onto the A31 which is already congested because of the poorly thought out traffic monstrosity called the "Canford Bottom Roundabout". Estimates seem to be about 100 lorries a day using the site 24/7 every day of the year. This would only compound an already grid locked road at times, having to break in and out of traffic, as well as the re-routing of traffic from the Brook road site which I understand will be closing. I believe this will cause greater congestion at the Canford Bottom roundabout which is already struggling to cope with larger loads whose transition across the roundabout does not allow the flow of traffic between the light sequences, because there is little room anyway. I do hope that you take a lead from the current Government and listen to the ordinary people of this country and reconsider your plans.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP809	Disagree	<p>I am a resident of Colehill, Wimborne and I would like to comment on the draft waste plan for Dorset's waste management needs. I am unhappy about the prospect that Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands could be used as a site for a waste treatment facility. I am a Biologist and I am very worried that a currently undamaged area with high biodiversity will be destroyed. This area should have high conservation value because it is connected to a large area of heathland and woodland. The smaller we make our natural areas the more vulnerable they become and the fewer species they can support. Fragmentation of habitats also reduces breeding opportunities within a species and ultimately reduces genetic diversity of each species. I could expand on these topics however I hope you are undertaking environmental impact assessments from experts. Your facility should ideally be being built in an area that is brown field. It is criminal to destroy a natural environment when such areas are becoming more and more rare and so many species are threatened.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP811	Disagree	I read with horror that it is proposed to use the land SW of Blunts Farm for Waste disposal. Blunts Farm was bad enough and I fully understand that the rubbish must be disposed of somewhere but to suggest this beautiful, much loved and used beauty spot is a step too far. I wonder if a site visit has ever been done. This is a haven for wild life There are bat boxes, very well used, bird boxes even talk of dormice but I except there is no hard evidence. In recent years a group of locals has spent hours and hours, with the help of grants from local and county councils of community charge payers hard earned money, to install picnic tables and benches and clear away debris and mark out woodland paths. Also restoring parts of the bridleway. Another resident has spent hours making fun wooden figures and set pieces out of fallen pieces of trees much to the delight of the children from the local nursery school who use this area for outdoor activities. Is this to be destroyed? I have used this area for the last 42 years and have seen how it is now so very well used. It is ideal for everyone cyclist, horse riders, walkers, dog walkers and staff from Uddens Estate taking their lunch breaks. Please rethink this as it really is not the place for Waste Plants.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP812	Disagree	It is with a sinking heart that once again I find that I am writing a letter of objection against the latest proposed development relating to the area of Uddens & Cannon Hill, having already fought the :- Gypsy site. Quarry scheme. In relation to this latest proposal of the Waste Plant there remains the persistent problems relating to the increased pressure on a road system, already literally at a standstill sometimes especially around Canford Bottom roundabout. This is going to be further exacerbated by the 600 additional houses to be built in the vicinity. However, for me the main question has to be "Why here?". Unlike the quarry this is not area dictated, i.e. the minerals were there. Why has a greenfield site been selected? During our 25 years in this area there has been a marked increase in the recreational use of this area. It is a safe environment for children, women and families. With the new builds referred to in the earlier paragraph this can only be an increasing asset in the future. All three of the following: - Gypsy site. Quarry Waste plant. Came via yourselves at Dorset County Council, perhaps you could let those whom you are meant to be representing speak instead of the money.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP814	Disagree	We would like to register our objections to the proposed waste treatment site at Cannon Hill South (Uddens woodlands). This area is used by many people from Ferndown, Canford Bottom, Stapehill and Colehill. There are many more houses going to be built in East Dorset and this is a green lung for the area. The road infrastructure and parking facilities for those seeking recreation, lorries concerned with waste disposal, traffic for the enlarged trading estate and cars transferred from Brook Road is insufficient. This proposed site is not suitable as a waste disposal site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP816	Disagree	Why at Uddens? this is primarily a light industrial area and unused space is widely used for recreation , I get Asthma and an incinerator and extra traffic fumes would cause a lot of extra grief , please don't put it there.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP818	Disagree	I wish to register my objection to the above proposed Waste Furnace at Uddens. This proposal demonstrates complete disregard for the health of local residents and those from the wider vicinity	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP823	Disagree	I would like to object to the plans to site a waste plant at woodlands at cannon hill south. I was only aware that the plans had changed from Blunts farm today. There are a variety of reasons to this objection which are as follows: 1. The woods are used by numerous people for recreational purposes and have been for a long time. Eg: walking, cycling, and riding. The woods are an important recreational area to the people of Ferndown and Wimborne and further afield. 2. The woods are part of the greenbelt and important to the biodiversity of the wildlife and flora and fauna contained. They absorb greenhouse emissions. We should be preserving them for future generations not destroying them. 3. Waste handling will be done in close proximity to houses and workplaces putting people's health at risk. 4. Increased traffic will cause a problem on the already congested roadways. 5. Why should cannon hill have to take Dorset's waste? Why not be eco-friendly and carbon friendly and sort this out nearer to home in Dorchester. 6. The proposed chimney also poses another health hazard to residents.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP833	Disagree	I would like to raise my objections to this being built on this land. With all the extra housing that is being built and proposed for the future any green space in this area is being swallowed up. A facility such as this will have a detrimental effect on this residential area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
RSPB	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP906	Disagree	<p>WP01 " Ferndown Area of Search The RSPB would like to re-iterate the recommendations of the HRSR that further detailed investigation should be undertaken before this site should be progressed in the plan. This is essential to dispel concerns relating to loss of potentially important heathland habitat and impacts on associated species. A strip of land in the north of the proposed site identified as a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) lies adjacent to Uddens Heath (Slop Bog and Uddens Heath) SSSI, part of the Dorset Heaths SAC/Dorset Heathlands SPA. The area of SNCI is likely to provide supporting SAC/SPA habitat and will have an important role in buffering sensitive habitats. As such it should not be included in the development plan. In addition to an investigation into the potential impacts of the development on the immediate habitat further consideration also needs to be given to ensure there are no far reaching impacts of air or water borne pollution on European protected sites in the area. Further to this the RSPB would like to highlight that the HRSR does not address the function of the site as a well-used dog walking facility by local residents. According to the Forestry Commissions Forestry Design Plan The southern part of Cannon Hill, south of the Ferndown Bypass, is heavily used by residents of Stapehill for dog walking. The Castleman Trailway runs through the southern part of Cannon Hill and western part of Uddens Plantation. Many local people regularly use other parts of Uddens Plantation for informal recreation 1. The map of the proposed waste allocation (p23 Update Waste Plan) shows two areas referred to as Area A (Blunts Farm) and Area B (Land SW including part of the Castle Man Trail). It appears both areas have current importance in local recreation which if displaced could deflect dog walkers to nearby protected heathland sites such as Holt Heath and Ferndown Common. The RSPB would expect the potential impacts of displacing recreation from this area to be fully investigated and mitigated accordingly.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP912	Disagree	<p>I am very concerned to only very recently hear about this: <a href="http://www.cannonhillfriends.org.uk/waste-plant.html">http://www.cannonhillfriends.org.uk/waste-plant.html</a></p> <p>'Bulky Waste transfer /treatment and/or residual waste treatment Facility "up to 3 ha land required (This is a massive concern, as if a Bulky Waste and Residual Treatment site go in our woods, this will be a strategic site serving Poole, Bournemouth and Dorset with doubtless some form of incinerator. Critically, it will not just serve the local area and it may include commercial waste). 'Years ago I went on a March (that you yourself attended) to stop precisely this kind of thing happening. We certainly do not want an incinerator &amp; all the associated fall-out of carcinogenic products &amp; dirty air &amp; smell in such a residential area - it is bad for human health. Cannot believe this problem has come up again - I thought it was decided long ago that this sort of thing would not happen in this kind of residential place. I didn't even know about the 'Public Consultation period that runs from 26th May until 5pm 21st July.' until after it was well over! It seems to have been sneaked in whilst everyone was so distracted by the EU referendum! Nearly every day or about 5 days a week or at least every week (it can vary - but at least a few days a week is the aim) I try to do at least a half hour brisk walk for the good of my health (like near the recreation ground in Ferndown) &amp; that is not very far from Uddens at all! And we all know how windy it can get &amp; how the wind can blow in any direction &amp; blow the waste particles about into the 'fresh air' we breathe as we walk. It would not be good for my health (I am sensitive to dirty air - hence I wish to live in a clean air environment) nor the health of the many people that live in the area; the families/mothers &amp; children I see that use the playground; &amp; people &amp; families I see that use the recreation ground at King George V playing fields &amp; fields near the schools &amp; sports centre regularly for walking &amp; sport &amp; walking their dogs etc.. Not to mention the children that go out at playtime at Ferndown 1st school, Ferndown Middle school, &amp; Ferndown Upper school all not so far from Uddens.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP339	Disagree	<p>I strongly object to the plans to make Manning Heath area a waste plant. The area is incredibly congested on the roads already. I also object to any odour that will come from there. I live in Canford Heath and can regularly smell the Riveta factory so we would be able to smell the waste. We want to enjoy being outside in our gardens not having awful smells. I strongly object to this happening.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP340	Disagree	<p>I would like to make it known that I and other residents in the area, Very strongly object to this waste site, in the fact that it is not only an industrial area ,but it is also a residential area, and it would have great impact on the property n the area as well. The increase in transport would be using a Road that has a weight restriction on it of 7.5T. Not only would we have to put up with the noise ,the smell, the rats, the dust that would increase, which we have had to put up with from the foundry. How would we be able to enjoy the pleasure of our Conservatory on a hot day, with the doors open? I am therefor sure that there are more suitable sites further out of town.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP439	Disagree	I am writing to register my comment/complaint about the proposed site for Waste Management at Mannings Heath. I work at SMD Limited and our windows face out on to part of this site and my objections are as follows:- Poor light - the offices I work in are on a slope and my window is near the bottom and my view will be blocked completely Ventilation “ at present I am able to open my window for some much needed ventilation and I feel that having a waste site the other side of the path will increase the smell and therefore decrease my ability to open the window Sanitation “ no matter how tidy a waste plant is there will be an increase of germs, animals etc causing the whole area to become unsanitary and unpleasant Poor access “ with the potential increase of up to 100 lorries a day getting to and from work will be increasingly impossible. During the winter months Ling Road is a dangerous enough road with ice etc without adding extra lorries Attracting candidates “I work as the HR Manager and a large part of my job is ensuring that we are attracting good candidates to come and work here. I strongly believe that with an office where people find it difficult to get in the car park, are constantly bombarded with bad smells and a completely blocked view will not help. Lunch breaks “at present we have a half an hour lunch break and make use of the pathway that runs down the side of the building to the steps leading to Tesco “if there is a waste plant will this pathway still be there and if not we do not have enough time to walk to Tesco and back during our half an hour.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Intelligent Land	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP447	Disagree	Intelligent Land acts for Ankers and Rawlings and its allied companies, that own the bulk of the land shown and identified as WPO2 as a strategic waste site and as detailed in the Draft Waste Plan Update “Additional and Emerging Preferred Waste Site Allocations. [Ankers and Rawlings also owns other land identified previously and recorded against Option WP ED03 WP550 in the Report on comments to text and policies of the Draft Waste Plan and officer response “May 2016]. The site WPO2 is being actively pursued through the planning process but is expensive to develop due to costs related, in particular to drainage and bio-diversity. The position of the Client Company has not changed since the representations made in 2015. It is essential that any proposed waste facilities will be viable commercially to enable substantial capital to be invested in new plant and buildings. Ankers and Rawlings also owns other land identified previously and recorded against Option WP ED03 WP550 in the Report on comments to text and policies of the Draft Waste Plan and officer response “May 2016. The previous points and representations as recorded Report on Comments made to the original text and policies of the Draft Waste Plan and officer response “May 2016 stand.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP450		I would like to strongly object to any burning unit for waste being sited on the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. There are many surrounding farms. There are residential sites close to hand. The land is in a hollow, any smoke may not dissipate. This proposal seems to have been as well hidden as the demolition of Arthur Dent's house in Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy. The Horton Road is definitely not suitable for increased traffic	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP455	Agree	My area of interest is the proposed development WP02. It would appear that there will be a considerable increase in lorry traffic site on a daily basis and an increase would not be at all desirable on a road classed as a C-road that is not suitable for heavy vehicles. If the proposed development included the opening up of the Azalea Roundabout and a new road running to the West of the Moors River to the Woolsbridge Industrial site that would relieve the Horton Road of much of the extra traffic this plan would be more acceptable.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Christchurch and East Dorset Councils	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP461	Comment\disagree	<p>WP02: Woolsbridge Industrial Estate: Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is identified in the Draft Waste Plan for the following uses: Residual Waste Treatment including Energy Recovery" (4ha) Bulky Waste Transfer / Treatment (1ha) Household Recycling Centre (0.5 " 1ha) (no longer a preferred option) Waste Vehicle Depot " (0.3 to 0.5ha) (no longer a preferred option) The Draft Waste Local Plan identifies this site as suitable primarily for residual waste treatment and a bulky waste management facility. The latest site assessment states that the site will now not be progressed for a Waste Vehicle Depot or household Recycling Centre. Policy KS5 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 80ha of employment land to come forward in Christchurch and East Dorset over the plan period to meet projected requirements for B1, B2 and B8 employment uses. Policy VTSW6 of the Core Strategy allocates land at Woolsbridge (13.1ha) for employment uses, which includes B1, B2 and B8 uses with some ancillary support services for these employment uses. The Woolsbridge site is of strategic significance for South East Dorset and forms part of a key market centre for industrial development as identified in the Workspace Strategy. The entirety of this employment allocation (VTSW6) is required to deliver Core Strategy employment land requirements for B1, B2 and B8 uses, which is also confirmed through the Workspace Study 2012. The existing Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is included in Core Strategy Policy PC1 where a flexible approach is adopted towards accommodating non B uses. This does not apply to the VTSW6 employment allocation which is allocated only for B1, B2 and B8 uses with some ancillary support services. Therefore the proposals for a waste facility are contrary to the adopted Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy. The Workspace Study identified a requirement for the Bournemouth and Poole SSCT of 173ha to be delivered between 2011 " 2031, which is balanced against an employment land supply of 150ha. In this respect, the site is needed to address employment land requirements for the South East Dorset area and the proposals for waste facilities will prejudice the council's ability to deliver projected requirements for employment land. The local authorities of Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole are currently updating the Workspace Strategy and this site remains part of an industrial centre which is required to meet the employment land needs for the Eastern Dorset Housing Market Area. The Waste Plan ignores the adopted Core Strategy and evidence requirement and inappropriately only refers to national waste planning policy. The councils are concerned about the traffic impact of the range of uses proposed and HGV movements, particularly given the proximity to the A31 Strategic Road Network. In addition to impact on the A31 any proposals will need to assess their impact on the new signalised junction onto Ringwood Road which is proposed as part of the recently consented employment planning application. There is a need for a robust transport assessment to be undertaken to determine the precise impact and mitigation required. The Councils also wish to restate its objection to proposals for household recycling centres at Candys Lane (ED08) and Bailie Gate (ED07). The Councils do not consider that relocating the household recycling centre to Poole as a sustainable option as this will increase traffic to and from the site and from all parts of East Dorset.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP480	Disagree	My main concern with WPO2 is the detrimental effect the extra lorries will have on the residents living on or near Horton Road. We already endure a daily onslaught of commuters and industrial vehicles using the road to access the A31 and A338 highways. Pedestrians also have to negotiate narrow footpaths fearful of the wide vehicles passing only inches away. At night and in winter the situation is much worse because of the lack of street lighting. Furthermore, there has been an increase in population in the area. New housing, shops and other development, combined with increase in the number of visitors to the leisure facilities, has changed Horton Road's character from rural to urban. At times the heavy congestion at Ashley Crossing, especially where Woolsbridge Road and Lions Lane intersect, increases the risk of accident to a high level. Proposals to develop waste processing facilities at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate using 40 heavy transports a day is unacceptable. A relief road would be the obvious solution. We should also be clear on whether the requirement to provide industrial facilities has priority over the need to attract tourists to the same area. The two do not mix!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP496	Disagree	Why would we want an extra waste site at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate when we already have 2 waste sites within a 10 minute drive? one in Ferndown Industrial Estate and one in Sandleheath Fordingbridge. Woolsbridge ind est falls into the catchment area of these 2 operating and existing sites, therefore dealing with all current waste being produced. The traffic flow in and out of Woolsbridge ind est would be significantly increased to an estimate of 80 extra plus vehicle movements per day!! Strongly disagree with this application, the impact on the local environment and local housing area and local businesses will be greatly reduced!! DISAGREE	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP504	Disagree	I oppose the proposal WPO2 in respect of the Woolsbridge Road Industrial site for the following reasons 1.The additional HGV vehicles that will use the Horton Road is totally unacceptable and dangerous. This road is currently the scene of many accidents. 2. The proposed sites are adjacent to an area designated SSI status. 3. The proposed sites are far too close to houses and the threat of air and related pollution is evident. 4. Most residents in this area are unaware of the proposals. I found out today only because I visited One Stop and saw the notice. Why hasn't this proposal which will have such detrimental effects for many people's lives, been more widely notified to residents in the large area affected? In the light of this the cut-off date of 21st July for comments is absurd. 5. The difficulty I have had in establishing how to post this comment is unbelievable, even now I am unsure my comment is being posted in the correct place.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP522	Comment	<p>This proposal seems to have been a surprise to many residents in the Ashley Heath area and it isn't my belief that there has been sufficient consultation on this proposal locally. Simply comparing the comment count seems to support this assertion. As a resident who regularly uses the Ringwood Road my observation is that this road has become very busy over the last 2 years. Unlike the Verwood Road which feeds the Somerly Household Recycling Centre, HGVs visiting the proposed site (up to 40 a day in the outline) will travel through narrow roads in residential areas with the road 10m from the fronts of dwellings. In particular the One Stop in Ashley Heath is already a dangerous focal point for short visits with very high numbers of cars pulling in and out through the day from 0700 to 2200. This shop also has the transit of the Castleman Trailway (pedestrian crossing) with high numbers of pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. These users are frequently families making the crossing already somewhat dangerous but I would say more so with potentially an additional 20 to 40 HGVs each day. In close proximity to the one stop is the entrance to Moors Valley Country Park with over 750,000 visitors a year. This very busy entrance would be crossed by HGVs accessing the proposed site. In addition to car traffic, Forest Edge Drive (almost opposite the entrance) is a feeder road from the Castleman Trailway and at peak times I would estimate 50 to 100 cyclists and pedestrians cross the Ringwood Road to access Moors Valley. This is already a perilous crossing of a 40mph road with no formal pedestrian crossing or traffic control. Assuming the proposed site will operate at weekends, the popular Ashley Heath car boot sale attracts hundreds of cars, again down Ringwood Road, across the Moors Valley entrance and it often tails back many hundreds of meters at peak times across the end of Forest Edge Drive. The new 60 bed care home nearing completion is further up Ringwood road towards the A338. This is sited at the top of a blind summit and throughout this section the road is surprisingly narrow. I believe if HGVs are travelling in both directions this section of the road this will present a risk. It is surprising how noise carries in the Moors river valley. At times work being carried out on the existing Woolsbridge Industrial estate is clearly audible across west side of Ashley's Heath. Any movements of HGVs tipping bulk waste up to 40 times a day will undoubtedly be very disruptive and audible locally. Even if this is carried out in an 8 m high containment building it is my belief that this will still present a significant nuisance to local residents not to mention wildlife in the adjacent SSSI. Any kind of incineration facility or fume venting from a stack would play directly over Moors Valley and the west of Ashley Heath given the prevailing SW wind direction. At a greater distance if brought to earth through precipitation, this would fall directly over the New Forest National park. There is insufficient clarity in the proposal to understand what this stack would emit. I disagree with the proposal and believe that the already busy, narrow, and dangerous Ringwood Road will struggle to cope with HGVs volume, presenting significant danger, noise and disruption to the local residents.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP527	Disagree	<p>My property overlooks the proposed waste site. There are plenty of non-residential areas for waste to be processed. The Horton Road will not take increased traffic, and Moors Valley cyclists and children will be in serious danger from an increase in lorry traffic. This plan is grossly irresponsible - shame on you.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP530	Disagree	<p>I comment as a land-owner with land adjacent to the SSSI which would be impacted by the proposed possible development near Woolsbridge Farm. The proposed siting option would locate a potentially polluting facility adjacent to the above-mentioned SSSI. This SSSI was created to protect species requiring the conditions of a river and or flood plain. On the assumption that any industrial facility, let alone a waste treatment plant, would have to be sited at a level little higher than the water table, the risk of contamination is extreme. I have not noticed an impact assessment by English Nature. Perhaps I have missed that. I have observed that the Moors River at this point is now devoid of fish that were plentiful a decade or so ago. I assume this is as a result of existing contamination. Further contamination to water can only worsen this issue. I find myself surprised at the extent of existing development within green belt in the Woolsbridge area. This is apparently justified in part by the need to create employment. How much unemployment is there in this area? Would the few unemployed have the skills or capacity to work in a waste facility? Reports mention under-use of existing buildings on Woolsbridge industrial estate. How then can more estate capacity be justifiable? In terms of vehicle access, the worst-case scenario, I understand, is two waste plant types requiring up to 50 vehicle (one way) journeys per day. How can this be sanctioned when the Horton Road is not fit even for existing commercial traffic? The consequent noise and particulate pollution from vehicles using this road will have a major impact on adjacent green belt, SSSI and Moors Valley Country Park. Moors Valley is one of the most popular recreational parks in the country. This is a facility that really does create employment. It also generates significant revenue locally and promotes fitness for health in a major way. Why risk negatively impacting Moors Valley with vehicular pollution and further traffic congestion? The bottom line: why cannot a waste treatment facility be located in other than Green Belt, away from environmentally sensitive environments and accessed by fit-for-purpose highways?</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Natural England	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP623	Comment	<p>WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment/ Bulky Waste Treatment There are sensitive specially protected designated sites to the west and east, Natural England advice that we would require some further information to conclude that the southern site would not give rise to concerns about aerial pollution effects (dust and NOx).</p>	<p>Your helpful comments are noted and will be considered further when developing the preferred site.</p>
Highways England	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP861	Comment	<p>This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. The development of this site has the potential to impact the SRN and previous comments still stand. However, Highways England welcomes the decision not to allocate the site in the Waste Plan, for a HRC/Depot, which may have generated significant movements of private cars and HGVs on and across the SRN.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Individual</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WP858</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment\disagree</p> <p>Response of the East Dorset Environment Partnership Please note all references to the Local Plan relate to the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan, adopted April 2014</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. HRA Screening 1.1 We note the HRA Screening report (updated June 2016) and the findings (p9-10) that the sites WPO1 and WPO2 have been assessed as needing further consideration as the likely significant effect on European sites is uncertain. We disagree with the suggestion that no is an appropriate assessment (Appendix 2 p35) as it has failed to consider the displacement of informal recreation from the land to the SW of Blunts Farm.</li> <li>2. Sustainability Appraisal 2.1 HRC Table 1 p100-108) 2.1.1 This displacement of informal recreation is identified in SA Objective 2 (though we suggest that the extent of its use and impact of its loss are underestimated). Because of its proximity to heathland and wetland SSSIs and the SNCI, we disagree with the Positive assessment of ED03 (Woolsbridge).</li> <li>2.1.2 Objective 4 .There is drainage from both Blunts Farm and the Ferndown Area of Search to Uddens Water, part of the Moors River SSSI system. A spillage on the Ferndown Industrial Estate some years ago resulted in huge ecological loss from which it has never recovered.</li> <li>2.1.3 Objective 5. Please see below for comments on high water table of the Land SW of Blunts Farm based on personal observation of EDEP members and local resident’s reports.</li> <li>2.1.4 Objective 15. The Land SW of Blunts Farm would have a negative impact on the transport network if access were from Wimborne Road West. Details of the AADT are given below.</li> <li>2.2 Waste Vehicle Depot p114 “121 2.2.1 Objectives 2 and 4. Impact on biodiversity and ground and surface water depends on proper pollution control measures being installed, managed and monitored. There is drainage from both Blunts Farm and Ferndown Area of Search to Uddens Water, part of the Moors River SSSI system. A spillage on the Ferndown Industrial Estate some years ago resulted in huge ecological loss from which it has never recovered. The Moors River is the subject of a restoration plan (Natural England/Environment Agency)</li> <li>3. The Residual Waste Site Identification Report (January 2016) has not included any reference to the Land SW of Blunts Farm so appears not to have been assessed.</li> <li>5. WPO2 (formerly ED03) Woolsbridge - Residual waste /bulky waste treatment 5.1 Please see our earlier comments, appended for ease of reference. They still stand. We note officer responses to these and wish to add the following.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5.1.1 The type, timing and frequency of vehicle movements and the route they take will affect the acceptability of proposals to local communities and other businesses on the Woolsbridge site. The impact on the complex, busy and dangerous double and adjacent T- junction where Horton, Woolsbridge and Lions Lane converge near the One-stop shop should be taken into consideration now and not left to the planning application stage.</li> <li>5.1.2 The entrance to Moors Valley Country Park is less than 1 mile from the entrance to Woolsbridge and most visitors will use the route from Ashley Heath roundabout (A31).</li> <li>5.1.3 The statement in the consultation document (p36) that the southern parcel of land is further from sensitive receptors is incorrect. No point on either of the two allocated areas of new employment land is more than 250m from a heathland or wetland SSSI sensitive to run-off and aerial pollution. Any waste facility would need to be a totally enclosed state of the art building so that there is no rain/run-off contact with waste, oil interceptors/pollution pond, SUDs for roads/hardstanding’s and building has air quality treatment on extractor fans. The cost of such a facility may render the proposal too costly to attract investment.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Appendix 1 Extract from EDEP response to Draft Waste Plan 2015 ED03 Woolsbridge Ind Estate, Three Legged Cross Not all of the VTSW6 allocation has come forward as a planning application to date: there is no information on the current position regarding the northernmost section. EDEPs response to the outline Planning Application for a large part of the site is appended for information. Please see also Dorset Wildlife Trusts response regarding the SNCI. The Highways improvements to the access to the site (2nd prerequisite in the Local Plan) apply to the entrance off the C2 and not the C2 itself. 2014 AADT for the C2 Horton Road “ Ashley Heath is 10,400. Weekend traffic is particularly heavy The Transport Plan identified that Ashley Heath roundabout would be at capacity in 2016 and the Planning Application for outline consent for the extension to the employment site also identifies that the junctions/mini-roundabouts at Three Legged Cross are nearing capacity and will be exceeded significantly by the end of the Local Plan period (2028). Highways Agency plans for widening the A31 in the Ringwood area will have an impact on access, particularly during construction. Consideration of the impact of establishing an HRC here will need to include potential for traffic increase on the C2 and use of the above mentioned road junctions and residential roads due to: - other new employment opportunities on the site - population growth and additional school traffic when all Local Plan developments for Verwood (including the new upper school) have been completed. The impact on visitors to Moors Valley Country Park (and hence revenue) should also be assessed. 2012 data (DorsetforYou) indicates over 800,000 visitor’s pa. Impact on other businesses and recreational facilities that contribute to the local economy should be considered including those on Woolsbridge Estate and the many others along the C2. Total vehicle movements accessing the site from all parts of East Dorset will be required. Is it intended to allow Hampshire residents to use it? The most likely routes should also be</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
---	--	--	---	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
				<p>established so that neither West Moors nor Ashley Heath becomes a rat run to an HRC facility with drivers avoiding a congested A31. The most obvious routes for anyone approaching from Wimborne/Ferndown would be: i) turnings off the A31 into Braeside Road and Woolsbridge Road with other residential roads leading off them also bearing the brunt of additional traffic: any increase in HGV traffic along Woolsbridge Road is unacceptable (narrow and would compromise access to Doctors surgery). Although HGVs could be restricted (this would require monitoring) it would not be possible to identify private vehicles and small vans travelling to an HRC. ii) Through West Moors. West Moors campaigned for many years for a bypass which cannot be provided for natural environment reasons. As with Stapehill and ED02, it would be unreasonable to expect either community to tolerate a significant increase in through traffic. Depending on the type of waste facility considered for this location there is potential for conflict with the Local Plan because of impact on sensitive ecological receptors "Moors River SSSI, Heathland SSSIs and the SNCI. Distances to this facility from various towns and villages given in the Site Assessments are incorrect: Verwood is 4.6 miles not 4.1km Ferndown (via West Moors) is 4.9 miles or 5.5 miles (via A31) not 4.9km Corfe Mullen is 13.9miles (not 13.4km) Wimborne is 9.7miles (not 9.3km) Colehill is 8.7 miles (not 7.2km) West Moors is 3.2 miles (via Three legged Cross) not 2.3km (data are from Google Maps).</p>	

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Environment Agency	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP836	Comment	<p>No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided below. Flood Risk Part of site is within FZ2 and FZ3. Some flooding is shown on our surface water maps. If there is an Ordinary watercourse on site "Land Drainage Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) may be required. LLFA should be consulted on the proposed waste site. Water quality Unaware of current waste storage, but site drains to sensitive Moors River, which is SSSI. Site has a minor watercourse running through it and is close to the Moors River. Site adjacent Dorset Heaths SAC/ Dorset Heathlands SPA and RAMSAR, and Holt and West Moors Heaths SSSI. Groundwater This site is on a minor aquifer of Secondary or Unproductive designation. We would have no objection relating to groundwater issues subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. Any existing contaminated land will require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options appraisal in accordance with CLR11. Flood Risk Because site is partially within FZ2 and FZ3, the Sequential Test / Sequential Approach should be undertaken by Local Planning Authority at the site allocation stage. A detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is required to include assessment of flood risk from all sources. Preferably the FRA should be undertaken at the site allocation stage. This should also include surface water management. There may be restrictions on use of soakaways, depending on the nature of the site (e.g. contaminated/ high groundwater levels). Groundwater and Contaminated land May require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options Appraisal at planning application stage. Waste/ Environmental permitting Other considerations to consider: 1. Under power lines 2. Odour and noise The application of the waste hierarchy should be considered. Mitigation should be in place to reduce disruption from flooding and contingency if facility made unavailable. Biodiversity Ecological survey may be required at planning application stage.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP827	Disagree	<p>I have today discovered by chance that there is a planning application for a large waste processing plant on the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. The date for objections was 21/07/16.as a rate payer and resident of Ashley Heath to develop such a facility so close to three major residential areas is totally unacceptable with air pollution, noise and significant disturbance due to the large number of HGVs accessing the site via Horton Road. Also it will less than a mile from Moors Valley Country Park which is one of the largest tourist attractions in Dorset. To allow this development would represent a significant retrograde step in sensible planning decisions and would be to the detriment of the health and welfare of Dorset's residents and its image nationally and internationally.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
St Leonards & St Ives Parish Council	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP805	Disagree	Firstly we fully endorse and support the comments made on the above consultation of the East Dorset Environment Project (EDEP). We particularly have grave concerns over the site proposed for the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate (site ED03) and strongly object as this will have a direct detrimental impact on this Parish and its residents due to:- Ecological Impact due to close proximity to SSSI land and the Moors river Number of vehicle movements of HGVs through residential areas impact of such on our community The Horton Road and adjacent roads are totally unsuitable to such an increase in HGVs Impact on the economy of such a facility so close to businesses, recreational facilities i.e., Moors Valley Detrimental impact on other new employment opportunities on the Woolsbridge Ind Site	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP699	Comment	The southern section of the proposed development site lies adjacent to SU00/053 Woolsbridge Farm Carr Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) which comprises wet woodland and unimproved neutral grassland, BAP priority habitats supporting a number of Dorset notable plant species. As with the current outline planning application for mixed employment development, Dorset Wildlife Trust would want to see a substantial buffer between any waste treatment facility and the SNCI. The ditch which runs down from the existing industrial estate, alongside the proposed site drains directly into the SNCI so there will need to be strict measures in place to ensure that there is no possibility of pollution into the fragile wet woodland habitat if waste materials are being treated. This would probably require a totally enclosed building with appropriate technology to ensure that there is no rain/run-off contact with waste, oil interceptors or other pollutants. Similar impacts will have to be assessed on the adjacent internationally designated heathlands.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised Further thought will be given to the provision of an appropriate buffer from the SNCI as suggested.
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP889	Comment	Woolsbridge, WP02 ( WP ED03 in original draft): Chapters 5 & 6 in the Update Please exclude the Southern site from your consideration as its environmental sensitivity makes it unsuitable for waste operations. Please don't consider keeping options open here. A waste operation in the North-Westerly site must have a buffer between it and the flood risk areas. Incineration Waste burning must not happen in these areas. As we pointed out in our response to para 1.1, we are strongly opposed to any waste burning on the site but if the WPA permits this, it should be in conjunction with CHP. As stated, we do not oppose pyrolysis & gasification and we support anaerobic digestion of (mostly) uncontaminated organic waste.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP732	Disagree	<p>We strongly contest the proposal to allow development of land adjacent to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate for a waste transfer station and burner unit. The green belt was lifted to allow development which would enhance the existing industrial estate (sports hall, crèches, cafes, etc): a waste transfer station does not. Transport The Horton Road is an unclassified road with a large number of residential properties directly accessing it. It cannot adequately support the present volume of traffic, this proposal would increase this by at least another 80 lorry journeys per day. When the Industrial Estate was originally built, residents were assured the main entrance would be built directly onto the A31 (the roundabout was built at that time and has never been linked up) because even then the road was deemed too small to handle increased capacity. Lorries carrying waste materials are prone to losing loose particles from their loads - these would contaminate residential areas. Much of the waste materials are contaminated, i.e. asbestos or chemicals, but that would not be determined until it has travelled to the site and sorted there, what happens to it then? Ecology The proposed development land borders a SSSI site, which is also a category 3 flood zone. All water, flooding or rainwater, naturally drains through this SSSI site into the Moors River (also SSSI). It would be impossible to prevent contamination (either surface or underground). Changing the water flow would be impossible and containment bonding totally ineffective. Since the Moors River and adjoining land was granted SSSI status, sympathetic farming practices have ensured it is one of the best preserved water meadow areas in the country, all of this would be destroyed. The Castleman Trailway runs along nearby and is very widely used by dog walkers, cyclists, rambles, etc, and this very scenic and peaceful environment would be adversely affected. A project was launched to reintroduce water vole into the Moors River, it is a very fragile ecological environment which is building in strength, and all this would be lost. Rare nesting birds that live in the SSSI area would be at a far greater risk of attack from the increased number of vermin who will reside within the waste environment. Environment Many families who live within the area of this proposed development were here long before the industrial estate was built. Whilst it is accepted that things change with time, this proposed waste treatment facility encroaches upon our lives and denies us the right to live in a clean, peaceful and healthy environment. Dust, smell and noise pollution would be predominate and totally unacceptable in a rural environment. Moors Valley Country Park was built to enhance and encourage outdoor activities, it attracts many tourists and the tourism industry is a very important part of the economy in this area. A waste transfer centre and waste burning unit would discourage anybody from visiting the area. Vermin are always very prevalent wherever waste exists, the airborne and waterborne diseases would increase to both humans and animals. Burner Unit We do not want a burner unit within our area. Emissions can be reduced but cannot be eradicated (mercury and heavy metal fallouts still occur) we have five schools and six nurseries within a five mile radius these could be affected by fallout from these chimneys no matter how high the stack is, our children have a right to grow up in a clean environment. Air pollution is a major cause of breather problems including asthma, and it has been proven that this type of burning emits more air pollutants than even the old fashioned open coal fires.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP736	Disagree	<p>Woolsbridge Manor Farm Caravan Park has been owned and run by the family for over 50 year. I have attained 4 star rating for quality and a gold award for conservation this development would destroy this business and many others around here. Tourism is a major contributor to the economy in this area "a clean and healthy rural environment is essential. This is a green belt area. Who would want to holiday opposite a rubbish dump? The road would be completely congested, entry and exist to properties almost impossible. The Horton Road is classes as a small rural road, it is already saturated with traffic beyond its capacity which is reflected in its poor condition and constant need for maintenance. Cyclists and pedestrians would be at risk from additional traffic and lorries thundering along.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP586	Disagree	I disagree that the site is suitable, in particular the North East extension, which is very close to residential properties. The siting of a chimney at either extension will cause poor air quality for residents, holiday makers that use the caravan sites in the area and also for patrons of the very popular Three Legged Cross pub, who sit in the gardens to eat and drink. Ringwood Road/Horton Road is already an extremely busy road with large numbers of noisy HGV's. There have been numerous road traffic accidents near/at the junction of Woolsbridge Road & Ringwood Road and any increase in traffic movements will only further blight the lives of residents.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP577	Disagree		
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP583	Disagree	I can only echo the valid objections and cogent arguments made by others regarding vehicle congestion [along Horton Road] and the inherent pollution to very many surrounding residents. Moreover, to dress this up with the suggestion that CHP might be a helpful bi-product is as spurious as indicating that living near Chernobyl could reduce the need for central heating!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP737	Disagree	For generations of my family have lived and worked here on our organic farm. Everything is produced free from chemicals, pesticides pollutants etc. A waste transfer station would pollute this whole area. We are very proud of our SSSI consideration area and always strive to ensure its welfare, vermin and contamination will destroy it all. Water voles were reintroduced into the Moors River after this fragile environment was destroyed by unrestricted leaching of pollutants from uncontrolled development upstream, this development would wipe it all out. The fallout from a burner would pollute air, much of the woodland around here comprise of hardwood trees, old oak etc these cannot survive contamination and would take hundreds of years to replenish themselves.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP746	Disagree	I am writing to express my strong opposition to this proposal as a local resident of Ashley Heath of 15 years, a former Parish Councillor here for 14 years and now official advisor to St Leonards and St Ives PC on environmental matters. My objections, in no particular order of importance but strongly applicable in all respects, are based on the impact on the local communities of Ashley Heath and Three Legged Cross arising from operation of the facility, the impact on heathland and river system SSSIs in close proximity, and further impact on residents of Ashley Heath consequent upon greatly increased traffic flows accessing this site from the A31 eastbound carriageway using Woolsbridge Road and possibly also Braeside Road. The impact on people's quality of life will be extremely detrimental. Given the nature of the facility, its location so close to residential properties and on the far Eastern border of Dorset does seem rather puzzling.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP747	Disagree	We would like to say how dismayed we were to suddenly learn at 13.23pm today of the proposed Bulky Waste treatment and Residual Waste treatment Facility at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, giving us only two days to make any comments. Firstly the traffic along Horton Road has greatly increased over the years and more heavy HGV Waste trucks using the road would be very detrimental to the area indeed. The road is already very congested with traffic coming from Verwood, and West Moors to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate to say nothing of the traffic coming from the other direction to Moors Valley Country Park, the car boot site and the Industrial site. We find it very difficult even now to exit our road Forest Edge Drive onto the Horton Road. Secondly to build a site like that next to a Site of Scientific Interest seems incredible. Has the effect of pollution even been considered on the flora and fauna? Thirdly the thought of a tall chimney spewing out smoke and fumes so near to residential houses is very alarming. We hope most sincerely that the Dorset County Council will reconsider siting the plant on the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP752	Disagree	Firstly I have to say that today was the first day any of my friends and neighbours had heard about this plan. The Home watch co-ordinator informed us but nowhere has any details of the proposal been seen. This seems to be a very sneaky way of trying to pass something without any opposition. Horton Road is already inundated with traffic from the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate and from Verwood, much of it very large and even Exceptionally large vehicles. This proposal would increase this traffic making a relatively small road even busier for any of the inhabitants trying to use the road. It is also quite narrow in places and already it is often necessary to drive along the pavement to give the lorries enough space. The area you propose using is very close to SSSI land and under usual circumstances nobody would be allowed to interfere with or cause any threat to the flora and fauna of such areas. The chimney of 100m would be a complete eyesore in such a lovely area and totally inappropriate for such a residential area. The fumes would be a health hazard to the many people living in the area. You say the site would be masked by trees. I would like to know where you would find a tree large enough to mask a 100m chimney. I am completely against such a proposed development for environmental and health reasons and see this as an attempt to get the proposal passed without giving the local people the opportunity to object - which I do most strongly.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP754	Disagree	<p>1/ Access. The Horton Road has seen a significant increase in traffic volume in the last 20 years. It is a minor county road of limited width and as such is unsuitable for large, heavy vehicles. It also serves as the only vehicular access to Moors valley Country Park bringing large numbers of visitors. This combination of heavy vehicles, leisure, and local traffic would be potentially dangerous and unsustainable. Vehicles emerging from the Woolsbridge site onto Horton Road have poor visibility due to a blind bend to the east. Increased movements of heavy lorries would increase the risk of accidents at this junction. 2/Environment. Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is a low key, low level commercial site and at present has no significant visual impact on the surrounding area. The erection of a chimney would have detrimental effect on what is generally rural countryside. The presence of SSSI sites in close proximity to the proposed facility is of great concern to me considering the amount of resources and effort has been put into conservation in this area by a lot of organisations including DDC and EDDC. There is a risk to these sensitive areas from the leaching of toxins into the Moors river, air pollution from the extra traffic and the proposed chimney. Moors Valley Country Park is now one of the most visited attractions in Dorset, in its self a credit to the council and the forestry commission, thousands of people enjoy the natural leisure facilities this area offers. Allowing this development can only be detrimental to a beautiful area of Dorset.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP755			

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Performance Message	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP756	Disagree	I would like to lodge my objection to this proposal and particular distain for the fact I have only today found out about the proposal despite being a local resident My reason for objecting are as follows 1. This is opposite Moors Valley Country Park where many local families and visitor come to enjoy the beautiful forest and clean air and enjoy some recreational time in the country. This would be spoilt with the smell of burning and air pollution. 2. The traffic in this area is currently already congested especially when Rollalong move their pre-fabricated buildings closing the road to traffic. This would only be further compromised with regular lorry movement. 3. During the school holiday Moors Valley creates a large volume of traffic entering and leaving the park which already results in traffic jams for local residents 3. There have been a number of accidents over the years at this junction and this would simply increase the flow of traffic and potential for further accidents. 4. This area is heathland which is resident to a number of animal and plant species as well as a popular place to walk 5. The casltemain Railway track runs behind this area which would spoil the experience for those that are using it. 6. Other local business such as livery yards, pubs and cafes would be affected by the solution 7. Residents along this road would see an increase in heavy traffic movement thereby decreasing the value of their homes.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP759	Disagree	This is opposite Moors Valley Country Park where many local families and visitor come to enjoy the beautiful forest and clean air and enjoy some recreational time in the country. This would be spoilt with the smell of burning and air pollution. 2. The traffic in this area is currently already congested especially when Rollalong move their pre-fabricated buildings closing the road to traffic. This would only be further compromised with regular lorry movement. 3. During the school holiday Moors Valley creates a large volume of traffic entering and leaving the park which already results in traffic jams for local residents 3. There have been a number of accidents over the years at this junction and this would simply increase the flow of traffic and potential for further accidents. 4. This area is heathland which is resident to a number of animal and plant species as well as a popular place to walk 5. The casltemain Railway track runs behind this area which would spoil the experience for those that are using it. 6. Other local business such as livery yards, pubs and cafes would be affected by the solution 7. Residents along this road would see an increase in heavy traffic movement thereby decreasing the value of their homes.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP768	Disagree	I am writing to beg you not to go ahead with this plan. I live on Horton Road and my bedroom is just feet away from the road and the lorries hurtling through is horrendous. The whole place shakes, and the garden is unusable because of noise and fumes from the existing lorries so to have more going up and down will be unbearable. The road needs to be 30 mph. They accelerate to get up the hill and are doing way over the present 40 mph it is now. There needs to be a road built from the Ind. Estate directly out on to the A31 before this plan should go ahead. Horton Road is too narrow I have seen lorries get wedged together when trying to pass each other and also mount the pavement. Please Please re think this.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP771	Disagree	We are very disappointed about this proposal. We moved here last year to enjoy our retirement in more rural surroundings and now we face the prospect of even heavier traffic on the Horton Road, particularly HGVs, and we are also alarmed by the proposal to build this huge chimney.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP772	Disagree	I wish to put forward my strongest objection to the above proposals. We live in the country for a reason and don't want extra traffic HGV. On the Horton Road. Especially as the attraction of moors valley is close by which man children ride their bikes to. The road is dangerous enough already. Also I would like to know why as a resident nothing was posted to me informing of any of the proposals. Only through local postings on face book would I be aware of what's going on. It's a disgrace	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP775	Disagree	I am writing to record my objection to a waste management site on the above industrial estate. Unfortunately your planning website is so nebulous and difficult to pinpoint a particular site that I have not been able to verify the rumours of a large site with a 60' chimney and regular 40 ton lorries accessing the site via Horton Road/Ringwood Road. However, the sparse details indicate that at least the latter is true if not the former. I would have thought that such an application would have been well publicised and circulated to the local population with notices at the entrance to the site (if there are I have not noticed and apologise). My objections are based upon - a) excess dust and noise from the site itself. b) Poor air quality that will drift on a prevailing westerly wind over the parishes of Ashley Heath, St. Ives and St. Leonards. c) The impact on the wildlife that surrounds the industrial estate. d) The increased traffic of 40 ton lorries on the Horton Road that will endanger young lives particularly those who visit Moors Valley. The access from Ringwood is blind and those of us that regularly use that route appreciate the need for care and quick responses to vehicles exiting the industrial estate which infrequent visitors to The Three legged Cross pub would not know. Why the natural and obvious extension from the A31 to W.I.E. has never been built is a mystery and should be actively considered. e) The ugliness of a 60' chimney polluting an area of SSSI with chemicals and dust directly passing above the aforementioned villages plus the walkers and cyclists that use the Castlemain Trailway breathing in potentially toxic air. f) The adverse impact the site will have on the existing workforce of the businesses sited on the W.I.E which should be for light commercial usage. I trust my objections will be noted and look forward to a suitable rejection of this application.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP776		We would like to record our opposition to the above proposal on the grounds of the number of lorry movements using Horton Road and the proximity of the incinerator chimney to local housing.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP778	Disagree	As a frequent walker on the heathland in close proximity to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate I would like to make the following comments about the proposal to position a waste site adjacent to this: Noxious fumes emitted would be harmful not only to local residents but also to the considerable SSSI which is a habitat for many rare creatures such as Nightjars and Dartford Warblers. A tall industrial chimney would be completely inappropriate in the middle of rural/heath land which is valued as a natural environment both by local residents and visitors (large numbers of whom in particular visit the nearby Moors Valley Country Park). I therefore would urge you to reject this proposal.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP783	Disagree	We are writing to lodge our objections via email due to be unable to access the application via the Dorset for You website. We live five houses away from the proposed site, this is a green belt area, I suffer from Asthma already and the air pollution will be detrimental to my health. Can this incinerator be located on an existing land fill site which would not have such a dramatic impact on village environment?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP784	Disagree	As a local resident in a reasonably close proximity to the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate I would like to make the following comments about the proposal to position a waste site in the specific area, I object strongly on the following grounds: I believe that fumes from such a plant would be noxious in nature and would ruin the residential area as there are many housing estates nearby. In addition adjacent to the Woolsbridge industrial estate is a site of special scientific interest which is the home of many wild and rare creatures. Lions Hill nature reserve for example has bats, Dartford warblers, nightjars, adders etc etc. There is a large leisure presence in the area due to the Castleman Trail Way and Moors Valley Park which are both used extensively and are adjacent to the site. There are also numerous campsites and a large tourist economy at risk. The tall chimney proposed I believe is probably due to noxious fumes is extremely tall and would ruin the skyline for all concerned. In summary I believe planning permission should not be granted due to residential impact, wildlife impact and potential harm to a very leisure and wildlife orientated area with a lot of tourists. I therefore would urge you to reject this proposal.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016W/P788	Disagree	I am objecting on behalf of my husband and my two beautiful daughters. We work and live 50 meters from the proposed site. I was born here and live with my parents who have been here for 63 years. Our land is 12ft lower than the proposed site and the ground floods onto our land and into the Moors river over the winter every year. The land is SSSI and the site would contaminate the river and land where we grow our organic vegetables for our family. The noise of reversing beepers and machinery on a day to day basis would be unbearable in a green belt area; the noise ricochets off any building making it magnified. Dust and rats are also a concern for our business. The road is obviously a problem as the footpaths are overshadowed by the lorries when passing one another, making us stop and stand back into the hedge to avoid contact, which is very dangerous with a pushchair.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016W/P791	Disagree	I learnt today about the incineration plant planned for Woolsbridge Industrial Estate and have many objections to it. My chief concern is that of air quality: 1. Cancer causing particles. 2. This plant is too close to a residential area. 3. The proximity to Moors Valley Country Park and caravan parks. 4. It is next to SSSI land, so the impact on wildlife will be significant. 5. It is close to streams and rivers, so the pollution will enter the water supply. In all, to place such an incinerator here is a totally ill-conceived idea and it must not be allowed to go ahead. I have emailed rather than written, as it has only just come to my attention. No one whom I have encountered in the area since finding out about this was aware of it. When there is a planned change of such major importance, it is imperative that everyone concerned, i.e. in a five mile radius, should have been informed of it via a leaflet drop or the Dorset Council Magazine, delivered to all homes in this area. To go ahead without those whom it concerns being made aware of it, seems very underhand. Concerns about the increase of heavy traffic on Horton Road, which is already at breaking point. As Woolsbridge Industrial Estate is on the boundary of Dorset and Hampshire, another reason why this site would be totally unsuitable is that waste would have to be brought right across Dorset to reach it, putting pressure on overused roads and holiday routes. It is also very low-lying. Would it not make sense, with regard to the toxic pollutants, to choose somewhere much further above sea-level than Woolsbridge Industrial Estate?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP794	Disagree	<p>1. The proposed site at the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate can only be accessed via the Horton Road. This road is not a major road and is already very heavily used by traffic to the neighbouring houses, The Country Park which is one of the most popular attractions in the area, the current Industrial Estate and other through traffic. At many times of the day it is already hard to enter the Horton Road from the side roads. I live in Forest Edge Drive. You state that some of the industrial units at Woolsbridge are unoccupied. Clearly if there is any upturn in the economy these may again be filled adding further to pressure on the road system. The proposed new facility could only add to the existing pressures. My assertion is that the Horton Road is not suitable for additional heavy lorries on a daily basis. 2. The land around the proposed site is low lying and must be at risk of flooding. Recent weather conditions caused by global warming have produced considerable drainage problems in the area. Where this proposed facility to be subject to flooding there must be significant risk of waste getting into the local rivers which flow through the local SSI. I note from your report that you quote a risk of 1:100/ 1:1000 but I would say that the risk in current climatic weather conditions is actually much greater than that. You have only to look at the land at the entrance to the Country park at the end of Forest Edge Drive which now is constantly under water. My Assertion is The seriousness of the drainage problems in the vicinity must not be glossed over. 3. Odour and noise, as already mentioned this proposed site is near the Country Park which has a very large car park often filled to capacity in the summer. This facility brings a lot of people to the local area and is a great resource for a reasonably priced day out for an enormous number of people (and cars), will you be able to ensure that there is no risk of this facility being damaged by odour and noise both from the facility itself and waste being transported by the lorries. It already has the waste resource on the other side in Verwood Forest. To surround such an important site with waste resources seems to be to be a very bad idea. There is also of course the Three Legged Cross public house and restaurant with its outside seating area. And the various local camp sites within very close proximity. Odour can hang around and may very well put people off eating outside or camping at this location which would of course damage local businesses. Little is made of it in your report but the trail way also passes very near to the site. The trailway provides further riding, cycling and walking opportunities for residents and visitors looking to get out for fresh air. My Assertion is that unless the odour and noise is very tightly controlled there is a very real risk to the local areas economy and facilities 4 Lastly- there is of course the very large fuel facility nearby. Should this proposed facility be built and catch fire- would there be any risk of it spreading through the vegetation either to the local houses or the fuel dump itself which would lead to potential catastrophic damage to the area? The nearest fire stations at Verwood has no full time fire fighters and the one at Ferndown has on call fire fighters in the evenings and weekends. Marshalling a strong fire fighting force could well take some time I apologise for having to write this without the full force of statistics and detail but the need for a response has only come to my attention in the last couple of days and I am grateful to Emma Macdonald for her assistance in giving me the necessary documentation to enable me to respond.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP797	Disagree	<p>This email is to object to the above proposal at Uddens and Woolsbridge, due to the toxicity and environmental pollution as well as the increased traffic and noise.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP801	Disagree	I have only just heard about the proposed plans for the above. I am very suspicious of the reasons that this has been kept quiet. Nobody I have spoken to in the last few days has heard anything about it! It seems incredible that someone is even considering this site. Besides the obvious horrors of smell and pollution close to the small village of Ashley Heath/St Leonard's and St Ives, that may do harm to a generally elder population live, who thought they had chosen a calm peaceful retirement area, the thought of the Horton Road having even more lorries travelling on a road that was certainly not designed for heavy traffic is unthinkable. Currently I walk along the Horton Road most days and take my life in my hands every time with oversized lorries with new mobile homes (unescorted most of the time!) and huge transporter lorries, most of which come to and from the Woolsbridge industrial estate! Why this is allowed I cannot say but it has been getting worse and worse recently. To add more lorries to this already horrendous situation would be nothing short of criminal!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP806	Disagree	I wish to formally object to the proposed Woolsbridge Industrial Estate Incinerator on the grounds of: - The effect on the SSSI land and Moors River. The number of HGVs travelling up and down Horton Road, which is completely unsuited to the volume of HGVs that will be using this B Road The impact on the local businesses presently in operation in the immediate area. The impact on nearby residential properties.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP807	Disagree	I would like to register my objection to the proposed Waste Unit and Strategic Re-cycling Centre at the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate on the grounds of increased HGV traffic on unsuitable roads, potential health problems and unacceptable noise and air pollution in a rural, domestic setting over a large area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP813	Disagree	Our farm is within 5 metres of the proposed site and will influence our family and business life for ever. The rural aspect will change, noise will be constant, whether in a building or not. Fumes and fallout from the burner will affect our health, especially when the cloud is low. Invasion from vermin into the hay straw in the barns and the considerable risk of fire. Dust and smells are very prevalent in these operations. Our farm is SSSI with rare flora and fauna which would at great risk from contamination in the winter months, as the proposed land floods our ground or at the least drains out through ditches. We all work outside in this property and would be at risk of pollution in the air. Many of our neighbours are unaware of the proposed development as no information has been sent to them, we feel a public meeting would be in order to put their concerns at rest.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP815	Disagree	We strongly object to your use of this site for recycling waste products so close to our property. This will cause dust and smells and excessive noise. More traffic on an already busy road. There will be lorries coming and going all day, when there are already numerous lorries from the Woolsbridge and Ashley heath industrial estates. This is entirely unsuitable in this residential & tourist area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP819	Disagree	With reference to the above proposal I am writing to express my concern over several factors which could in turn have an impact on my family and residence. I live on the Horton Road, which is one of the access routes to Woolsbridge Industrial Estate and already there are an increasing number of very large and heavy transport vehicles using this road. The increased number that will obviously occur due to your waste proposal plan will in turn impact on the traffic levels, wear and tear on the roads, danger to walkers, cyclists and other road users over time. Already the extremely large vehicles who use this road frequently cause my entire house to shake and this problem will again, most likely increase further. This also brings extra traffic pollution and noise pollution to a once quiet and peaceful green belt area. My other concern is more serious, however, as I feel that no matter how much the environment agency assess the impact of an incineration plant, this again will increase levels of pollution and I worry for the health of my family and my children. I therefore wish to strongly oppose this proposal on the above points aforementioned.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP820	Disagree	NO NO NO. Can you imagine what it will be like for us in Ashley Heath with the prevailing wind. I have been to Lulworth today and there has been plenty of land with NO HOUSES nearby. Pick out another area where pollution and Traffic chaos will not happen. I and my husband only found out yesterday about this ridiculous idea (caught a bus on Lions Lane where a notice was displayed) so did others from my area of Ashley Heath. The notice said today was the last day to moan. NO NO NO	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP821	Disagree	Strong objection regarding expected increase in heavy lorry usage of Horton Road. Previous plans for access to be made to estates from A31, twice considered, should be a prior requisite in view of large increase already experienced in traffic volumes.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP822	Disagree	Our local community chat site has raised this issue. Wherever this site is required, there are going to be additional heavy goods vehicles using the roads local to the site. So firstly the Council needs to show the residents a copy of a contract showing their intention to maintain these roads. More and more use is being made of them over the years yet there does not seem to be enough funding to accommodate their upkeep now, so a maintenance plan is a must if these roads are to be used more and by bigger vehicles. Whether or not it will inconvenience the residents living near the proposed site is for the residents to assess and then comment. The Council must therefore be sure to notify these residents and invite their opinion individually by means of a letter rather than a notice in a local circular, which may or may not reach everyone involved. If these two extremely relevant matters are adequately addressed then as you say, plans to deal with waste efficiently are needed. However it is a quick fix rather than the government make it law for all manufacturers to make environmentally/ biodegradable friendly packaging, or wait until the population stops increasing when the immigrant problem is addressed now we have declined the EU's invitation/expectations to remain associated with them.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP824	Disagree	I would like to register my objection to the proposed burner at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate. There are many studies about the emissions, with possible connections to cancer, & as I live in West Moors, backing on to the Plantation, I am very concerned about this.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP825	Disagree	I would like to convey my dislike about the proposed chimney for waste on the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate, I live in Ashley Heath, and find it difficult now to get onto the Horton Rd, without all the extra lorries, rushing about, there is a caravan park with children, and also Moors Valley Country Park, again lots of private cars with mostly children inside them, this is a residential area, not an area for a very tall chimney burning rubbish. Please rethink on this area. This is not the place for this chimney	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO2 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP826	Disagree	I find it unacceptable that Dorset City Council has not publicised the proposal for a bulky waste treatment and residual waste treatment facility at Woodsbridge Business Park. We found out about it through local residents today and the closing date was yesterday. This is a residential area with overcrowded roads and 40 lorries every day on Horton Road would cause major traffic problem. The fumes (some providing health hazard) from the chimney would go with the westerly prevailing wind and pollute the Ashley Heath and St Leonard residential areas. I strongly object to this proposal which should not go ahead	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP828	Disagree	<p>Please accept this email as an objection to the proposed waste treatment facility (including burner unit) at Woolsbridge industrial estate. Incidentally, the lateness of this submission is due to the fact that I was unaware of this proposal until alerted on a community forum (Streetlife) - the Council's attempts at public consultation do seem to be rather desultory, relying on individuals visiting their website. I'm unaware of any significantly proactive measure which has been taken to engage local residents. My objections are threefold: I am concerned at the possible harmful effects of the burner plume on residents whose locale will be impacted - which is mostly all in the plume area, as the wind will determine the direction and 'fallout' of the plume. I understand from other similar sites that the plume contents cannot be guaranteed hazard-free and that air quality can often deteriorate after such developments. I did not see any submissions stating that air quality would remain as good, or better, as a result of the proposed development, nor any evidence to show unequivocally that there would not be any health issues associated with such a facility. The 'worst case' traffic movements cited in the proposal would cause, in my opinion, severe hardship and potential hazard to road users, pedestrians and residents alike, in addition to severely increased wear and tear on already badly deteriorating road surfaces. In addition, there would not appear to be any alternative for HGVs but to travel either through Verwood, Three Cross or West Moors - all of which are currently experiencing (again my opinion) unacceptably high and stressful levels of traffic. I find it hard to contemplate that a planning authority would seek to allow building of such a facility in such a lovely rural; no doubt citing Woolsbridge industrial estate as 'industrial' is factually correct, but in the wider landscape context this is a predominantly rural or semi-rural, residential area which includes a major public rural facility in the form of Moors Valley Country Park. No doubt citing Woolsbridge as industrial is factually correct, but it seems crass beyond belief to use that 'fact' to suggest allowing a development with significant footprint, visual and traffic impacts in an area whose over-riding characteristic and nature is rural or semi-rural. I do not believe (no matter the amount of care taken in design and build), that it would be possible to hide a 100m high chimney. Please accept my apologies for the lateness of this submission, but I would be grateful if you would allow it.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP829	Disagree	<p>I am writing lodge my objection to the proposed waste plan pertaining to woolsbridge industrial estate. Adding any kind of waste centre in this area will not only be devastating for the local landscape, towns and farms but there is no way that the Horton road can cope with any more traffic. The Horton road is a very over used C-class road. It is used by many commuters and industrial traffic to access the various businesses situated in the vicinity. Any increase in traffic would have a dramatic impact on the quality of life for those residents in the surrounding area. I cannot convey how strongly I am opposed to these plans and I wish for my objection to be noted accordingly.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP831	Disagree	I would like to register my objection to the proposed Waste Unit and Strategic Re-cycling Centre at the Woolsbridge Industrial Estate on the grounds of increased HGV traffic on unsuitable roads, potential health problems and unacceptable noise and air pollution in a rural, domestic setting over a large area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP832	Disagree	I am a local resident. Until being on streetlife.co.uk this morning, I have never heard of any proposal regarding the above facility. Where has it been widely advertised? Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised I seriously object, the Horton Road is already overladen with traffic, regularly at standstill. More fumes and more heavy traffic will cause chaos. I am past the closing date to object but your publicising of the proposal has not been seen by myself or many, many residents locally and I therefore question the validity of your publicity's sufficiency.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP907	Disagree	WP02 " Woolsbridge Industrial Estate The southern site of this proposed waste allocation lies adjacent to Holt and West Moors Heath SSSI, part of the Dorset Heaths SAC/ Dorset Heathlands SPA. The RSPB supports the recommendation of the HRSR for further investigation to ascertain if habitats or protected species will be adversely affected by the proximity of this development the SAC/SPA. The RSPB would also like to emphasise any risks relating to run-off or water borne pollution arising from the waste treatment technologies proposed at this site warrant full and thorough consideration given its location adjacent to the Moors river SSSI and upstream of an area of SAC/SPA.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP470	Disagree	I have just been notified of the plan for a draft waste plan which is going to be held on Manning's heath. I object strongly to this idea for the following reasons. The plant will increase odour which will annoy residents, reduce tourist attraction to tower park, and reduce general satisfaction of area living. This is stupid as people come from all over Dorset to go to tower park, and without them, the business there may close. The plant will also increase the amount of rodent life in the area. As it is, there is a lot, being by a Heath. These pests will make wild life numbers struggle, and could put a strain of the current animals and plants. Currently, there are already lots of Heath fires, costing money to put out and rep are damages. If there was more, plants, animals and people could be at risk of severe injury which may have fatal consequences. Currently, traffic is at its worst in 10 years. If there was potentially another 70 lorries on the road, this would make the local area a fume filled stand still which infuriating for the local people.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP136	Disagree	I am a business owner located near one of these proposed sites WP03, I do not agree this is a suitable location for waste management, the area is full of local businesses and is situated near residential areas. I have serious concerns with the possible smells and increased traffic movement a development of this nature would bring. I also have concerns with our ability to attract new staff to the business if the above concerns are realised.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	1.8	2016WP150	Comment	I am sending this comment with regards to the proposal to develop Mannings Heath area to take food waste. I am the owner of Unit B, The Outlook, and Ling Road, which will be a few meters away from the proposed site, already the road outside the offices is extremely busy with heavy goods vehicles transiting to deposit cardboard waste. The proposal will only be a hundred meters from the Tower Park Leisure complex and large Tesco's. Surely the new proposal to use the site for food waste will not be allowed so close to office environments and Dorset's premier leisure and social complex, as well as a large Tesco's.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	1.8	2016WP582	Disagree	Tower Park is a vibrant leisure area and adjacent to the large residential areas of Parkstone and Canford Heath. The increased heavy traffic movements over what is already a congested area, together with the associated noise smells and eyesore of high stacks is not in keeping with the need of the area. Therefore I object to this proposal.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP145	Disagree	I work at the Outlook and my window looks out onto the site. I feel the quality of my working environment will be greatly affected by the smell (lack of fresh air), increased noise/traffic. Impact to businesses. No longer a family, friendly area for all to enjoy.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP146	Disagree	I am a fan of when a nice day enjoying the outside as much as possible, be that eat outside or have fresh air with an open window. Having a waste management site next to my place of work is going to restrict this free pleasure. Strongly disagree with this proposal. Tower Park is a family and child friendly place and this will be ruined if this goes forward.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP147	Disagree	I disagree with the view to open a waste management site in this area because of the factors that will affect not only me but my colleagues also. The smells will prevent us from opening the windows at the outlook which will be directly opposite the facility. Also, there will be increase in traffic which will mean working people in the area will have to leave earlier in order to get to their workplace in time.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP148	Disagree	I feel that this plan would be detrimental to our business and the local environment. In terms of business, we are based in the offices at the Outlook and this could potentially impact on the value of our property and our ability to sell it in the future. In terms of environment, the impact could be increased traffic to the area, odour management would be impossible to control along with the potential influx of vermin. Tower Park is billed as an environment for family entertainment but this could put people off visiting the attraction	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP149	Disagree	I work at the outlook and this will affect the view, won't be able to open the windows and the strong smell. Increased traffic will be an issue when it comes to driving up Ling Road.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP151	Disagree	As I currently work on Ling road I am worried about the effect on the quality of my working environment. I would ask what provisions are in place to protect air quality, and monitor traffic on an already congested area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP153	Disagree	I feel that the increase in road traffic and associated noises and smells that will be created from this development will be detrimental to the surrounding area and properties. Our office is located next door to this proposed site and our only windows look out onto this area which will be blocked by such proposal.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP152	Disagree	I feel that the increase in road traffic and associated noises and smells that will be created from this development will be detrimental to the surrounding area and properties. Our office is located next door to this proposed site and our only windows look out onto this area which will be blocked by such proposal.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP154	Disagree	The proposed area will cause a large amount of disruption for access to work, the larger vehicles may make roads more dangerous for cycling to work. The air pollution and increase in rubbish in the local area will make travel outside terrible, also effecting the air quality within our working area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP155	Disagree	I work at The Outlook and strongly disapprove of the waste site being based next to the building. Not only will this be unhygienic to staff, but prevent any windows being open - depriving office of fresh air instead of reconditioned. I am also a frequent user of the walkway we have to access Tower Park and this will take away the option of being able to stretch our legs during our 30 minute lunch break. Unsightly to our building, would block out natural light and cause disgust with our visitors having such an eyesore.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP156	Disagree	As a business in the area, this proposed plan would disrupt our working environment with noise and pollution. Closing our walkway to Tesco's would inconvenience staff who need lunch as we only get half an hour.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP158	Disagree	I work at the outlook and i firmly object to the plans to use the surrounding areas for a waste management site. This will have adverse effects to the smells and pollution in my working area. The increased noise and traffic will also have a negative effect on my working environment and potentially my health and wellbeing.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP159	Disagree	I work at the Outlook and my major concern is the added pollution in the air, being unable to have our office windows open due to smell and losing our view to a massive waste site. This will make our working environment extremely unpleasant.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP161	Disagree	I work at the Outlook, we are situated directly adjacent to the plots of land mentioned in the planning application. The area of industrial land in question is situated right next to our group of offices, allowing the land adjacent to us to be used for waste processing on such a massive scale will have a direct impact on our ability to work effectively in our office. We can expect to have to constantly smell a stench from the massive amount of waste, not to mention the proliferation of rats and other creatures that will make their way over to our office area. Please do not change the usage of the land, it will have negative consequences for ourselves.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP165	Disagree	I work for SMD at the outlook. I am concerned about the planning for waste disposal around my company. I will definitely affect me in everyday working time. I sit right next to the window and I will not be able to open the window because of the smell. View will be limited and will not be nice to look at it all day. Also it will affect me with commuting to work.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP166	Disagree	I work at the outlook and i feel as if putting a waste land next to a formal place of work is inappropriate as it will cause disruption in many ways. It will disallow us to open the windows when the offices are too hot, it might even call disturbance with the air con filtration systems, it will block the light, it will look bad on the company and it's just inconvenient.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP167	Disagree	I work at the outlook and object to the waste management site as it will affect my work due to noise and air quality pollution.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP168	Disagree	I work at the Outlook and I am concerned about the waste management site that will be positioned next to my workplace. What concerns me is the hygiene and noise pollution that will come from the site. As we have just had windows fitted in our office to provide fresh air it is going to be a distraction to all of us at SMD.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP169	Disagree	I work at the Outlook and strongly disagree due to the following reasons - 1. Smell 2. Hygiene 3. Parking 4. Traffic 5. View from our offices	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP170	Disagree	Work at the Outlook adjacent to this site and extremely concerned about the impacts of this in terms of noise, additional traffic, smell, un hygienic and unpleasant view outside my office window!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP171	Disagree	I work at the Outlook and i am concerned that what is currently a desirable and pleasant location to work in will be spoilt by the following: Noise, traffic, smell, bad hygiene, distracting view. This would have an impact for all staff that work from here and i would be very unhappy if this went ahead.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP172	Disagree	As a staff member in The Outlook which overlooks this site, I have concerns about smell, pollution and general eye sore. We have opening windows which are essential for fresh air in the office, but as these overlook the proposed site, we will not be able to use these. The same is true for an area outside the back of the office where we were planning decking and a lunch area. The smell and possible vermin will make this impossible.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Structural Metal Decks Limited	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WVP173	Disagree	I work at the nearby office The Outlook, situated on Ling Road. I believe that the proposed draft waste plan will have a detrimental effect to the nearby locality, by reducing the quality of air and increasing noise and traffic.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
T A Colbourne Limited	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WVP178	Disagree	I am the principal of a business which is situated just across the road from the site described in the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Waste plan as a preferred site for, and I quote: "Municipal Solid Waste (waste from the householder) and commercial waste". Our understanding of this proposal is that the site be used for the emptying and processing of bin collection lorries, potentially from the whole of the three towns conurbation and as far away as Bridport. We do not consider this a suitable site for a number of reasons: Nearby housing, offices, the leisure centre, supermarket, car dealerships and small manufacturing businesses will be affected by the inevitable smells and dust arising. Wherever there is food there is vermin, however well controlled, it will be an additional problem to the food outlets which are within 200 metres of the site. Ling Road does not have the capacity for the vehicle movements involved. There is parking in the road, but this is usually occupied. If an HGV - or any vehicle - is held up for any reason, it creates a dangerous situation. The writer has witnessed a number of near misses and the road was closed recently as the result of a collision. Lorries do use the road for "stacking" whilst waiting to unload. The noise level from the traffic movements and the waste process will be unacceptable to the people working in nearby offices and homes. The increased lorry movements will not encourage people to cycle or walk to work and will make the route more dangerous for those who already do so. There have been a number of fires at recycling centres recently including one at Sita in Mannings Heath Road within the last five years. It will be difficult to attract new employees to the area, who might not feel they want to work next to a bin emptying facility. This is particularly relevant to this company as we are seeking to recruit apprentices and trainees. The facility does not add to the local economy, indeed it is a waste of a prime site with one of the best aspects in the area, which would be much better used for the sort of mixed development that has taken place nearby in recent years. That includes office, retail outlets and car dealerships. Housing is also an option it is situated between areas of housing development. The paragraph under the heading "Adjacent land uses" is clearly prejudicial as it mentions a foundry and recycling and makes no reference to housing, offices, restaurants, retail warehouses, entertainment centre etc. either immediately adjacent or nearby. The marked plan appears incorrect in that it outlines land already subject to planning permission for industrial units. To conclude these remarks I would make one final point. Poole does not collect food waste separately from households. Are there plans to do this? Or is Poole (It's a Beautiful Place) just to host the food waste from the whole of the rest of the county?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WVP185	Disagree	I work daily in Unit B, The Outlook, Ling Road. I am very concerned this proposed Treatment Site will result in: Substantial increase in the number of lorries on Ling Road causing an increase in noise, traffic issues and pollution; Due to the nature of the treatment there is very likely to be unsavoury odours and dust which will make working in our offices very difficult as the proposed site is on two sides of our property; There will be an increase in vermin, again due to the nature of the treatment centre; Furthermore there are very many local businesses in the direct vicinity who will suffer from this development.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WVP186	Disagree	<p>I am the joint company director and co-owner of C3IA Solutions Limited, a Medium sized company providing Engineering and Security consultancy to Her Majesty's Government and Commercial Organisations across the UK. I and my business partner purchased our offices at Unit B, The Outlook, Ling Road, Poole, BH14 4PY in October 2015. The main reasons for the purchase of the unit are that it was located off of a main thoroughfare, was aesthetically pleasing and provided the correct image when we host existing and potential clients. The site is not overlooked and has good access into and out of the local area. My concerns are that if this is approved we shall be a few meters away from rotting food, noisy processing plant and waste lorries continually driving waste from all over Dorset (Bridport (57 Miles) to this site. I employ over 70 staff of which many have a requirement to visit the Head Office on a regular basis and work from the office. At lunch time many of them walk the local area and either dine at Tower Park or collect their lunch from Tesco's and walk back up the hill past the proposed site. Which if the proposal for this site is approved will mean additional personal risk to them from the increased traffic and potential odour issues. In addition to this we (C3IA) are in the process of setting up a sterile test and reference facility to conduct hardware and software analysis on behalf of HMG and other clients, which will require a clean air environment. I also have more general concerns that to allow the phased implementation of development &amp; relevant condition discharge of waste and to allow receipt of food waste to the proposed site will severely impact on the local amenities. I feel that no consideration has been given to the fact that only a few hundred meters away is one of Dorset's premier leisure facilities (Tower Park) which includes dining, leisure and entertainment services, all of which will be impacted by the development of the bulk waste facility, through: Odour issues; Transport issues "Ingress and Egress; Increased likelihood of road traffic accidents; Fire concerns (we have already had a major fire with 100M (Trents scrap yard)). Thus impacting on the reputation and potential financial viability of the Tower Park complex, the local area, and Poole Councils reputation especially as the strap line they push for Poole is that It's a Beautiful Place . Many people visiting said Beautiful Place visit the leisure facilities at Tower Park. I have recently contacted my local MP1 (Robert Syms) to voice my concerns regarding how this proposal has been handled by Dorset County Council, and I have invited him to the site to see the proximity of the proposed site to the C3IA and my business colleagues complex of offices. In particular my concerns are that the Eunomia Research &amp; Consulting paper (Application to Modify Existing Planning Permission at Manning Road MRF to Allow Acceptance of Food Waste "Odour Management) is not an accurate document. Table 1- Identification and Proximity of Sensitive Receptors has significant inaccuracies and falls short of the comprehensive factually correct list one would have expected. In that, it has omitted a significant number of businesses in the area and local roads. When contacting other local businesses many of them are unaware of the proposals, implying that due notification has not been served on those in the local area that will be impacted should this be granted. I strongly object to this proposal and will not accept that it is in the best interest of Poole and Tower Park to have such a facility built on the proposed site. I and my business partner have spent significant funds in purchasing Unit B for the reasons stated and do not want a household food waste recycling plant built next to our office, imposing significant increase in odour, traffic congestion, bulk waste movement leading to an increase risk of injury. Furthermore I have plans to expand my business into new business areas which will be impacted and not forgetting the significant challenge of recruiting more personnel to work next to a waste plant.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WVP189	Disagree	<p>It's bad enough to try and get out of Ling Road and on to Ringwood Road or surrounding areas in rush hour traffic as it is, let alone if we had the additional lorries and vehicles of personnel working there etc. I work in Unit A The Outlook across the road from the proposed site, I don't want the smell, rats or noise that would come from there, and I'm sure the people in Tower Park trying to enjoy their meal outside wouldn't appreciate the smell either.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WV190	Disagree	It's bad enough to try and get out of Ling Road and on to Ringwood Road or surrounding areas in rush hour traffic as it is, let alone if we had the additional lorries and vehicles of personnel working there etc. I work in Unit A The Outlook across the road from the proposed site, I don't want the smell, rats or noise that would come from there, and I'm sure the people in Tower Park trying to enjoy their meal outside wouldn't appreciate the smell either.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WV201	Disagree	Mannings Heath area. This is not the ideal place for this to go ahead. It is right in the middle of a built up area with young families and on the top of a hill overlooking Poole and beyond.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WV206	Disagree	I would like to strongly disagree with the proposal to use Mannings Heath as a bulk waste treatment. I routinely work in this area and as a company we work hard to promote and grow employment and business opportunities across the borough and the wider UK. First impressions count for everything and having a bulk waste site dealing with household and commercial waste right on your doorstep is not the image that an employer wants to present to potential employees or business partners. This should not be considered as a suitable site for a number of reasons: a. Reputational damage. There will be an impact on SME image and damage to potential business and employment opportunities - if this transpires it may lead to financial litigation due to loss of earnings; b. Increase in air pollution and smell. This will have an inevitable impact to health and increase in respiratory conditions due to the air pollution it will cause; c. Increase in vermin and rodent. The area already has a number of large facilities processing waste (Tesco, Tower Park) to add to this will cause a rise in the vermin and rodent population along with all the issues that this brings.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP207	Disagree	<p>I am a resident of Parkstone, within close proximity to the proposed new waste site at Mannings Heath... Firstly, I am shocked that this is the first time I have heard of these proposals which I have seen, by chance, in the Bournemouth Echo this morning, as my Council you have not seen fit to notify residents of your plans? Let me start by saying that I fully appreciate that Poole is a growing urban area and waste disposal is a large, and increasing, problem for the Council. However, the proposed site at Mannings Heath is wholly unsuitable for several reasons. Its proximity to housing is a grave concern (156,750 residential properties within 5 miles) as, despite theoretical reassurances from the proposed operator, emissions will affect local residents including those like my neighbour who suffer from breathing problems and rely on oxygen, the local schools where children play outdoors as well as the remainder of the local population who may have their lives curtailed by this plant. Whilst the operator will doubtless make all efforts to reduce this impact, they cannot eliminate this or take account of weather and the direction of the prevailing wind will mean that the impact will be most felt in the Oakdale and Parkstone areas. This will also have a detrimental effect on housing prices when we are already facing an uncertain market owing to the BREXIT vote. The proposed location next to Tower Park is frankly astonishing. Poole has few attractions when compared its neighbours - a soulless quayside, dead High Street, no notable town centre attractions - and it would seem to beggar belief that the Council would wish to blight this successful commercial enterprise with additional traffic, emissions and noise. Visitors to the many restaurants, and to Tesco, will doubtless think twice about visiting when a waste site is sited so very close to food retailers. The additional traffic, estimated at an additional 70 HGV movements per day, on roads that are already crowded and often gridlocked is also unacceptable. Assuming this estimate to be accurate (and it is probably very conservative and will doubtless rise in time) the additional burden will create further traffic problems and will further reduce the quality of life for Parkstone, Oakdale and Canford Heath residents. So, in summary, Mannings Heath is wholly unsuitable and should be rejected. I am not unsympathetic to the need for an additional waste site for Poole however this should not be sited in an area that is so densely populated and has considerable economic value to Poole, when there are out of town sites that are more suitable. In this time of economic uncertainty it would seem to be commercial suicide to make Poole even less attractive to residents, visitors and commerce; the Council should rethink the location of the waste facilities with due regard to the tax payer and their quality of life.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WVP216	Disagree	<p>I am a Director of a company that relatively recently relocated to Ling Road from Parkstone due to company growth. When we were considering where to move to we took notice of the local council's desire to grow its footprint of technology and cyber security companies and to encourage further employment in this sector; in which we specialise. When we were looking for new premises there were very few options to stay in the area, but Ling Road did provide the right kind of environment and image to be attractive to our employees and customers. We very much hoped that by moving to our Ling Road offices that would form part of a growing community of technology focused businesses. If the facility in question was to be built in the Ling Road area then we can state with some authority that this would affect future business and employment growth as it would contradict everything that we expected for Ling Road and the area would become an unattractive area to be based in for small specialist employers. The limited number of alternative sites would push employers out of the area and along the coast (if not out of the county altogether). Hence I feel that the Council's choice is to decide what kind of industry the area should be known for and what image it wishes to portray. The council should decide whether the employment and value that comes with supporting technology based industry is a sacrifice that it is willing to make by basing the facility in this area. A simple evaluation of the number and skills of the employees associated with companies located along Ling Road would be easy to do and therefore provide a comparison of the value of the choices at hand. This also raises the question as to whether alternative uses of the site have been evaluated. Fundamentally I disagree with the Ling Road area being used for this purpose because of the detrimental effect it will have on the business and employment plans held by companies in the area.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP217	Comment	<p>I work on the Acorn Business Park site, in Ling Road. There are 40+ people in our office building alone. We already have enough problems getting on and off Mannings Heath with the current weight of traffic so increasing the quantity of HGV's, by a very significant number, is going to compound the existing issue. Which route are they going to take to enter and leave Mannings Heath? I object to potentially spending my day breathing in by-products of waste disposal and diesel fumes from the increased number of HGV's. Trying to tell us that any pollution will be kept within legal standards won't convince me that it will be ok - we already have to contend with other local industrial plants pumping out by-products into the air. The air is frequently acrid and our cars are always covered in dust/dirt. Adding another industrial plant into the equation will only make this worse. I also live only a mile and a half away from the proposed site and can say that should an incinerator be constructed with a giant chimney it will almost certainly adversely impact the value of my home; plus the increase in traffic will also affect my home - rumbling giant lorries create vibrations which impact roads &amp; buildings. I would suspect that there isn't going to be a decrease in my council tax to compensate for this. If I'm only a mile and a half away from the site then St Edward's School is even closer - has any consideration been given to the number of school children who use Ling Road to get to and from the school? They cycle and walk up and down Ling Road. All of the above aside, where's the consideration for the Tower Park Leisure Complex? I would definitely think twice about heading to Tower Park, as a visitor, if all I could see in the background was a giant smog billowing chimney and a waste plant. Tower Park/Mannings Heath/Ling Road is not a totally industrial area and I don't believe that enough consideration has been given to the surrounding area or residents. I fully appreciate that waste disposal is an issue, and it has to be handled somewhere, but this proposal is putting a gigantic site into the middle of an area that's supposed to attract tourists and locals. Not repel them.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP219	Disagree	<p>I live just across the main road, and work on Ling Road just across the road from the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Waste plan as a preferred site for Municipal Solid Waste and commercial waste". I strongly disagree that this should be the preferred site for this waste plant for the following reasons: Not only will i have to put up with the smell and noise all day at work but i will also not escape it when i get home, like many people who work in the surrounding area. The area of the site, where we all live also has a high population of minors (some old enough to go out without adults) that have to cross the roads which will be effected by the high increase in traffic to get to tower park, ling road and the other roads surrounding the site do not have suitable pedestrian crossings to cope with traffic of this kind, therefore restricting children from walking alone across to Tower Park and lowering their sales (especially in school holiday periods). Many food restaurants are within 200m of the site, where there is waste there is smell and vermin, which will have an impact on the amount of people that visit. The small roads that surround the site will not be able to cope with the build-up in traffic the waste site will cause. Poole unlike surrounding areas does not collect food waste separately from households, but yet we are the 'preferred' area for the site to be held.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP401	Disagree	As far as I am aware the council has failed to inform local residents about this proposal. I support the objections already put forward by many people to this proposal including -it is too close to residential area -it is too close to leisure facilities at Tower Park -it will increase traffic	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP224	Disagree	I totally object to the proposed Mannings Heath site. This sits within close proximity of the densely populated residential areas of Canford Heath, Oakdale, Parkstone and Alderney and is situated close to many schools. It cannot be proven that these waste incineration plants do not have adverse health risks, and it would be incredibly risky for Poole council to agree to this. Furthermore, the site would sit just yards from the Canford Heath nature reserve. Tower Park leisure complex is again just yards away, and people may choose to avoid using the complex with concerns over health risks, in turn leading to a loss of revenue and loss of jobs. As it stands, the roads surrounding the site are incredibly congested, and there are already large volumes of lorries using these relatively narrow roads, including the stone quarry. It would be dangerous to have more lorries on the roads. The area has already suffered large disruption due to the erection of the new Audi garage causing traffic chaos, and it would be unfair for locals to experience this again in such a short space of time.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP228	Disagree	The waste tower at Manning Heath Tower park is totally wrong. The wind will blow the smoke etc over Canford Heath. We are aware of this because we get from time to time the smell from the waste tip if the wind is blowing from there. The waste should be placed where the other tip is not in a built up area. If to go to fleets bridge the waste smells quite offend and this is not next to over all these homes. Check the wind and when it rains it will pull the fumes down.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP248	Comment	I am one of the ward councillors for Canford Heath and would point out that although this site is located in the Newtown Ward and borders the Alderney Ward, the nearest houses and affected residents live in Canford Heath, an area of high density housing with over 6000 properties. In addition, the site is in close proximity to leisure facilities at Tower Park, non-industrial businesses and SSI heathland. I consider this site is, therefore, totally unsuitable and completely inappropriate for a residual waste treatment facility due to the detrimental impact and adverse financial viability it would have on the leisure and business facilities and SSI heathland in terms of noise, smell, air pollution and increased hgv traffic. In addition, this site is located in an area that already has concerns about lorry movements; there is also a weight restriction on the Ringwood Road. I would add that consultation for this plan is extremely poor, there has been a lack of accurate publicity about the plan or the proposed sites and because of the recent Echo article residents and local businesses are now understandably extremely concerned and upset. This should and could have been better managed!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP271	Disagree	I would like to STRONGLY DISAGREE with the WPO3 proposal for an additional MRF at Mannings Heath.. I work in the offices at Unit B on Lings Road and have grave concerns about the impact on the working environment and also on my clients visiting out offices. I would also challenge the existing HGV flows statistics provided by SITA (who clearly have a vested Interest). I would estimate that HGV movements certainly outweigh those quoted and already have a detrimental effect in both noise levels and traffic congestion, especially during peak travel hours. I think that this proposal could have a severe and detrimental impact on the business that employs me, as well as on my personal working environment and travel.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP305	Disagree	WPO3 Mannings Heath Area of Search “ Residual Waste Treatment At, according the Eunomia OMP report at 71m away (actual 24m away) and the nearest receptor I am somewhat confused as to why ABPM or the Proprietor has not been formally notified of this consultation. Table 1 Identification and Proximity of Sensitive receptors From the plans provide in the Eunomia and consultation documents the distance is actually much lower than this at only 24m from boundary to building. This shows complete inaccuracy and incompetence in the Eunomia report and assumptions therein.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP307	Disagree	<p>Residual (MSW) and Food waste odour is a major concern for the Acorn Business Park and its users at this site. The Eunomia OMP Ref pg 3.1 Management odours states thus at no point will food waste be outside of either of the contained delivery vehicle or the contained receiving container. This is not true for the following reasons and as such completely discredits the Eunomia OMP further; i, The food waste containers have a manually lifting lid and when open the food waste is exposed. See Figure 1. ii, The lids are invariably left open for operational ease. If the lid is closed drivers have been known to tip onto the lid. See Figure 1. iii, The food waste is tipped openly into the container hopper from the 2m3 food pod on the collection vehicle. See Figure 2. iv, Spillage regularly occurs when tipping from the food pod. v, Food waste always lands on the hopper and needs to be manually cleared. See figure 4 &amp; 5. vi, Skips are sold as sealed but it only takes a small amount of contamination to compromise the rubber seal and cause a leak. See figure 6. vii, Hydraulic compaction of the waste in the skip forces air out of the container. These are not airtight units only water tight. This mechanical process causes odour and bio aerosols to be released. As the waste is tipped from the food pod the food waste is outside both containers and open to the elements. The spilled food is then cleaned up when an operative is available (not necessarily immediately). Then the lid may or may not be closed until the next delivery. On the sites visited the lid was generally left open all day while receiving waste for ease of operation. The operators do not want to be opening and shutting the lid for every vehicle as this is a manual function and not particularly easy to perform single handed. The tipping process and the potential to leave the lid open both release odour and bio aerosols. At this point there is a noticeably sharp spike in the odour units around the container which, is then transported in the air to other near receptors depending on the direction of the prevailing wind. At only 24m away from the boundary and the nearest receptor this is a major concern for us. This method of storage and transfer is best placed at a remote site with fewer sensitive receptors. If receptors are closer than 200m ideally food waste should be tipped in an enclosed building with suitable air handling equipment and not dealt with in skips. The hydraulic compaction process also squeezes air out of the container which is heavily laden with odour units and bio aerosols. The skips are sold as water tight (although this is in question) but they are not sold as air tight which is quite apparent when looking at them in any detail. Figure 1. Operational skip (hopper end) lid left open all day whilst receiving waste Figure 2. Operational skip (hopper end) receiving waste "open transfer from pod. Figure 3. Operational skip spillage and clean up Figure 4. Manual hopper clearance. Figure 5. Operational skip (hopper end) waste after tipping Figure 6. Operational skip leakage. The Acorn Business site already experiences issues with odour, noise and dust from this site and others in the vicinity. An increase in tonnage and waste streams to this sensitive site would almost certainly have adverse effects to the whole area. The site is located close to public amenities leisure facilities, workplaces as identified by the flawed sensitive receptors table. Furthermore ABPM would like to object on the basis of a significant increase traffic movements including the associated noise and dust emissions to the Mannings heath area. The increase in vehicle movements would undoubtedly cause further disruption to the local area. The OMP refers to a potential further 100 movements per day on an already busy road. With cars parked on one side of the road at present it is already difficult to pass particularly when an HGV is coming the in the opposite direction. Residual Waste (MSW) delivery and treatment also raises concerns on this site as this has the potential to release odours and bio aerosols if not handled correctly through an internal reception with sufficient air handling, scrubbing and filtering. Again these sites are much better suited to a more remote area. With sensitive receptors only 25m away (boundary to boundary) this would be a totally unacceptable use for this site in my opinion. ABPM questions whether the final statement under Deliverability / Viability of WP03 appears somewhat contradictory. You are saying this site is not deliverable anyway. Is this correct?</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP309	Disagree	<p>I live near to the Tower Park Complex on Ringwood Road. I think it is wrong to put a waste site near to Tower Park. The traffic around the area is already congested with huge lorries and commuters to work. There are already congestion at all hours of the day. The pollution from the factories and traffic are already high. We are already breathing in contaminated air. Not to mention the vermin that will bring to near the restaurants and Tesco. Really a bad idea.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP310	Disagree	I strongly object to the Mannings Heath site development. I understand that there is a need to manage waste and that the spatial concerns of landfill are significant, however I believe we need to look at a greener longer term strategy generally. I agree that incineration reduces the bulk of waste but it does not make it disappear, more ominously it transforms it into a significant pollution problem. Incineration is a major contributor to global pollution and a whole range of health problems. Do we really want to be producing carcinogenic Dioxins amongst residential area? The transport links are already overwhelmed with the Dorset Way, Mannings Heath Road, Ling Road and the Ringwood Road almost at gridlock during the rush hour and during the summer with the Tower Park visitor traffic it is even worse. The proposed increase in traffic flow is significant and would not be sustainable without serious congestion problems.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP325	Disagree	This is not an appropriate site for a waste plant. Tower Park roads are extremely busy, anymore traffic in that area would be chaos. It would definitely put me off going to the leisure park.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP326	Disagree	This is not an appropriate site, don't want even more traffic problems!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP328	Comment	Are you MAD!! The site is right next to one of Poole best visitor attractions, the extra traffic and potential smell will give the area bad name, many jobs in Poole are based around the tourist industry so I am sure you can find somewhere a little more out of town. Please don't put it here !!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP330	Disagree	I am a regular user of Tower Park for social reasons and this would put me off visiting here with my family. The last thing I want is the stench of rotten food while enjoying the outdoor slide at Splashdown!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP331	Disagree	The traffic around Manning Heath is already busy and this will increase if this plan goes ahead, so I strongly disagree. There are offices, family attractions and homes very close to the site, which will be affected badly due to the smells, waste and traffic.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP338	Disagree	I am a local resident and work in the heart of the proposed zone. I am amazed that POOLE thinks that this site is suited to waste management when there is such close proximity to light manufacturing, offices, shopping and leisure with working people and families all sharing a clean healthy environment, I regularly see people picnicking on the slopes around tower park. I see more benefit in developing the land for housing or leisure please don't allow this place to be ruined by this scheme and watch the rest of the area slip into waste in its shadow.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP350	Disagree	the potential smell and pest population, as well as increased traffic problems and not looking nice	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP359	Disagree	As a resident local to the site, I disagree with the proposal due to the pollution, traffic problems and potential for the pest population to increase. It should be built in a less commercialised and residential area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP374	Disagree	<p>It has again come to our attention of yet another proposal to locate a waste processing plant on the Mannings Heath Tower Park site. Although we acknowledge the need for such plants throughout the area, the proposed location at Mannings Heath is, by no means, the best solution and carries with it grave concerns with health and safety issues to both traders and residents in and around the Mannings Heath area, including the general public which frequent Tower Park to do shopping and other leisure and entertainment pursuits. It appears from reading your proposed plan, consideration, at the Mannings Heath location, has only been given to the availability of land and the prospect of reasonable access to the site, this I am afraid, is only the tip of the iceberg and more concerning issues are at stake. The Mannings Heath site, although defined as a commercial development site, is as one can see from either street plans or satellite images, right in the centre of surrounding residential areas. The Tower Park section of Mannings Heath is a major leisure, entertainment and shopping area where many of the general public frequent in large numbers at varying times of the day and evening. Now over the last several decades, there have been numerous complaints and petitions raised, relating to health and safety issues emanating from the Mannings Heath site such as, air pollution, foul odours, noise levels, and excess traffic movements at all hours of the day and night. And yet again, here we are faced with these same issues, however, in this case with greater and far reaching implications. One of the major health and safety issues with the proposed planned site is, the very close proximity to so many food retailer outlet properties. I have prepared a copy of a recent satellite image of the Mannings Heath Tower Park area (please see attached PNG image Mannings_Heath_Area_3B_C) onto which I have indicated in RED boundary lines, the proposed waste site(s) as taken from your proposal PDF file on page 28, and in YELLOW boundary lines I have indicated all the near food retail properties, all of which, are either restaurants or takeaway outlets. In particular, the Tesco Extra superstore has both a restaurant and a bakery which I might add, the bakery is at the rear of the store, closest to the proposed waste site. It beggars belief what would be the consequences if pollutants from the waste site, airborne or otherwise, were to be introduced unwittingly into any of the products of the numerous near food outlets, particularly that of the Tesco Extra superstore which is frequented by large numbers of people each day and evening, the word 'pandemic' comes to mind. The next major concern is, the effects of air pollution and dreadful odours that would emanate from the waste site and permeate the surround area and particularly the residential properties causing health risks and distress to the residents, to say nothing of the working staff of the trading properties in the area. There is the additional concern of increased pest (vermin) creatures, being attracted to the area by the introduction of a further and very large food source due to the waste plant. There is also the question of considerable Increased traffic flow and danger to public due to the additional large number of extra waste disposal delivery trucks, coming from other areas that would frequent the waste plant. Mannings Heath is at present, a very busy and traffic laden area which often leads to long period tail-backs of traffic at the junction entries and exits to the site, this would clearly add considerably to that dilemma. The actual road approaches to the proposed waste plant, are used not only by the trading properties on the site, with their transport and staff private vehicles, but is also used by the general public in great numbers to gain access to the Tower Park area, any further increase in heavy vehicle movements on the approaches, would pose a further increased danger to the general public and additional delays to and from the Mannings Heath site. An additional risk of fire will also be present at such a waste plant, due to the great amount the volatile materials that are generally present at such sites. Surrounding businesses would be put at further risk. There is also the question of the affect the waste plant would have on residential property values. Clearly no reasonable person intending to purchase a property would wish to live near to a large waste disposal plant which may well be emitting airborne pollutants and foul odours, it is therefore quite clear that property values will be reduced, and also be more difficult to sell if one wanted to move from the area. In conclusion, Mannings Heath is not a suitable area to locate a major waste disposal plant in light of all the above mentioned comments, and in particular the surrounding and general populous.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP378	Disagree	Please register my objection to the proposal to site a recycling plant at Mannings Heath, Poole. The site is unsuitable as it is located very close to dense housing, a major leisure centre, a large supermarket and employment centres. The additional traffic will make an already difficult area to transit even more so and cause damage to already less than ideal road surfaces. The strong odours will have an effect on the surrounding area and its residents. The potential increase in vermin and insect life could also increase potential health problems.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP395	Disagree	I am registering my concern at your plan for the above at Mannings heath. This is a concentrated residential area, also has popular children's leisure facilities at Tower Park. The increase of odour across the area and the increase of pests irrelevant to the increase of traffic movement i.e. lorries in an already busy area, means that this would have an extremely negative effect on the area and the local residents	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP437	Disagree	There has been significant business development in this area over the last 10-15 years but investment in the road infrastructure has not matched it. There are numerous HGV's accessing businesses off Mannings Heath and Ling Road and any addition to this would make an already overcrowded area significantly worse. Businesses are already using flexible working hours and other options to minimise the travel chaos for local residents and our employees but the area still grinds to a halt during the commuting hours. If developments like these are approved, without significant improvements to the transportation links, it's likely that existing business will start to look elsewhere.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP438	Disagree	I work at SMD Limited and our windows face out on to part of this site and my objections are as follows:- Poor light - the offices I work in are on a slope and my window is near the bottom and my view will be blocked completely Ventilation " at present I am able to open my window for some much needed ventilation and I feel that having a waste site the other side of the path will increase the smell and therefore decrease my ability to open the window Sanitation " no matter how tidy a waste plant is there will be an increase of germs, animals etc causing the whole area to become unsanitary and unpleasant Poor access " with the potential increase of up to 100 lorries a day getting to and from work will be increasingly impossible. During the winter months Ling Road is a dangerous enough road with ice etc without adding extra lorries Attracting candidates "I work as the HR Manager and a large part of my job is ensuring that we are attracting good candidates to come and work here. I strongly believe that with an office where people find it difficult to get in the car park, are constantly bombarded with bad smells and a completely blocked view will not help. Lunch breaks "at present we have a half an hour lunch break and make use of the pathway that runs down the side of the building to the steps leading to Tesco "if there is a waste plant will this pathway still be there and if not we do not have enough time to walk to Tesco and back during our half an hour.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP440	Disagree	For many years now, residents of the surrounding area (Ringwood rd,manor ave,herbert ave,mannings heath etc),have been complaining about the 'foundry 'as all the locals know it , Precision Disc Castings, with light pollution, constant noise, dust and filings floating around and settling on cars and window sills etc,,,,now we have another challenge in the smell of a 'waste plant', and to want to put it on the top of a hill so the wind can take the smell for miles???,REDICULOUS.....So the whole of towerpark,poole and all the surrounding area can smell it. Really good for tourists ,residents and shoppers It really needs to be somewhere low so the wind doesn't pick up the smell and maybe surrounded by trees or in a suburb where there are no residents and now risk to ANYONE!!!!!! Obviously whoever is dealing with this proposed site, doesn't live anywhere near it??!!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP469	Disagree	I am a resident living in Canford Heath and I too have a job here, in Tower park. I see many holiday makers visit tower park and spend their time and money here. It would be a great loss to our community if tower park became less successful, due to a constant unpleasant smell or traffic increase. The traffic is already congested every day, and to place more pressure on an already overcrowded road would be devastating to tower parks visitors, workers and residents. I strongly believe this should be reconsidered, as tower park is a huge industry for tourism, income and enjoyment. I formally object to the idea of the waste plan going ahead, for the benefits of these people.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP478	Disagree	I disagree with this proposal (WPO3 Mannings heath). The office building I work from is directly next to both these sites (The outlook, Ling Rd). The surrounding area has a large number of office buildings, car dealerships, housing and the popular Tower park complex and would be detrimental to all of these. The proposal to turn this area into a household waste dump is completely out of context with the recent development of the rest of the area. See below a number of reasons for my disagreement to this proposal: - The odour the disposal facility would produce. - The large increase in vermin such a disposal facility would bring. - The noise level would increase significantly due to the general running of the disposal facility and the increase of lorries/trucks that would use the surrounding roads. - The area is not suitable for such a large increase in vehicular traffic, - Safety concerns that the facility would bring with the large increase in vehicular traffic and the increase risk of fire such a facility would bring. - Health issues that may result in working next to such a facility. - Increase in general litter in the surrounding area due to this disposal facility. - The negative effect it will have on all the surrounding businesses in maintaining a healthy and positive working environment; attracting employees; attracting future customers. Let's keep Poole a beautiful place and keep largely populated areas like this free from waste disposal facilities that are obviously harmful to the area and better suited elsewhere.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP493	Disagree	My principal place of work has been on Ling Road for the last 9 years during which time the journey to work and more particularly the journey home in the afternoon has become increasingly congested with all the increased vehicle pollution that goes with that. My route takes me out of Tower Park on the A3049 Ringwood Road through Longham and onto the A31. The bridge at Longham is not suitable for HGV traffic as it is too narrow to have a HGV on the bridge from each direction at the same time. I question the reasoning behind bringing waste from Outside of the Poole area for processing within a built up area via a route that is already heavily congested and unsuitable for HGVs. Who thought that one up?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP494	Comment	My place of work is directly opposite the proposed site and am concerned for the following reasons. 1. The processing of food waste will inevitably result in malodourous smells at all times but particularly in hot weather when houses and businesses have windows open. 2. Undoubtedly vermin will be attracted and will proliferate. 3. HGV traffic in the surrounding roads is already heavy and will be further increased by transport of waste by 100s of movements per week. There are already problems with large articulated vehicles waiting to be unloaded at the insulation warehouse at the top of Ling Road. 4. Such a prime site with views across the Purbecks could surely be put to a better use.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP499	Comment	OH NO!!!!!! WHATS THAT ON THE FRONT PAGE OF WEDNESDAY 20thS ECHO?????????,,,,,,,,,,,,,, HUGE BLAZE ROCKS LANDFILL SITE,,,,,, SEVENTEEN FIRECREWS TACKLE A HUGE FIRE AT WAREHAMS LANDFILL SITE,,,,,10,000 TONS OF RUBBISH TOOK 5HOURS TO GET IT UNDER CONTROL,,,,,, ANOTHER FIRE AT THAT SITE IN SEPTEMBER 2014 TOOK 5DAYS TOO PUT OUT!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! AND THE COUNCIL WANTS TO PUT ONE OF THESE SITES ON TOP OF A HILL BEHIND TOWER PARK NEXT TO OFFICES AND NEAR TO HOUSES!!!!!!!!!!!!!! WHAT A JOKE!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	Your comments are noted, however it is not proposed to locate a landfill site at Mannings Heath Industrial Estate. A modern residual waste treatment facility and/or bulky waste facility is being considered.

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP501	Disagree	I disagree with this proposal (WP03 Mannings heath). The office building I work from is directly next to both these sites (The outlook, Ling Rd). The surrounding area has a large number of office buildings, car dealerships, housing and the popular Tower park complex and would be detrimental to all of these. The proposal to turn this area into a household waste dump is completely out of context with the recent development of the rest of the area. See below a number of reasons for my disagreement to this proposal: - The odour the disposal facility would produce. - The large increase in vermin such a disposal facility would bring. - The noise level would increase significantly due to the general running of the disposal facility and the increase of lorries/trucks that would use the surrounding roads. - The area is not suitable for such a large increase in vehicular traffic, - Safety concerns that the facility would bring with the large increase in vehicular traffic and the increase risk of fire such a facility would bring. - Health issues that may result in working next to such a facility. - Increase in general litter in the surrounding area due to this disposal facility. - The negative effect it will have on all the surrounding businesses in maintaining a healthy and positive working environment; attracting employees; attracting future customers. Let's keep Poole a beautiful place and keep largely populated areas like this free from waste disposal facilities that are obviously harmful to the area and better suited elsewhere.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP534	Disagree	Having considered the proposed location of the waste transfer site on Ling road I do not feel there has been sufficient or rigorous consideration on the impact that this will have on local business and infrastructure. In summary: Tower park retail /commercial centre " Proximity of Tesco (less than 50m) to the site must surely be an issue from an environmental pollution perspective Tower park retail/ commercial centre " Proximity of numerous restaurants and food outlets (Days, Burger King, KFC etc) cannot be good for their business (Days is 50m away) Location of outside swimming (Splashdown) " 150m from the site, potential safety, smells for all visitors Adjacent Business " Many properties and businesses are immediately adjacent and will suffer from smells/ environmental impacts / traffic congestion for visitors Infrastructure " Ling road already suffers from heavy traffic and severe congestion. Additional plant movements will only compound this issue and increase traffic beyond what is already very frustrating. Bournemouth Airport "Descending flight path for some flights almost overhead. Consideration for FOD must be a serious concern. In summary the proposed location is too close (immediately adjacent) a retail and commercial zone and without sufficient infrastructure to enable the safe or efficient operation of such a site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP538	Disagree	<p>I work adjacent and opposite the proposed site at Mannings Heath and strongly object to the sites use as a Material Waste Recycling Centre. With the close proximity to Tesco and Tower Park Leisure facilities, I find it unbelievable that this site has been proposed with the inevitable smells and dust arising. There will also be the obvious increase in lorry movements, on an already busy road, that people use to avoid the queuing traffic up Old Wareham Road. If the route back to the Nuffield is via the Dorset Way, then that will increase the queuing traffic trying to navigate the roundabout, as the junction is always a bottleneck due to the queuing traffic up Old Wareham Road. I've seen various traffic surveys being carried out over the years but nothing ever done about it. I wouldn't be surprised to see lorries queuing in the road and causing traffic mayhem, like already occurs when a lorry parks up, on occasions, for whatever reason. I believe the site is already being used for some form of Material Recycling, with offices recently being installed and for the last two years, they have had large bonfires for the 5th November, no doubt left unattended overnight and still burning the following day. I don't know what they are burning but it stinks, probably the non-recyclable plastics. Have the council carried out a traffic survey on Ling Road, not to mention the amount of children walking to school and people walking to and from Tesco or Tower Park from Parkstone. I find it incredulous for the council to even have this site under consideration, it should never been on the short list, of which there are far better suited sites than Mannings Heath.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP866	Comment	<p>This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. Comments remain the same.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Environment Agency	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP837	Comment	<p>No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided below. Flood Risk Some flooding shown on our surface water maps. If there is an Ordinary watercourse on site "Land Drainage Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) may be required. LLFA should be consulted on the proposed waste site. Water quality Drains to Poole Harbour SAC. Groundwater This site is on a minor aquifer of Secondary or Unproductive designation. We would have no objection subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. Any existing contaminated land will require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options appraisal in accordance with CLR11. Flood Risk Flood Zone 1. Other flood risks may be present and should be assessed. Detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) required at planning application stage. This should also include surface water management. There may be restrictions on use of soakaways, depending on the nature of the site (e.g. contaminated/ high groundwater levels). Groundwater and Contaminated land May require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options Appraisal at planning application stage. Waste/ Environmental permitting The requirement for MRF regulation registration should be considered. Impacts upon amenity should be considered bearing in mind the locations of residents and nearby business and control measures put in place to reduce effects from odour, dust etc. The waste hierarchy should be considered for outputs and processes. Biodiversity Ecological survey may be required at planning application stage.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP897	Disagree	<p>Objection 1 “ Site WP03 Mannings Heath Area of Search &amp; PO04 Mannings Heath Within the supporting documentation on Residual Waste Site identification “ the SUEZ site at Mannings Heath Road “ site PO04 is considered to be not large enough to accommodate a single 212,000tpa thermal facility. The site on its own therefore seems to be discounted for any form of thermal recovery, whether municipal based or commercial waste based, despite the fact that the site is; Under the control of SUEZ who have the largest commercial waste collection business within Dorset, Poole and Bournemouth and is therefore available for development by SUEZ The site is adequately sized for a 100-150ktpa thermal recovery facility The site is the best placed of any site within the Waste Plan area to supply heat or supply electricity to a single source receiver given the proximity of Tower Park Leisure complex and swimming pools (220m), Tesco`s supermarket, numerous industrial plots including Sunseeker. The presence of an unconstrained grid connection within 1km SUEZ would suggest that the Plan as currently drafted is unsound because of the arbitrary way that sites (such as PO04) are not allocated in their own right because they may not be able to accommodate a single 212,000tpa thermal recovery or MBT plant. This is pre-judging what form of recovery may be commercially viable over the Plan period “ for instance a single 212,000ktpa facility with a distant grid connection and no viable steam receiver, may not be as viable as a 100,000tpa thermal recovery facility with a proximate contracted steam user. Furthermore the Draft Waste Plan as currently written would prevent and stifle any commercial development of a sub 212,000tpa thermal recovery facility, such as a 75-100ktpa gasification / pyrolysis facility with commercial steam user. Until such matters are addressed and rectified, SUEZ would maintain its objection and would advise that the Waste Plan could be considered unsound . Suggestion 1 That sites are considered for allocation to provide part of the thermal capacity required for Dorset Issues relating to not prejudicing those sites that are available, deliverable and can provide a heat supply to viable existing users (such as Tower Park leisure facility or Sunseeker) are not prejudiced and are not allocated in their own right due to the (unjustified) need to provide single facilities for a 212,000tpa thermal capacity. In this sense, it is sense it is equally unsound to amalgamate sites with two different owners and which straddle a public highway (the Mannings Heath Area of Search). To amalgamate these sites into one allocation creates a deliverability issue by combining two separate landowners in a single site allocation, whilst also stating that the site is inappropriate unless combined. To rectify this issue SUEZ suggest that the two separate landholdings which make up the Mannings Heath area of search are separately allocated in their own right. This increases deliverability and prevents an issue arising which could make the plan Unsound.</p>	<p>Although the SUEZ site is unlikely to be large enough to accommodate a single facility to manage circa 212,000tpa of residual waste this should not rule it out for a smaller facility. The strategy suggests that addressing the entire shortfall is most likely to be through a combination of expansion of existing facilities and at least one new site. The reason we amalgamated the two sites land owned by SUEZ and W&amp;S) is because it is unlikely to be appropriate to have two residual treatment facilities on the Manning's Heath Industrial Estate and we did not want to discount one or other at this stage.</p>
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP890		<p>WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' (WP PO 01 &amp; 04 in original draft): Chapters 5 &amp; 6 in the Update These areas need a wide buffer from the leisure centre and the superstore. Incineration Again, waste burning must not happen in these areas. As we pointed out in our response to para 1.1, we are strongly opposed to any waste burning on the site but if the WPA permits this, it should be in conjunction with CHP. As stated, we do not oppose pyrolysis &amp; gasification and we support anaerobic digestion of (mostly) uncontaminated organic waste.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP560	Disagree	As the lead officer for Tourism within Poole I feel this location should not be chosen. It is adjacent to the South Coast's leading entertainments/leisure complex (Tower Park). Tower Park is one of Poole and Bournemouth's major tourist attractions (as well as being a huge draw for the local community as well) and helps support a £200m pa Tourism economy in Poole. The siting of such a facility and its operation here could potentially harm the levels of visitors attending the complex, as people will not want to enjoy their leisure time next to this facility, and therefore diminish its position as a leading attraction, and in doing so diminish Poole's overall tourism product and therefore competitiveness.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP554	Disagree	We strongly disagree with the proposal to use Mannings Heath as a bulk waste treatment site. As the owners of two businesses on Tower Park we work hard to promote our business and grow employment. We welcome more than 250k people to our attractions each year. We are part of the leading employment sector in the area, some 5k people which contributes to visitor spend of around £218m p.a. clearly any down turn in our business will have knock on effects in the wider community, reducing employment opportunities and negative impacts in the supply chain. First impressions count for everything and having a bulk waste site dealing with household and commercial waste right on your doorstep is not the image that any business wants to present but as ambassadors to visitors from around the globe this would be a disaster. Impressions aside we have some real concerns about an increase in air pollution and smell. Some of our business is outside, especially in the summer when food waste deteriorates very quickly and the inside uses forced air handling, any hint of air contamination would be terminal to our operation. It would necessitate enclosing the entire business with a building and a change to the air conditioning to ensure adequate ventilation "we would seek to pursue the cost of the capital cost of this installation together with a monthly payment to cover the additional costs associated with this, from the operators, if the Mannings Heath site was used. Any smell at all would toll a death knell to our businesses and I am sure many of the others at Tower Park. We offer visitors and locals the opportunity to bring their families to a healthy, fun activity, who will want to bring their families to a place where there is the potential for their health to be impacted adversely, their ability to enjoy themselves compromised or be involved in traffic issues including the increased risk of accident with heavy vehicles due to poor road infrastructure? We and our staff are concerned about job security, the smell, pollution, road movements of heavy vehicles and inadequate road infrastructure. Clearly there is the potential to affect the popularity of Tower Park, and in turn employment opportunities and the wider supply chain. It undoubtedly would affect the general impression of Poole as a visitor destination. We appreciate the need to find waste sites, of course, but we consider that this site is wholly inappropriate due to the proximity to one of the jewels in the crown of the Poole visitor economy and the potential negative impacts on the local economy. We also believe that there are better, less negatively impactful, uses of this particular parcel of land. Jackie and Alan Richmond - Lemur Waterparks Ltd	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP652	Disagree	It has been brought to my attention that 'Dorset County Council' are planning to put a 'Waste Plant' very near my house and as the crow flies seconds. My concerns are many as I have a lovely wildlife garden, pond, birds, etc enjoy being in it having my windows open in good weather and entertaining family (grandchildren), friends' holding some charity events. So the thought of all this to be put into 'jeopardy' is upsetting and alarming. The proposed site is in an elevated position behind Pool's popular leisure facilities Tower Park, a place for families to eat etc; so my concerns are many! - Odour across the area - Pest pollution 'Rats' - Risk of fire (huge fire at the moment at Trigon, Wareham) - As well as having a negative visual impact on the area. As a conservationist belonging to Dorset Wildlife Trust, I hope that you will see that this is completely the 'WRONG PLACE TO PUT THIS PLANT'.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP674	Disagree	My objections: The proposed huge treatment facility would result in dust, fumes, smoke, pollutants, smells, loud noise, and pests in an area close to homes, schools, work places, Tesco and Tower Park. The thermal, chemical/biological treatments could increase pollution and be hazardous. An 8m high building and 40m chimney discharging potentially polluting exhaust gases would overlook and overshadow many homes and businesses. Canford Heath, a huge residential estate, is located below the facility site and would be exposed to pollution. The facility would be visible from much of Poole and the Purbecks because of its height and location. 100+ HGVs per day would make worse the already very busy roads. The Highways Authority has concerns over existing lorry movements. Increased emissions would cause deterioration in air quality, already a health concern. Waste could come from Bridport, Dorchester etc increasing lorry miles. A more central location could be considered such as the site at UKAEA at Winfrith.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP789	Disagree	Having considered the proposed location of the waste transfer site on Ling road I do not feel there has been sufficient or rigorous consideration on the impact that this will have on local business and infrastructure. In summary: Tower park retail /commercial centre " Proximity of Tesco (less than 50m) to the site must surely be an issue from an environmental pollution perspective Tower park retail/ commercial centre " Proximity of numerous restaurants and food outlets (Days, Burger King, KFC etc) cannot be good for their business (Days is 50m away) Location of outside swimming (Splashdown) " 150m from the site, potential safety, smells for all visitors Adjacent Business " Many properties and businesses are immediately adjacent and will suffer from smells/ environmental impacts / traffic congestion for visitors Infrastructure " Ling road already suffers from heavy traffic and severe congestion. Additional plant movements will only compound this issue and increase traffic beyond what is already very frustrating. Bournemouth Airport "Descending flight path for some flights almost overhead. Consideration for FOD must be a serious concern. In summary the proposed location is too close (immediately adjacent) a retail and commercial zone and without sufficient infrastructure to enable the safe or efficient operation of such a site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP830	Disagree	<p>We are writing in formal objection of the proposed waste plan for the Mannings Heath Industrial Estate Area. We feel that, should the site be selected, there will be adverse effects not only for ourselves, but many oval shops, restaurants and other businesses. In the Area of Search document, the sites adjacent land uses are described as general industry there us reference to the foundry, concrete plant and plant hire. There is not however mention of Town Park, a popular leisure complex which is well separated from the foundry etc. but is overlooked by and downwind from the site in question. Although it is suggested that odour controlling aerosols will be in use it is doubtful that the smell and air pollution will not have an effect on restaurants just down the hill or the offices next door. We would also expect there to be a rise in vermin in the area, which would be equally unpleasant. We belief the chosen site should be more remote and not amongst these businesses which rely on providing a safe and comfortable environment for their customers and staff. Despite reassurances from a local councillor that a waste incinerator would not be built in the Mannings Heath area, the document includes details of a 40m chimney stack, stating the site may be sued for recovery of energy by thermal treatment. Although we recognise the problems that councils face, with regards to waste disposal, we do not agree that releasing harmful ash and toxins into the atmosphere within a mile radius of a popular swimming complex and a number of schools, should be considered as an option. A study, carried out by the British Society for Ecological Medicine found higher rates of adult and childhood cancer around municipal waste incinerators, as well as a range of other illnesses. The study explains that present safety measures/attempts only deal with acute toxic effects in the immediate area, but ignore bioaccumulation, and the wider reaching effects of organic toxins which can enter the food chain and cause chronic illness. Unlike materials used at the foundry, household waste is constantly changing and therefore emissions of organic toxins (including carcinogens) are impossible to predict and control. The safety of a new incinerator cannot be established in advance, as the modelling data used ignores the important problem of secondary particulates and chemical interactions. In light of this we feel the Mannings Heath area is completely unsuitable for such an incinerator, not only with regards to the health and safety of local residents, but also of the many visitors and employees in Tower Park and the wider area.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
RSPB	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP908	Comment	<p>WPO3 " Mannings Heath The RSPB support the recommendation made by the HRSR for further investigation into the likely impacts of emissions from the waste management technologies proposed for this site. Further information is required before impacts on nearby areas of the Dorset Heaths SAC/Dorset Heathlands SPA can be satisfactorily ruled out.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO4 Site Control Centre, Canford Magna - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP58	Disagree	<p>More development and waste on an already polluting and stinking site and more traffic on overcrowded roads are not needed wanted or desired by the residents of Bearwood and Merley. The traffic is bad in both direction in busy periods just look at the jams the boot sale causes on Sunday mornings Every day I have to travel across Bournemouth for work and my wife in the opposite direction in solid queues enough is enough The wildlife is already under threat because of less habitat and to many people now we do not need more concrete we do need green spaces</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP04 Site Control Centre, Canford Magna - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP59	Disagree	<p>I note that the Waste Planning Authority wishes to consult on this as its preferred site for Intensification of Existing Waste Management Facility, including increased capacity for the management of residual waste and complementary activities that push waste up the waste hierarchy . Last August I objected to increasing the capacity of these sites (for processing bulk waste and energy recovery facilities) and I do so again now. In objecting I make reference to your own Sustainability Appraisal and your Conservation Regulations Assessment. The Site This comprises two sites on the SE Dorset Green Belt where waste is processed under distinct planning permissions. A raft of temporary permissions for the recycling of waste at the Recycling Centre, Site Control Centre, BH21 3AP were superseded by APP/13/00856/F, which allowed the plant to remain in perpetuity. W H White Ltd were granted permission by APP/14/00120/Y for retention of an inert recycling facility to generate recycled aggregates and soils. That permission is time limited and activities must be ceased/removed on or before 1 August 2022. Sustainability The appraisal states that permission currently exists for a materials recycling facility (MRF). That needs to be qualified as indicated above. Objective No. 8 “to protect and improve air quality and reduce the impacts of noise. The appraisal states No specific effects “although the development would not reduce impacts of noise, there are no residential properties or other sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity. This is wrong. You should be aware that the Environment Agency has reported substantiated complaints of noise and smell from the existing operations and these complaints persist. The LPA has always been reluctant to accept that the recycling plant causes a nuisance to local residents. Objective No.15 “to minimise the negative impacts of waste and minerals transport on the transport network, mitigating any residual impacts. The appraisal states This site is strategically well located with good access from Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole . This ignores the fact that the A341 Magna Road is at saturation point and Bearcross roundabout is working beyond its design capacity. In 2015, Poole Councils Automatic Traffic Counter (positioned to the east of Canford Magna Garden Centre) recorded a weekday 24 hour average of 14,950 vehicles. The road is often closed due to flooding or accidents. Apart from the intensification of the existing Waste Management Facility, there are other proposed new developments which will further impede access. Conservation Regulations Assessments While recognising that there will be likely significant effect (LSE) to the adjacent Canford Heath SSSI, Ramsar site, SPA etc. it appears that no assessment has yet been made of the damage which would be caused to these sites by intensification of the existing waste management facilities. I note that Natural England has been consulted on the Draft Waste Plans and has been invited to comment on the Habitats Regulation Assessment. In May 2014, Natural England objected to APP/14/00120/Y because of damage that had been caused and would be caused to adjacent protected sites. The letter of objection dated 9 May 2014 can be read in full on Poole Councils planning portal under this reference. I find it strange that the Sustainability Appraisal and the Habitats Regulations Assessment seem to have been produced without reference to that letter. Conclusion Intensification of the current facilities will cause huge damage to the environment and to Canford Heath and its wildlife habitats. I should be grateful if you would confirm that the Waste Planning Authority has been made aware of my objection.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP04 Site Control Centre, Canford Magna - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP84	Disagree	I note that the proposed extensions to the existing site have been reduced following comments made in the consultation in August 2015 to that of the B4 lagoon only. However I am still concerned at the intensification of use. The existing site has intensified considerably over the last decade or so and is of considerable annoyance to local residents due to noise and smells. This can only increase with the proposals and cannot be overcome with planning conditions. Access is from the A341 Magna Road. This road is already heavily used and the Bear Cross roundabout is used over and above design capacity. Proposed development of the Magna Business Park will result in additional traffic and possible further residential developments currently the subject of public consultation as part of the Local Plan process will cause further overload. The loss of the lagoon B4 which is understood supports various species would be regrettable and the effect of the intensified development of the whole area on the SSSI and The SNCI should be seriously considered. It is suggested that the lagoon should also be designated a SNCI.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP04 Site Control Centre, Canford Magna - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP85	Disagree	I note that the proposed extensions to the existing site have been reduced following comments made in the consultation in August 2015 to that of the B4 lagoon only. However I am still concerned at the intensification of use. The existing site uses have intensified over the last decade or so with a raft of planning approvals and are of considerable annoyance to local residents due to noise and smells and also traffic generation. This situation can only increase with the present proposal and cannot be overcome with planning conditions. Access is from the A341 Magna Road. This road is already heavily used and the Bearcross roundabout is used over and above design capacity. Proposed development at the Magna Business Park will result in additional traffic using the road and further developments currently under consultation as part of the Local Plan process will cause further overload if they eventually proceed. Only a major investment in infrastructure could allay these traffic problems but seems unlikely. The loss of the lagoon B4 which is understood supports various species would be regrettable and the effect of the intensified development on the adjoining SSSI and the SNCI should be more seriously considered. It is therefore suggested that the lagoon should be designated a SNCI and intensification of the uses on the site ruled out.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP04 Site Control Centre, Canford Magna - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP109	Disagree	I object to the use of the Site Control Centre at Canford Magna for the Intensification of its current waste facilities. Any increased waste or recycling activity would result in additional/unwanted strain on our roads causing stress and annoyance when travelling to and from our homes in the area. The A341 Magna Road is at saturation point and the Bear Cross roundabout is working beyond its design capacity. The road is often closed due to flooding or accidents. Any additional lorries travelling on the road to and from the site will make matters unbearably worse. Proposed development of the Magna Business Park will result in additional traffic and possible further residential developments currently the subject of public consultation as part of the Local Plan process will cause further overload. Furthermore, the Environment Agency has reported substantiated complaints of noise and smell from the existing operations and these complaints persist. Any additional amount of waste removal will only exacerbate these existing problems and further damage Canford Heath and its wildlife habitats.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
W H White LTD	WP04 Site Control Centre, Canford Magna - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP432	Comment	WP04 Site Control Centre, Canford Magna "Residual Waste Treatment Please note that: the planning permission for a standalone Advanced Thermal Treatment plant has lapsed and the plant has been removed. The planning permission for the Low Carbon Energy Facility has been implemented, with the first phase - a commercial proving plant "now in operation. The remaining modular plant will be rolled out in phases. The supporting map is incorrect insofar as it shows the washing plant as part of the MRF. The washing plant has been relocated to the aggregates recycling plant at Whites Pit. WHW welcomes the inclusion of the B4 lagoon (which in any event technically formed part of the original Site Control Centre) as well as the recognition given to the potential intensification of the established activities. As set out above in relation to Paras 2.34-2.40, WHW opines that there is latent residual commercial waste capacity which could be released through direct access to the ATT plant. Thus it could play a significant role in meeting the identified shortfall in residual waste treatment facility. This is underplayed in the Update.	Your helpful comments are noted and will be reflected in the final Plan as appropriate.
Individual	WP04 Site Control Centre, Canford Magna - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP453	Disagree	I wish to object to the intensification of existing waste management facilities at the Canford Renewables site of Magna Road Bearwood. This site is already generating foreign HGV movements along Magna Road which is already at saturation point. Intensification would generate more lorry movements causing increase in noise, vibration and dust to the detriment of local residents. The site already generates noxious smells which on occasions necessitates windows being closed. Increase use would also increase these smell. A plant like this should not be situated anywhere near housing.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Highways England	WP04 Site Control Centre, Canford Magna - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP867		This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. HEs concerns remain the same.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Environment Agency	WP04 Site Control Centre, Canford Magna - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP838	Comment	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided below. Flood Risk Some flooding shown on our surface water maps. If there is an Ordinary watercourse on site "Land Drainage Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) may be required. LLFA should be consulted on the proposed waste site. Water quality Site borders SSSI / SAC/ SPA Site close to small watercourse leading to River Stour. Groundwater This site is on a minor aquifer of Secondary or Unproductive designation. We would have no objection subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. Any existing contaminated land will require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options appraisal in accordance with CLR11. Flood Risk Flood Zone 1. Other flood risks may be present and should be assessed. Detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) required at planning application stage. This should also include surface water management. There may be restrictions on use of soakaways, depending on the nature of the site (e.g. contaminated/ high groundwater levels). Groundwater and Contaminated land May require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options Appraisal at planning application stage. Biodiversity Ecological survey may be required at planning application stage.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
	WP04 Site Control Centre, Canford Magna - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP856	Comment	New Earth welcomes the identification of the Site Control Centre and the WPAs support for further intensification. As previously highlighted, New Earth believe that an additional 30,000t of residual waste treatment capacity could be released through investment in new processing plant and technological/process innovation over of the life of the Plan. The planning permission for the trial pyrolysis plant has lapsed and the plant has been removed from the New Earth Facility "as such reference can be removed.	The Plan and supporting documents will be updated to reflect the removal of the trial pyrolysis plant.
Dorset Wildlife Trust	WP04 Site Control Centre, Canford Magna - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP701	Comment	The proposed extension to this site lies close to SZ 09/043 Frogmore Wood Site of Nature Conservation Interest (as does the existing site). Provided that the woodland strip is retained as a buffer between the site and the SNCI, then the proposals should not cause any major problems with regards to the SNCI. The proposed extension does, however bring the development right up to the Dorset Heathlands SPA / Dorset Heaths SAC / Canford Heath SSSI and full consultation with Natural England will be essential with regards to ecological mitigation and restoration if this site is taken forward.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	WP04 Site Control Centre, Canford Magna - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP891	Comment	WP04 Site Control Centre, Canford Magna (WP PO 02 in original draft): Chapter 5 in the Update The lagoon area is inappropriate for development. It should be excluded from the plan immediately, no dithering. It should be designated as an SNCI. If the site owners or operators fill in the lagoon in the meantime, without planning consent, they must be ordered to re-excavate, re-plug and decontaminate it at once, leaving an island in the middle. The rest of the site is OK, subject to an environmental and habitat assessment.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP04 Site Control Centre, Canford Magna - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP562	Disagree	This is green belt land and as such should be protected. Once the green belt is gone we will never get it back. The green belt is home to a lot of native animals and plants which need protecting. The A341 Magna Road is very busy and does not need any more lorries. These areas are also included in the Poole Local Plan review to provide housing	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Society of Poole Men	WP04 Site Control Centre, Canford Magna - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP676	Disagree	Waste Plan consultation concerning Proposed Intensification of Existing Waste Management Facilities at Canford Magna This is to record our objection to the above mentioned proposals on the grounds of over-development, particularly since the current usage of the sites has involved the Environment Agency in reporting substantiated complaints of smell and noise and because current attention to enforcement action appears to be inadequate: intensification of usage would exacerbate existing unlawful issues and create further problems on the less than adequate transport routes. It is also extremely relevant to recall that the site is in the vulnerable green belt zone that form's part of the natural assets that Poole values so highly as does Natural England and many other community groups including our society: hence the relevant regulations that must be recognised and enforced. Green belts were created for a well-known purpose that does not include using them as bases from which to generate pollutants of any kind and in this case noises and smells. It is also understood that one of our local Councillors has publicly stated that a chimney would never be allowed and we trust that will actually be the case, notwithstanding possible indications to the contrary. Please ensure that I am informed about the decision (following this consultation) that we expect to reinforce the proper role of the Green Belt Zone serving the best environmental interests of Poole and its neighbours,	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Christchurch and East Dorset Councils	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP462	Comment\disagree	<p>WP05: Eco Composting, Chapel Lane, Parley: The Eco-Composting site is proposed for the following uses in the Draft Waste Plan: Intensification of existing Waste Management Facility, including increased capacity for the management of residual waste and complementary activities that push waste up the waste hierarchy. This site was originally included in the Draft Waste Plan (2015) in line with the planning application that was being considered for the reconfiguration of the site. Planning permission has now been granted for the introduction of a new plant and processes including a solid recovered fuel processing plant. Now that permission has been granted this proposed allocation should be deleted from the draft waste plan. The councils object to any further increase in capacity in relation to the impacts set out below. It is understood that Eco are proposing to replace the currently permitted AD unit with a Waste to Energy recovery plant to receive and process a proportion of the County's residual waste. It is proposed in the draft plan that the current planning permission be amended to allow the site to receive and recycle / recover bulky waste. The proposed operations would raise the total permitted tonnage throughput of the site to 530,000 tonnes per annum from the currently permitted 260,000 tonnes per annum. The proposed doubling of tonnage throughput to the site will have a significant impact on the number of vehicular movements to the site. The draft plan states that this will result in an increase from 560 to 840 movements per day on average. This impact on the B3073 corridor would need to mitigate and has not been considered as part of the current planned improvements to the B3073. A transport impact assessment is required to determine the impact on the network and how this will be mitigated. The existing site has a history of odour issues and the proposed increase in capacity is likely to further exacerbate these issues. In this respect, sensitive receptors to the site include the following: Sports facilities (330m south of site); Portfield Primary School (800m south of site); 1 residential property within 250m 127,500 residential properties within 5 miles; and Bournemouth Airport (1.25km south east of site). The site is located in very close proximity to the following sensitive habitats and the councils are concerned about any adverse impact on these sites and particularly the adjacent heathlands. The HRA undertaken for the recent planning permission identified possible impacts from gaseous emissions on the adjacent heathlands which would be greater with in an increase in size of the SFR. It will need to be demonstrated that any possible impacts on the Dorset Heaths SPA / SAC / Ramsar are avoided. Further development of the site on Chapel Lane, Hurn should not take place prior to an assessment of the likely effects on both the operation of Bournemouth Airport and the development of the Strategic Employment site have shown they are capable of mitigation. Processes that are likely to give rise to impact on the safe operation of aircraft using the airport should only be permitted / allocated if the statutory Aerodrome Safeguarding Authority can be convinced that they can be mitigated. In respect of impacts on the development of the Strategic Site, environmental effects that detract from the ability to attract businesses to it or traffic impacts that detract from the ability to access it should be controlled, mitigated or eliminated. The proposal in the Draft Plan includes a stack height of approximately 100m which raises immediate concerns in terms of airport safeguarding. Manchester Airports Group is currently in the process of developing a flood mitigation strategy for the airport strategic employment site. These proposals will need to avoid any adverse up stream effects on flood risk mitigation measures that are required to develop the strategic employment site. This proposal does provide the opportunity to derive power to support development located on the adjacent strategic employment site which would be considered a benefit to the proposal.</p>	<p>The WPA would welcome further discussions with CBC with regards to this proposal.</p>
West Parley Parish Council	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WPP495	Disagree	<p>West Parley Parish Council discussed the application and have huge concerns that the impact on Highways would be considerable with an increase in daily vehicles from 560 to 840. This is an additional 280 vehicles per day, when West Parley is already seeing vastly increased activity on the highways, including the Gravel Extraction, Aviation park development, Berry Hill, Portfield School, Eco and residential developments in the Core Strategy. Councillors felt that nothing further should be approved until the road improvements have been made, due to the impact on Parley Cross and therefore object to the proposal. The Council also wish to object to the Blunts Farm proposal as the impact of this would also impact not just Ferndown but also West Parley.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Barrack Road Residents Association	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP508	Disagree	Capacity has been expanded for a number of years and the site now has a considerable impact on the local community. Further expansion would make this situation worse. Site adjoins the rear of the Airport that is planned for considerable job growth over the medium term attracting high value businesses. Noise, dust and odours are a feature of the current plant despite efforts to cure the problems. Environment Agency keep the site under close review. Further expansion would not ease current problems. Considerable increase in heavy vehicles on already busy roads. Concerns about plans for new residual waste processing with unknown impact of emissions from multi waste sources mixing with existing known local levels of emissions from green waste activities, aircraft emissions and traffic emissions. Waste Plan details of sensitive receptors are incorrect. Some 100 residents are living within 400m of Eco and many hundred employees work on the local business park. Noise of the plant operations are heard. Smell of Eco already experienced by residents and businesses up to a mile away.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Hurn Parish Council	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP517	Disagree	Hurn Parish Councillors strongly object to the inclusion of WP05 "Eco Composting, Chapel Lane. Councillors feel that the overall proposed intensification of waste tonnage through the site from 260,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) to 530,000 tpa is unacceptable in this location. In particular, Councillors object to the proposal to increase the currently permitted 10,000tpa of residual waste to up to 160,000tpa with a Waste to Energy (WtE) Plant. The currently permitted 10,000tpa of residual waste was granted for disposal in a Solid Recovered Fuel (SRF) Plant which has never been built. Therefore, this proposal, in reality, is not actually to increase throughput from 10,000tpa (although granted) to 160,000tpa, but to increase from NIL to 160,000tpa. Currently no residual waste at all comes to this site. The Eco site is located immediately adjacent to Bournemouth Airport, which is one of the 2 largest employment sites in Dorset. The Aviation Business Park prides itself on offering high quality employment accommodation. Currently Aim Aviation will be moving into new premises in October 2016, and Curtiss Wright will move into their new Headquarters in February 2017. Both of these employers have around 500 staff each. The Bournemouth International Growth (BIG) Programme is to, (quote) Provide the single largest employment opportunity in the south east Dorset conurbation with the potential to create up to 10,000 new highly skilled jobs over the next decade . It will release up to 60 hectares of prime, flexible employment land for high quality new business premises at Aviation Business Park . The Aviation Park has already experienced serious odour issues from the Eco Composting Site, which has resulted in bad press for the Business Park and one business has been given an air conditioning unit, as even after mitigation, on some days the business still cannot open their windows due to smells from the Eco Site. That is the current situation with odours from the Eco site. Eco Composting has a history of odour issues and the Environment Agency has placed enforcement measures on them in the past. It is our understanding that the storage and processing of residual /putrescible waste will cause odour. Also the incineration process will cause odour and emissions. Whilst no doubt, the usual mitigation will be offered, The Parish Council considers that to import up to 160,000tpa of residual putrescible waste to the Eco Site (when currently none is imported), in close proximity to the Aviation Business Park is an unacceptable HIGH RISK, which could damage the BIG Programme which is championed by the Dorset LEP. It is noted that a stack height of 100m is proposed, which is unrealistic and inappropriate in this location, so close to an airport. In addition, the Eco site is located very close to Dorset heathland SSSIs and the Moors River SSSI. Processing of this huge amount of waste via incineration will cause emissions which could be detrimental to the sensitive habitats. Currently there are no such emissions in the area. The proposal will more than double the waste throughput through the Eco site, which will also massively increase the vehicular movements. The draft Plan suggests an increase from 560 to 840 vehicles per day. Roads surrounding the site are already heavily congested at peak times and this huge addition of HGV traffic will have a major detrimental impact by increasing congestion, especially for those employed at the Airport site. Hurn Parish Council strongly objects to the proposed intensification of waste tonnage through the Eco Composting site from 260,000tpa to 530,000tpa.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Natural England	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Residual Waste	2016WP625	Comment	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Residual Waste Treatment/ Bulky Waste Treatment Natural England have concerns about this proposal which lies adjacent to specially protected sites, in particular in relation to water pollution and aerial pollution effects arising from treatment processes and additional vehicle movements. These issues should be flagged up at this stage and be identified clearly in the WLP policy approach.	Your helpful comments are noted and will be considered further when developing the preferred site.
Highways England	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Residual Waste	2016WP859	Comment	Since the Draft Waste Plan consultation, Eco Sustainable Solutions have proposed an increase to the tonnage of material that could be managed through a new energy from waste facility and intensification of permitted operations. Trips to and from the site will increase. We would welcome pre application discussions to discuss impacts on the SRN.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP839	Comment	<p>No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided below. Flood Risk Small part of site FZ2 and FZ3. Some flooding shown on our surface water maps. If there is an Ordinary watercourse on site "Land Drainage Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) may be required. LLFA should be consulted on the proposed waste site. Water quality Moors River SSSI catchment Site boundaries border SSSI / near RAMSAR / SAC / SPA. Site borders very close to watercourse leading to Moors River SSSI. Groundwater This site is on a minor aquifer of Secondary or Unproductive designation. We would have no objection subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. Any existing contaminated land will require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options appraisal in accordance with CLR11. Waste We have been involved with pre EPR permit application discussions with Eco. Once an application arrives the surface water flood risk and other risks will be assessed as part of the permit application. As the strategic waste planning authority (DCC), should the site need to close for any reason then due to the size of the site alternative contingencies need to be considered to deal with the volumes of waste that would need to be diverted from the site. Majority of the land is now a solar park "so the national grid ought to have sufficient capacity in order to fully utilise the benefit of any energy that is recovered. As with all sites that handle biowastes, whilst we permit sites and appropriate measures are applied this does not necessarily mean that odours and dust will not be present off site at some level. Flood Risk FZ2 &amp; 3 so Sequential Test may be required by the LPA. Sequential Approach required. Detailed FRA required to assess fluvial flood risk, and other sources of flood risk. FRA also to include surface water management. There may be restrictions on use of soakaways, depending on the nature of the site (e.g. contaminated/ high groundwater levels). Groundwater and Contaminated land May require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options Appraisal at planning application stage. Waste/ Environmental permitting Contingency should exist in the exception the sites ability to operate is affected due to the large total throughput. Amenity impacts should be mitigated and managed in terms of the effect on local residents and business. The waste hierarchy should be applied. Contingency for any flood risk and loss of operation should be considered, Biodiversity Ecological survey may be required at planning application stage.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Bournemouth Airport	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP711	Comment	<p>Bournemouth Airport (BOH) is an Officially Safeguarded Aerodrome under the terms of the DfT/ODPM Circular 1/2003 Town and Country Planning (Safeguarded Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas) Direction. The element of this response pertaining to that designation is offered independently as a Statutory Consultee and is offered with the sole purpose on ensuring the safe operation of the aerodrome. 1.3 Bournemouth Airport also has a commercial interest as the landowner. This interest has two distinct strands; the operational airport and the business park. Negative effects on the amenity of these two separate interests should also form an important consideration of any proposals. 2.0 Draft Waste Plan Update "Additional and Emerging Preferred Sites 2.1 In respect of the additional sites proposed we are surprised that the consideration on the safeguarding implications for BOH has not appeared to be a consideration in any of the site assessments. To be clear the aforementioned Circular requires Local Planning Authorities to have regard to inter alia the following aerodrome safeguarding criteria when bring forward proposals:</p> <p>i) Bird-strike Risk. The handling and processing on non-inert waste has the potential of attracting increased bird activity. Any assessment of such sites should include a bird-strike risk assessment and mitigation plan. It should be stated that sometimes proposals result in risks that cannot be overcome. In such circumstances an objection would be sustained and if any consent were to be granted with such an outstanding objection (or without recommended conditions) then the safety regulator (in the case of BOH this is the Civil Aviation Authority) and the consultee must be informed. The safety regulator may then request the First Secretary of State to call in the application for determination.</p> <p>ii) Obstacle Limitation Surfaces. Within 15km of an airport there are a series of protected surfaces that restrict any upstanding non-frangible obstacles of a certain height. This applies to temporary structures such as cranes and excavators as well as permanent structures. iii) Air Traffic Control. All proposals for lighting in both construction or operational phase (or other potential sources of glare) should be examined to ensure there is no impact on the sightlines from Air Traffic Control or aircraft operating from or in the vicinity of the airport. iv) Air Traffic Engineering. Details of any radio communications systems operating in the vicinity of the airport should be detailed and assessed to ensure there is no interference with on-airport critical equipment or communication frequencies. This advice applies to all sites emerging through the Waste Local Plan. 2.2 In respect of other comments about proposed site WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley, in addition to the consideration of the above non-negotiable safety aspects there are questions that require to be addressed in respect of current and future odour emissions from the site, any dust / smoke arising's from the proposal, traffic generation impacts, impacts on protected habitats and impacts on flood risk mitigation measures. 2.3 Bournemouth Airport is defined in in the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan and in the Dorset Strategic Economic Plan as a priority site to deliver employment growth. This has been taken up by the Local Enterprise Partnership and is a focus for investment to improve accessibility to the Airport in order to deliver this growth. Any development coming forward in the vicinity of the airport should not compromise the ability to deliver the shared ambitions to drive forward economic growth and deliver the opportunities afforded by development at the airport site. Already major blue-chip companies are placing faith in the site by choosing it as the location to consolidate and expand operations. 2.4 Properly mitigated development need not necessarily compromise this ability, but the current assessment does not detail the requisite mitigation from either a Statutory Aerodrome Safeguarding perspective or from a commercial employment growth objective. We would suggest, therefore, that the Site Assessment contained within the consultation document is insufficient grounds on which to proceed with taking the proposal forward. We would request that further work is done before proceeding further with this revised allocation. 4.0 I trust that these comments can be accepted as part of the consultation process. I would alert you to the role of the Safety Regulator and their ability to request to the Secretary of State to call in a Plan or proposal if the concerns of the Statutory Consultee have either not been incorporated or consent has been granted following an objection. I would hope therefore that the concerns outlined above can be incorporated into further iterations of both the Minerals and Waste Plans.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Alliance Planning	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP900		<p>Eco Sustainable Solutions Site at Parley The Eco Sustainable Solutions Site at Parley is referred to as Site WP05 in the Draft Waste Plan Update. The document outlines that this is an existing waste management facility incorporating a range of activities including inert recycling, street sweepings recycling, food waste reception and transfer, composting, and wood recycling. There are also a number of permitted activities that benefit from planning permission. The document refers to the previous representations made by Eco, which outlined that there is scope to replace the currently permitted Anaerobic Digestion Facility and solid recovered fuel processing plant with a 125,000 to 160,000 tpa Waste to Energy recovery plant to receive and process residual waste. This proposal would make a significant contribution to meeting the identified shortfall in residual waste management capacity. It is recognised that a Waste to Energy recovery plant and the associated intensification of the site would need to be subject to a planning application and further assessment, particularly in relation to landscape, emissions and traffic impacts. Eco also recognise the important of engagement with the local community and key stakeholders, such as Manchester Airport Group. The existing infrastructure on-site and the site access from Chapel Lane will be enhanced following the implementation of the development approved by Dorset County Councils Planning Committee in July 2015 (Planning Ref: 8/14/0515). The aforementioned approval will include the widening of Chapel Lane and improvement works with the junction at Chapel Gate, thereby improving the capability of the site to accommodate a suitably scaled Waste to Energy recovery plant. It is envisaged that any planning application for a Waste to Energy recovery plant would be subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment, which would consider the impact on highways and various environmental factors, such as air quality, noise, ecology, human health, flood risk, and landscape and visual impact. Any application would also be subject to consultation with Dorset County Councils Waste Planning Department, Hurn and West Parley Parish Councils, Natural England and the Environment Agency. We would therefore reiterate that the inclusion of Ecos Parley site in the new Waste Plan is in accordance with the principles of sustainable development. In this regard, it is an existing brownfield site with an established history as a waste management site, being a restored landfill. The site processes a number of waste streams and has the capacity to accommodate a suitably-scaled Waste to Energy recovery plant as part of its continued evolution. Concluding Comments Having regard to the size of the approved facility at Parley and the wide range of waste streams that it receives, the site is well placed to accommodate strategic facilities. The size of the Parley site and the variety of waste streams would make it a viable and sustainable location for a Waste to Energy recovery plant to receive and process residual waste. This proposal would make a significant contribution to meeting the identified shortfall in residual waste management capacity</p>	Noted
Dorset Wildlife Trust	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Residual Waste	2016WP702	Comment	<p>The proposed extension of this site would bring it adjacent to the Dorset Heathlands SPA/Dorset Heaths SAC/ Hurn Common SSSI so close consultation with Natural England would be needed to ensure no adverse impacts on this internationally designated site. Ecological mitigation and long-term restoration would need to be agreed.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Residual Waste	2016WP892	Comment	<p>WP05, Eco Composting, Parley (Eco Sustainable Solutions, WP CB 02 in original draft): Chapters 5 &amp; 6 in the Update We in EDFoE oppose any increase to the waste burning facility but we support any other development here, subject to safeguards such as buffering from potential floods.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Dorset Local Enterprise Partnership	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Residual Waste Treatment	2016WP896	Comment	<p>On behalf of the LEP Board I have been asked to respond thus: We need to express concerns that the proposed waste site at Christchurch could potentially have a detrimental impact on Dorset's growth potential through the attractiveness of the Aviation Park and on the LEPs commitment with government to deliver 42,000 sq. m of commercial floor space at Bournemouth airport along with 10, 000 jobs as part of our growth deal agreement which has attracted over £40m of infrastructure investment to Dorset</p> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/398849/09_Dorset_Growth_Deal.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/398849/09_Dorset_Growth_Deal.pdf</a></p> <p>We would respectfully request that due to the potential economic impact the site near Bournemouth airport is not prioritised.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
RSPB	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Residual Waste	2016WP909		<p>WP05 " Eco-composting Parley This proposed waste allocation site is located in close proximity to Parley and Hurn Commons SSSI, both are part of the Dorset Heaths SAC/Dorset Heathlands SPA. The RSPB supports the recommendation made by the HRSR for further investigation into the likely impacts of any emissions or water borne pollution from the waste management technologies proposed for this site.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP38	Disagree	<p>We are shocked and disgusted at reading in our local newspaper The Stour and Avon Magazine that plans are being considered to site a Waste Incinerator Plant in a triangle of land abutting Uddens Lane in Ferndown. We would like to register that we consider this, together with a forty metre chimney to be a travesty and a blot on what is a rather lovely part of Ferndown. We have walked in this area, where there is a farm and several properties and are regular users of the pubic house on the corner of Uddens Lane, which would surely suffer from this plant if it is built.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP50	Disagree	<p>I have read with disbelief and absolute horror about the proposals to locate a Household Recycling Centre together with a Bulky Waste Transfer and Treatment Facility serving, it seems, not only the local area but Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset on land comprising Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands, Dorset. This proposal must not be allowed to become a reality. This unspoilt area of green belt woodland and open areas is enjoyed for quiet rural recreation by many people of all ages, not just those whose houses adjoin it, but a large number of people from surrounding communities without the benefit of such a space. They appreciate the efforts of the strong band of dedicated Friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands supporters who help to keep it in good order for the enjoyment of all. In addition it provides home and shelter for many species of wildlife. Apart from the proposed facilities taking away a much valued amenity area, access could only be off the A31 single carriageway Ferndown bypass, a very busy road which is an important access to Wimborne and Dorset generally. Wimborne does not deserve to become known as the town just past the waste disposal depot. The current access to and egress from Uddens Drive is not good at present and has been an accident scene. The volume and type of traffic this proposal would generate would make this extremely dangerous and any traffic lights or roundabout would make the traffic holdups on this road totally unacceptable, so close to the recent Canford Bottom hamburger junction, which already can come to a standstill at busy times. By their very nature facilities of the sort proposed should not be located on amenity land close to residential areas, but in an area of industrial use. A far more suitable site would be adjacent to the large roundabout at the start of the Ferndown Industrial Estate just off the A31. This roundabout is mainly used for lorry parking but could easily provide an access point to a waste facility which would not be visible from the A31 Ferndown bypass. I note that this deplorable proposal has been agreed for consultation by the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals and Waste Advisory Committee and is therefore an early example of how the green belt areas of Dorset would be under threat if a single Unitary Authority were to be formed for Dorset. Bournemouth and Poole do not have a good record of preserving green areas and have now all but run out of open land on which to build. The large towns would wield their weight at the expenses of rural Dorset and the whole character of Dorset as a delightful area of countryside would be under extreme threat. If it is necessary for Authorities to join together it should be with those of like character and interests, rural areas linking with other rural regions and the larger towns joining together. A mix of the two would be a recipe for severe difficulties.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP53	Disagree	<p>I wish to strongly object to the proposed waste plant at Uddens Woodlands/ Cannon Hill South. I regularly walk through this area to access Cannon Hill on the other side of the bypass, it's a quiet beautiful area that saves those of us living on this side of the woods having to walk around the hideous Canford Bottom Roundabout and up to Colehill to get there. I don't need to walk along any roads at all as I can use the Castleman Trail ,which runs behind my home, to access the south side of the woods, and then cross the bypass to the other side. I live on Wimborne Rd West and the traffic here is already dreadful with the huge Ferndown industrial estate and its lorries vans and cars just up the road. We also have to contend with the massive amount of traffic using Canford Bottom Roundabout all day and the knock on effects from that. To add that volume of extra traffic using a waste plant just up the road would be complete madness and lead to us having an unacceptable and huge upsurge in traffic volume plus the smells associated with a huge chimney and rubbish rotting. Take it somewhere well away from our already compromised homes and roads PLEASE!!!!</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP56	Disagree	Cannot believe that the Council are considering this area. Reason the land has less value than other areas!!. How can you put a value on the right of people in built up areas to be able to walk, walk their dogs and ride in comparative safety and enjoy the wildlife in the process. This land deserves to be protected for the future. Also that area is totally unsuitable for the type of vehicles that would be using it.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP63	Disagree	I am writing to oppose fully any development of the Cannon Hill Wood site for your waste disposal plans on any Green Belt land. The fact this is your preferred site shows a great deal of disconnection from the local community who are already opposed to the Travellers site proposed there. Or any other development on Green Belt. Please could you confirm what future plans you or the council have for the development of the Brook Road site?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP68	Disagree	Fumes Transport Road Links Residential Properties Its been turned down before why now?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP72		I am writing to raise my concerns about the development of a waste sit in Cannon Hill Woods. I use these woods daily with my children and am not at all happy about the prospect of waste Lorries travelling to the site or the impact it will have on a beautiful nature resource. I oppose this strongly please find an alternative site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP74		I also disagree with the use of this land which borders the bridle ways and rural area of ferndown. The transport links to ferndown are poor at best with the options being the a31 via canford bottom roundabout or Wimborne road East both of which are heavily congested on a very regular basis and large HGV's will only add to this. Many local residents visit this area which is very pleasant and an incinerator and waste plant would seriously damage this area and I fear that the area would be avoided	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP77	Disagree	I have read the above proposal with disbelief! Apart from the fact this proposal would be on green belt land, have any of you driven through the Canford Bottom roundabout on a normal day with a normal flow of traffic? It's tricky, and in rush hours and summer time when it's a main tourist route it's practically impossible so to add 100,000 cars plus associated lorries to that mix is madness. I understand there is an additional bulky waste transfer and treatment facility also planned for the site so that would mean even more lorries coming from Bournemouth, Poole and East Dorset. And does this term mean an incinerator will be involved? That would cause pollution and thus a damage to health in a built up area. I think whoever thought up this idea should have a serious re-think.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP86		It has been brought to our notice that there is a proposal to make Uddens forestry the main waste vehicle depot with facilities for recycling household waste. Bulky waste transfer and treatment facility and taking waste from Bournemouth, Poole as well as East Dorset with the possibility to build an incinerator with an estimated 40m chimney. I cannot understand how the environmental services could even consider the site of Uddens Forestry for this purpose. As a friend of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodland and using the site of great recreational importance, for all members of the public, seems inconceivable that you could even consider this site of great beauty and ecological importance. A lot of work has been invested by a troop of volunteers to make this site a place of tranquillity to enjoy all the diverse flora and fauna the site has to offer. Looking at the petitions signed when a proposal to build a gypsy and traveller site, you will be aware of how many people feel very passionately that we need a space for resident and visitors to the area to enjoy. This site is not only used by the families and people of Staplehill, but also Cannon Hill, Ferndown, Longham, Cannon Hill and north of the bypass. It is also used by the people working in the industrial estates in the area to get a much needed break. If such a motion is passed, it will be taking away a much loved and used site leaving no substitute. This proposal will also have a massive impact on the health of the residents if a chimney is built to burn industrial waste. The fallout fumes from the proposed 40m high incinerator chimney could jeopardise fresh air for miles, encompassing schools, housing and industrial units, potentially leading to health issues for all. I will be proposing that this should be taken up with the Court of Human Rights if this proposal gets the go ahead. With a proposal to build 6000 new homes in the area, we need more recreational land, not less. The sustainable alternative natural green spaces are all very well but they are not mature natural areas. We have used Uddens Forestry for the last 40 years and hope that our children and grandchildren will also enjoy these wonderful spaces. This proposal will also impact on the Castleman Trailway used frequently by cyclists, walkers, and horse riders. This route is also used by workers on the industrial estate as a safe alternative way of getting to work. The road infrastructure which would serve this waste unit would be swamped by an estimated 100 lorries per day, every day of the year, 24 hours a day. This in addition to the 100,000 cars using Brook Road currently, and would transfer to Uddens drive. I urge all concerned in considering this proposal to please think very seriously on the consequences passing such a plan would be. As mentioned, since we moved to Staplehill some 40 years ago, we have been plagued with so many proposals to ruin this lovely community with its Forestry. From a proposal by pass along what is now the Castleman Trailway to the traveller's campsite. This is not a suitable area for any of these proposals. Please consider the lives you will be impacting with this proposal and the recreation area we have worked so hard to protect for generations to come.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP88	Disagree	This area is totally unsuitable for waste disposal. It is Green Belt land which is widely used by residents for recreation. It also allows pedestrian access to Cannon Hill plantation on the north side of the A31 via the footbridge. Canford Bottom Roundabout is already a bottleneck and the increased traffic will exacerbate this.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP96	Disagree	I am not happy with the proposal for the huge waste plant at Cannon Hill South as I live close to it! We have enough traffic from the canford bottom roundabout and any more would result in further disruption to Stapehill and Ferndown. I also do not wish for my child to inhale anything from the proposed 40m chimney. Please rethink your actions and construct it elsewhere	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP98	Disagree	Cannon Hill is a quiet area of woodland enjoyed by dog walkers, cyclists, joggers and workers from the nearby industrial estate which can be accessed without travelling on the busy A31 road. The green space areas are already limited in this area and the roads are already heavily congested. Therefore siting any waste processing centre here would be inappropriate.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP101	Disagree	I am strongly objecting to the proposal to put bulky and residual waste treatment facility, HRC and a waste vehicle depot in the areas of Blunts Farm, land adjacent to Blunts Farm or Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates on these grounds; The close proximity of residential areas and schools could prove hazardous. There is a question mark over where and there could be potential harm caused to people from the long term effects of any waste burning facility. Despite regulations it is questionable as to whether the companies who run these installations are as rigorous as they should be in applying the safety measures. They may be tall chimneys but what goes up must come down again. The prevailing winds mostly come from the west bringing smells and fumes over the whole of Ferndown. Up to 100 HGVs on Ferndowns roads particularly Canford Bottom roundabout per day, it's a ridiculous proposition, the area would be in total gridlock. Apart from the noise and odour on surrounding areas. Why should Ferndown take the whole of Dorset's waste. Its noticeable it would be far away from Dorchester. The land adjacent to Blunts Farm is picturesque woodlands. I have seen lizards, snakes and many varied species of birds there. It is frequently used by local people for recreational purposes with access to the Castleman trail way	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP104	Disagree	I am devastated that you could even consider Cannon Hill South for a Waste Disposal Unit. These woods are in constant use by the local community for dog walking, cycling, schools use it regularly for nature walks with children and it is always busy. We are told to exercise more and you are thinking of taking away this amenity. Why do you keep trying to take this special site away from us. We had talk of a Gypsy Camp and now you are talking about a Waste Plant. Please reconsider, this is not a suitable area for such intrusive use. I look forward to you making a more caring and sensible decision.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP113	Disagree	As a resident of the immediate vicinity and an active member of the Cannon Hill Woodlands Group it is with great dismay that I read that our woodlands are being targeted again for development. There are numerous other sites in the consultation some of which the land owners are actively encouraging the waste facilities because they dovetail into already existing businesses. The woodlands are a valuable leisure resource and form part of the GREEN BELT. The woodlands group have had many work parties over the past five years improving the woods much of which has been funded by Dorset County Council. It would be very disappointing if all of our hard work and council funding were to go to waste. The volume of traffic in the surrounding area is already at saturation point so come on planners do the right thing and drop this site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP116	Disagree	I wish to express my views against the plan to build a waste plant (site reference WP01) in Uddens Woodland. This area is a valuable community resource that would be devastating to all to lose. Enjoyed by walkers, dog walkers, cyclists, riders and more, surely this site should not be the preferred site for a waste plant!? I grew up, like many others did, exploring these woods and growing very fond of them. It would bring myself and many more people a great deal of sadness and anger to see this woodland turn into a waste plant, polluting the air, destroying habitat and bringing traffic and noise to the area. This woodland is used so much by all the people who live in the surrounding area. Ferndown, Longham, Stapehill, Canford Bottom and Colehill. For the people of Ferndown, Longham and Stapehill, it is a means of accessing the wider recreational area without having to cross Canford Bottom roundabout. For some of our residents they just walk in Cannon Hill South and never cross to the north of the bypass, but for many others it is the only way on foot that they can access a wider area. If this access to our woodlands is removed where else can the people south of the bypass walk? The walk by the Stour is for fine weather only. Otherwise there is Ferndown Common but this is very wet in bad weather and takes as long to dry out as by the river. Cannon Hill South is an all weather walking area. Not only can people walk but they can ride bikes and horses too, wheel chair users are able to negotiate the paths and enjoy a little nature. With almost 6000 new homes planned in the Core Strategy we need more recreational land, not less. The Sustainable Alternate natural green Spaces (SANGS) are all very well but they are not mature natural areas. I hope you will listen to the views of the people of this area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP119	Disagree	Please can you confirm that there will be no refuse site built within Cannon Hill woods in Colehill.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP122	Disagree	I am writing to you on behalf of my family and many of the residents local to Cannon Hill South (Uddens Woodland) and the proposed Waste Plant for this area. Myself and hundreds of the local residents fiercely oppose this plan to turn the woods from a beautiful countryside retreat to a development that will bring pollution, noise, flies, vermin and mass traffic. I will ensure that all my contacts in the national press and TV are aware of these plans, and if necessary to highlight what is proposed by the council in order to stop this shameful plan to turn a beautiful piece of land into a concrete monster. As you will have gathered from this email, myself and my fellow residents are 100% against this Waste Plant (or indeed anything else similar). And I will fight tooth and nail to ensure this land remains untouched and free of these disturbing proposed plans.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP125	Disagree	I wholly object to this planned development. Such a lovely wooded area with beautiful wildlife. I use it often for walking and photography, cycling and walking my dog, so do many others. Absolutely ludicrous!!!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP129	Disagree	Having read your report on the potential waste plant in Blunts Farm Ferndown, once again you do not appear to care about the Welfare of the Ferndown residents of EDDC. If this project was to go ahead it would probably effect the health of residents of Ferndown this type of Plant should be built in a rural area, not close to housing estates ,this is how they do it in Germany .We would also be overloaded with excessive traffic as .the roads in this area have not been upgraded for 30 years and Ferndown is continually log jammed by the amount of traffic passing through and around it I am also concerned about the , casegenics that will be put into the atmosphere from that huge chimney .This project appears to be the same as the appeal that you lost in 2006 Therefore I would be unable to support this project.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP141	Disagree	We would like to object to using uddens / blunts farm for waste. We are concerned regarding air pollution. Traffic pollution with the additional lorries. Loss of woodland green space wildlife. We object to this near our homes and schools. The page has flooded in the past so unsafe for more lorries.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP160		My son attends school adjacent to the land proposed for this rubbish facility and uses the woods regularly for walks, to play, look for insects and have picnics. He came home from nursery telling me about a sign that they had seen whilst out on a walk that day. The sign, according to him, said that "some people wanted to cut down the trees". He felt very passionately about telling them to stop. He has asked me to write a letter to the "naughty people who want to build the tower" Below is Harry's letter in his own words; STOP! I don't want you to knock the trees down. Don't build it because we won't be able to go in the woods anymore or have our teddy bears picnics When the smoke comes out of the chimney all the insects will die. The smoke will make me cough and the rubbish will be stinky and smelly. We play in the woods and find insects. There won't be anywhere for the animals to live because it will be full of rubbish.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP164	Disagree	I strongly oppose the use of this outstanding natural area to burn waste and create a rubbish 'dump'. Not only are the environmental impacts evident with the destruction of beautiful woodland, extra chaos of additional lorries and vehicles on the already over laded A31, fumes, smoke and stench of a tip and furnace, but this site is sandwiched between densely populated areas of Ferndown, Uddens and Colehill. My children attend the Barn Nursery School which backs onto your proposed/preferred site, the health impact greatly concerns us and you should reconsider your site location. We also live within a mile of this site and if you do live locally you will know that there are strong winds in the area due to the topography, we (or our close neighbours in Wimborne, Ferndown & Uddens) will suffer the stench and toxic smoke from the site. By choosing this location for such a huge site, you would be taking away the right of a healthy life for thousands of local residents, not to mention at least 6 schools within a 2 mile radius.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP181	Disagree	<p>I am writing to express my concern and opinions as requested in the article I read in the Stour and Avon Magazine Woodland under treat “ people urged to give their views Having lived locally within this area for over fourteen and a half years I feel it is important to express my concerns and explain why I object to Cannon Hill South Woodlands being used as; Waste vehicle depot HRC Bulky waste transfer and treatment facility I believe that many local residents and individuals who use these woodlands on a daily basis will feel as passionately as I do in protecting a peaceful, unspoilt natural environment now and for future generations to enjoy. The thought of this area being spoilt and developed as proposed is unthinkable. A chimney 40m in height polluting the air will have a detrimental impact on the woodland and natural habitats will be destroyed. Local people, dog walkers, cyclists, holiday makers and businesses will no doubt be severely affected and this will in turn impact on the surrounding community. Others comments highlight the importance of recreational space and this is an extremely valid point. The government along with the NHS and many businesses has for an increasing number of years tried to encourage individuals to keep fit and healthy, promoting a lifestyle that combines regular exercise and a balanced diet. By going ahead with these proposals will mean that many people who regularly take pleasure in walking, jogging, exercising, cycling, playing, bird watching and enjoying the woodland will no longer be able to enjoy the tranquillity and breath the fresh woodland air. The friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill have worked as a team over the years to ensure that this area is maintained, equipping it with picnic benches, clearing pathways and keeping it litter free because it is an area that is loved and enjoyed by people of all ages. I hope that all their hard work has not been in vain. I realise that a site needs to be established but would urge you not to earmark Cannon Hill South because of the following; It is the only area similar to Moors Valley that people who live in Wimborne and Ferndown can access by foot and one that provides a relaxed environment “a natural, unspoilt area Increased traffic noise pollution, air pollution. Would impact hugely on an already busy area We need to maintain this beautiful woodland area. The forestry commission have cleared trees and new saplings have been planted It would be devastating to lose such a pleasant woodland area that is enjoyed and loved by a large local population. I do hope another suitable site can be found.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP197	Disagree	I am writing to express my concern about the proposed building of a major waste processing plant on woodland in Ferndown. Yet again it would appear that the issue that creates problems is not being addressed but how to solve the problem created. The council has created many examples of this, the most obvious is Canford Bottom Round-a- bout. Polio was attacked by a vaccine, government and councils would have created the best iron lung to solve the same issue. Building a bigger waste site and then having to truck waste from a greater area, is not going to solve the issue of increasing waste. Building it on greenbelt in an area already blighted by traffic congestion may resolve an issue in the short term but will create so many other issues that will take much longer to sort out. Since the introduction of charges to get rid of waste and the closing off of certain waste centres to residents living in the wrong area has created an increase in fly tipping. Making it harder still to get rid of waste and charging residents through local tax will not help. The disposal of waste needs to be close to the point of production to encourage its responsible disposal. Secondly reducing the amount of packaging through legislation and the allocation of the cost of disposal to the producer will have a greater affect long term on the issue than building bigger and better incinerators.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP200	Disagree	I am writing to strongly object to the proposal for a Waste Plant to be erected at the above site. This is the Castleman Trail which is used by many walkers and cyclists, myself included, on a regular basis. This is a lovely scenic woodland in the middle of a built up area, which you are thinking of destroying plus the increased traffic, e.g. heavy lorries, on our already congested Canford Bottom roundabout on the A31. Is the council mad! Are they intent on covering our natural woodlands with air and noise pollution plus vermin? We are being bombarded with houses being built on every spare piece of land in this lovely area. Our small woodland is a place where our community can get away from the constant traffic noise. I plead with the council to reconsider!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP203	Disagree	I would like to strongly object to the proposal to put bulky and residual waste treatment facility, HRC and a waste vehicle depot in the areas of Blunts Farm, land adjacent to Blunts Farm or Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates for many reasons, including: * My family and I use the area for family walks, our friends walk their dogs there and my children have a safe and clean place to ride their bikes. * I use the Castleman Trailway to cycle to Ringwood and Moors Valley due to the fact that it is safe but also because of the beautiful scenery and wildlife you see. If the proposal goes ahead at this site, the increase in traffic will not only pollute the air but will also remove the enjoyment out of this part of the cycle and drive away wildlife. * We moved to the area less than 5 years ago, attracted by the easy access to unspoilt woodland on our doorstep. Since moving, all we have heard is proposals to change this natural resource. * With ever increasing traffic on our roads, can our local infrastructure really support the extra burden this proposal would result in? More important than the infrastructure, will our health suffer as a direct result of increased fumes from both extra lorries and incinerators?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP210	Disagree	I write to strongly object to the proposed household recycling centres, bulky waste treatment and residual waste treatment plant at Uddens Woodland/Cannon Hill South/Blunts Farm. I regularly walk my dog through this beautiful area of woodland and often use as a safe access to Cannon Hill Plantation on the other side of the bypass. I frequently encounter walkers and bike riders using this woodland to traverse the Castleman Trailway, some of which have travelled some distance to enjoy the area. It is a well-used community asset and haven for wildlife. The Friends of Uddens & Cannon Hill Woodlands do a wonderful job of maintained the woodland for the whole community's enjoyment. The suggestion of an incinerator with a 40m chimney being constructed on this greenbelt site is abhorrent and totally unnecessary when there are vastly more suitable sites within already industrialised zones. Furthermore, the proposed access via Uddens Drive is not suitable for the volume and type of traffic this proposal would generate. Also, the extra vehicles that would have to use the Canford Bottom roundabout to access the site would make, what is already a continuous situation of congestion most of the time, intolerable. I sincerely hope that the views if the local residents are taken seriously and this proposals is refused.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP213	Disagree	If access is required using the by-pass A31 or old A31 via Canford Bottom the roundabout would need to be redeveloped to handle the enormous extra traffic at a very high cost. Uddens drive a country lane. A cul-de-sac abutted by the by-pass and old A31. Only entrance exits to trading estate and Chestnut grove and the farm. Time money and great effort has been put into making this small triangle of woodland into a leisure facility for the surrounding Ferndown area Prevailing winds blow across towards Ferndown Schools and the population of Ferndown and Stapehill The enormous amount of extra traffic to access this small triangle area would cause stress to those who live and work in the area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP222	Disagree	This green belt land is an essential part of Ferndown, for recreation and natural beauty, and one of the many reasons people love living here. The council/government have already ruined our road infrastructure with the terrible mess they have made over the Canford Bottom Roundabout 'improvements' that have made the traffic congestion worse and has also increased the number of accidents on the road. Surely, it does not take a genius to work out that should this waste plant go ahead at Cannon hill Plantation then the road congestion would be 10 fold and utterly unbearable to the residents and those driving through our town? It is bad enough when all the caravans start coming through in the holiday season but to increase this with the massive lorries belching out disgusting fumes, on top of the pollution that the plant itself will create, will only reduce the value of everyone's properties on top of making driving around Ferndown completely unbearable. I appreciate that the waste plant needs to be built and will be used by all but surely it needs to be in a less populated position that will not impact crowded roads further???	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP233	Disagree	<p>We would like to strongly object to the proposal of the above (along with the proposed sand and gravel extraction and also traveller's site). We think that the amount of expected lorries per day would be hugely detrimental to the area swamping the already heavily congested roads, especially Canford Bottom, along, of course, with the cars and vans going there with waste instead of Brook Rd. Can the road infrastructure actually accommodate all this extra traffic? We understand that there would be an incinerator chimney which could obviously pollute the air for miles. Areas where people live, work and go to school, risking breathing problems and health issues for all, making this lovely area not so wonderful any more. We must also not forget the woodland which is loved and used by so many. What a blight on the landscape to have chimney pollution, the heavy continual traffic and the noise when we need more recreational areas for all the proposed housing as planned in the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Individual</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WP236</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Disagree</p> <p>In response to the Additional and Emerging Waste Site Allocations (WP01) i.e. forestry land to the south west and adjacent Blunts Farm, I want to express my objections to the proposal for a Waste Treatment Plant on or anywhere near this area of land. In the original plan I objected to such a plant being sited at Blunts Farm so as this proposed emerging site is adjacent to Blunts Farm much of my comment applies equally to both sites. My objections are based on a number of grounds as shown below: Health and Safety This proposed site is virtually central to the main population areas of Ferndown, Wimborne, and Colehill, along with others further afield such as West Moors and Wimborne which include schools and leisure facilities. It is also directly situated in the woodland amenity areas of Cannon Hill and Uddens which are widely and continuously used for recreation in many forms by local people and visitors to the area. The Castleman Trailway, a major outdoor leisure feature of the county runs directly through this area. No-one can guarantee fume free operation and with the general prevailing wind from the south west (with north easterlies quite common) no-one can guarantee the flow of emissions or the absolute level of pollutants generated from a high chimney. The landfall of pollutants close by would subject residents to long term exposure to low level pollution and in the event of a serious leakage exposure to high level pollution perhaps toxic in nature. Both these scenarios could have a serious and unacceptable effect on the health of the local people. Noise Pollution It is now well known that continuous noise generated by the operations and traffic which would be bound to result from such a facility can have a serious effect on the health of people, and could make life in the vicinity of such a site unbearable. Green Belt Land The land in question is Green Belt and to establish a waste site this would need to be changed. I believe this can only be done as a last resort if all other alternatives have been proved to be unsuitable. I cannot see proof positive in the plan that this is the only possible site available. Recreational Use This area of land has been used for recreational purposes for many years and forms part of the Cannon Hill Woodlands which is recognised by the Forestry Commission (FC) website as a valuable area for recreation. The woodlands are used by the people of Ferndown, Longham, Stapehill, Canford Bottom and Colehill. It is also quite common when walking there to meet people from far afield. The Castleman Trailway is an all-weather track enabling people to enjoy it all year round used by walkers, runners, horse riders, dog walkers, and cyclists. It is an off road alternative for many cyclists going to their work. It is used by a local nursery school as an outside activity area. Picnic tables and benches provided in more recent times persuade people to stop a while and they also encourage older people to use the woodlands. The sculptures created out of fallen/felled wood add to the enjoyment of both adults and children, and some of those working on the industrial estate use the woods in their lunch break. A great deal of work has been undertaken in Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands in conjunction with the Forestry Commission and many more people are using the area for recreation. As a result of this work a number of species of mammals and birds have been discovered - who can tell how many more undiscovered creatures there may be - the adjacent area of Whitesheet is a designated SSSI site. It should be noted also that this work has been encouraged not only by the Forestry Commission but by Dorset County Council and local authorities. In short it is an extremely valuable and well used recreational facility, and it is also a scarce one. With thousands more houses planned in the current local plan, and a further development of Blunts Farm for industrial use, this green space needs to be preserved. There is mounting evidence that experiencing the outdoors and engaging with the natural environment is good for physical and mental health and the area is shown as part of the Open Space provision for Ferndown. Drainage Land drainage is complex in this area and seepage of pollutants is a major concern. Stapehill is also notorious for flooding, another major hazard if waste recovery operations were to take place here. There are concerns that if such a large area of land is stripped of trees and other vegetation flooding could be worse and may lead to other areas of the woodlands being too wet to use in bad weather. Access Denied The road network in the Ferndown area is heavily used on all fronts such as the very busy A31, and the local roads such as Wimborne Road East and West. Traffic is always a problem now and the addition of much more heavy haulage and cars would simply completely overload the roads. It would be highly likely that Uddens Drive would be used to access any Waste Site which would virtually make this road unusable for pedestrians, cyclists, elderly people and children, and wheelchair users who can currently use the woodland pathways. This would result in it being almost impossible to access the remaining woodlands except from perhaps Colehill which is already very busy and no facilities for car parking for visitors to the woods. Inappropriate Impact Buildings and processing plant will have an adverse impact on the area in which it is sited and as such by default will breach most of the considerations in Proposed Policy 12 - Amenity and Quality of Life. Whilst mitigations can be put in place for some of the adverse impacts, some such as air pollution, natural leakage and water drainage are much more unpredictable and uncontrollable. A chimney of the proportions suggested (30 - 40 metres high) would be a blight on the area for miles around and could not be screened by</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
---	---	--	--	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
				<p>landscaping or other screening techniques. Ferndown Industrial Estate in which the Blunts Farm site and this extended area will fall is designated an area of light industrial use in the Core Strategy. Many people work here in small industrial units; I think waste recovery could not be considered as light industrial use. At the moment the industrial, residential, and recreational open spaces sit relatively comfortably with each other. This equilibrium would be totally destroyed by the building of a waste site in this area. Conclusion A waste plant such as this should be sited as far as possible from populated or recreational areas where people obviously live, work, and gather together. Cannon Hill Woodlands and the Uddens are becoming more and more recognised as the only viable open land facility available to large numbers of people with diverse healthy recreational interests. Over the years this area of land has been 'targeted' for a number of inappropriate developments but it is quite clear that it needs to be preserved and protected for future generations.</p>	

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WHP239	Disagree	I have just received details of the proposed development at Cannon Hill South to establish a Waste Vehicle Depot, Household Recycling Centre and a Bulky Waste Transfer and Treatment Facility. There is no way I could support this development at this location. This is a valuable area of woodland and heathland which is used by many people each week and supports many examples of rare birds and animals including Nightjars and Woodcocks. The Household Recycling Centre that would replace the Brook Road site in Wimborne would bring 100.000 cars a year to this site. How would these vehicles get there? The idea of all these vehicles using Wimborne Road and travelling via Canford Bottom or Ferndown is untenable, The Canford Bottom roundabout has to be one of the worst in the country and certainly the worst in Dorset. The lack of money invested in that roundabout, leading to the lack of an underpass results in massive queues every morning and evening along Wimborne road which would get much worse, leading to those queues being present most of the day. How many hundreds and probably thousands of man hours a week are totally lost to drivers locked in these queues? We cannot afford to lose this area of important countryside, and while I have no doubt that the development suggested would benefit the county this is certainly not the place to put it.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WHP242	Disagree	We Object strongly to your future plans of the ruination of these special woods, which are an amazing facility for our local community, also the threat to the varied wild life, flora and fauna. DO NOT GO AHEAD WITH THESE PLANS.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WHP245	Disagree	I would like to express my concern over the proposed waste plant at Cannon Hill South. My family and I regularly visit this area of woodland and it is of real value to us. The health, amenity and social benefits of trees and woodland are well documented. This resource needs to be maintained for the benefit of local people. We are also concerned about the impact on traffic as the a31 is already arguably at maximum capacity. My daughter has asthma and the negative impact on air quality is also a real worry for us.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WHP249	Disagree	I would like to object to the siting of the Ferndown waste processing plant. The reasons for my objections are that I use the open space to cycle and walk my dog. I also understand there is the possibility of an incineration plant. I live within walking distance of this plant and am concerned about the health effects and potential smell and fumes arising from this. The traffic is already heavy in this area and the extra traffic from users of the site and the lorries that will be accessing this plant will only add to the congestion.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

<p style="text-align: center;">Friends of Uddens &amp; Cannon Hill Woodlands</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WP253</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Disagree</p> <p>Thank you for giving us this opportunity to respond. We do hope you look favourably on our hopes of keeping our woodland open for everyone to enjoy. We are only going to respond quite narrowly, concentrating on the small triangle of Forestry Commission woodland to the South West of Blunts Farm which was a new site proposed in the Additional and Emerging Waste Site Allocations (WP01). We will refer to it as Cannon Hill South as it is the part of Cannon Hill but to the south of the A31. OBJECTION: THIS IS GREEN BELT So much land has been removed from the Green Belt by the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan. Most of it green fields or allotments, but this site is not only Green Belt it is also an area of woodland heavily used for recreation. There appears to be no very special circumstances to warrant the release of this Green belt land. There seems to have been no comprehensive search for alternative sites in the urban area or alternate brown field sites in the Green Belt. OBJECTION: THIS IS WIDELY USED AS RECREATIONAL LAND The people of Ferndown, Longham, Stapehill, Canford Bottom and Colehill use this patch of woodland. It is very pretty with not too much of it as a conifer plantation. It has been adopted by the local people for decades. It is used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders, wheel chair users and families. Some paths are wet in bad weather but the Castleman Trailway remains an all-weather track enabling people to enjoy it all year round. It is the only patch of woodland accessible to the South of the A31 so people do not have to drive to find space to walk. The only other space to the south of the A31 is Ferndown Common (an International Designated heath) which is not only a protected site but is so eroded and impossible to walk in wet weather unless forced to. It is the same for the Stour Valley. It does not have to be flooded to be impassable due to deep mud. The Forestry Commission (FC) website recognises the value of Cannon Hill as a whole for recreation and also mentions our patch; The southern part of Cannon Hill, south of the Ferndown Bypass, is heavily used by residents of Stapehill for dog walking. They are not quite right as people come from much further afield to use it and not just dog walkers, especially since a local community volunteer group have improved access by removing so much rhododendron growth and looking after the paths (with the approval of the FC). It is used by a local nursery school as an outside activity area. Picnic tables and benches persuade people to stop a while. There are also some sculptures created out of fallen/felled wood for the enjoyment of both adults and children. Some of those working on the industrial estate use the woods in their lunch break, vans park up for lunch time. It is very widely used, all this activity has not been recognised. With thousands of houses planned in the current local plan, and a further development of 30 hectares of the Blunts Farm site as industrial use, we need our Green Space. The Draft Sustainability Appraisal fails to mention this loss of amenity to the wider community and how important this woodland is to all of us. The Local Authorities are already looking to revise Local Plans or progress new ones. An additional 700 houses a year has been mentioned. We need to protect Open Spaces for the children. This area could serve as an informal SANG as it is. Please take this into account and protect our woodlands from development of any kind. OBJECTION: FAILS TO RECOGNISE OPEN SPACE PROVISION AND THE VALUE OF GREEN SPACES TO BOTH PHYSICAL AND MENTAL WELLBEING. This is an emerging area of study. Evaluating Health and Wellbeing Outcomes for Community Growing Programmes. We are obviously not trained experts and we do not run community farms, but we do hold monthly community volunteer parties for people to enhance the woodlands, both north and south of the A31. To quote from the introduction, Experiencing the outdoors and engaging with the natural environment is good for physical and mental health. The Community Open Spaces Newsletter 2016, Christchurch and East Dorset Councils, shows all the different areas funded and run by the joint council. We run our Cannon Hill Friends with some funding from both EDDC and DCC, but otherwise just volunteers; that makes us good value for money. The area is shown as part of the Open Space provision for Ferndown, though if I could find it on line, I am sure it must be part of Wimborne's too. OBJECTION: POSSIBLE DISRUPTION TO THE CASTLEMAN TRAILWAY This is such a vital off-road track from Poole to Ringwood with options for cyclists/walkers to hop on or off without using cars/roads to get from A to B. A waste site of any kind would put people off using it which would put more cars on the road. OBJECTION: INCREASE OF TRAFFIC ON LOCAL ROADS. It is highly unlikely that the Highways Agency would allow access directly off the A31. If Uddens Drive is used to access a Waste Site this would add to the appalling problems we already have with Wimborne Road East and West to say nothing of this charming Drive lost to development. Some of the more elderly dog walkers, or those travelling some distance, drive to the woodlands and park. It would be too difficult for them to access any woods remaining if there was too much traffic and the traffic fumes would discourage them anyhow. OBJECTION: TO TALL CHIMNEYS AND POSSIBLE POLLUTANTS The 30 to 40 meter chimney would be visible from miles around, this would introduce a look of heavy industry to a residential area. We have all grown up with Uddens and Ferndown Trading Estates but they have never had the appearance of heavy industry. The prevailing winds from the South West would have the potential to spread pollutants, both chemical and smells, over dense residential areas and local schools. This is</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
--	---	--	--	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
				<p>not acceptable to local people. OBJECTION TO SPOILT LOCAL LANDSCAPE It mentions a major landscape concern and then says the development would avoid development of more sensitive sites! Do people not matter? Is this the conclusion we should make? Has there been a landscape assessment? We are already losing 30 hectares of open land. Not all of it accessible as some of it was farmed. We have raised no objections during the Local Plan process as we accepted the need for more industrial land and were informally advised that there would be a wide natural area to form a barrier to protect our woodland, a wild life pond was mentioned (informally). OBJECTION TO POTENTIAL DRAINAGE PROBLEMS Cannon Hill woodlands to the South of the A31 can get very wet underfoot in periods of rain, especially over the western part of the site. There are concerns that if the vegetation/trees are removed over a large area and the area concreted over, then in wet weather any remaining woodlands would be too wet to use. OBJECTION TO THE CONCLUSION In the conclusion on this site it fails to mention the loss of amenity value for recreation and also fails to mention the Green Belt. This summarises our concerns over this emerging site. Although we have only objected to this preferred site to the South West of Blunts Farm, we do not feel that that Waste Sites are suitable in an area of dense housing.</p>	
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WVP256	Disagree	<p>I was astounded to hear about the plan to put a Waste Plant at Uddens Woods. We walk and use the woods every day, these woods are beautiful and have an amazing diversity of plants, trees and wildlife. Away from the ecological issues, most days, traffic on the A31 and Wimborne Road approaching Canford Bottom roundabout is at a standstill most mornings and afternoons/early evenings. Adding lorries to this is just a crazy, ridiculous idea. I cannot believe these beautiful woods are even being considered. Shame on you!!!</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP259	Disagree	<p>I am writing to you to express my disgust and outrage that these beautiful Woods are even being considered for a Waste Site. I worked for several years for East Dorset District Council and have knowledge of planners. In my mind, if they actually removed their backsides from their chairs in their comfy offices from whichever Council they are at and actually walked and strolled around these Woods, they would actually realise what a beautiful Woods these are. Sitting in offices and maybe carrying out a site meeting in their Mini Bus will not give them any idea at all of the beauty and wildlife which live in these Woods. Besides the pollution, and mess which is involved in this so called Waste Plan, there is also the traffic to consider, which again, probably hasn't even been considered along this road approaching the Canford Bottom Roundabout at different times. Using these Woods every day, we do know about these things, unlike some of these Council Planners who really have no idea of these issues. Please, consider other areas around without having to wreck these beautiful woods. We have children and no doubt will have grandchildren within the next few years, I would love to take them for walks up there and show them the wonderful birds and wildlife which exist up there and if only these 'people' who choose these sites would take the time to do this, they may realise what damage they are doing to the environment and our beautiful area we live in. Although, they probably do not even live around here, so this would make no difference to them!!!!</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP263		<p>I write to register my objection to the proposed household recycling centre, bulky waste treatment and residual waste treatment plant at Uddens Woodlands/Cannon Hill/Land SW of Blunts Farm. The area of woodland at Uddens and SW of Blunts Farm is a vital community resource. It is a green space for the local community, used by those working on the Industrial Estate, users of the very popular Castleman Trailway, dog walkers, horse riders and bike riders. It paths are also pushchair also wheelchair friendly. The potential for hazardous fumes discharging from the proposed incinerator and 40m chimney in such close proximity from residential areas and schools is also a major concern to public health. Wimborne Road West could not accommodate the proposed quantity of lorries and vehicles accessing the site on top of local traffic without causing gridlock to already heavily congested roads. The proposed access off Uddens Drive is simply not suitable or safe for such volumes of vehicles. Approx. 6000 new homes are planned within the Core Strategy for the local area and we need more recreation land, not less. I cannot see how this proposal can be given the go ahead and can only hope that, for once, the Council listens to public opinion and issues a categorical refusal.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP266	Disagree	<p>I write to register my objection to the proposed household recycling centre, bulky waste treatment and residual waste treatment plant at Uddens Woodlands/Blunts Farm. The proposed use of the land to the SW of Blunts Farm for a waste plant is wholly inappropriate and would be detrimental to the local community. I am a regular visitor to the woodland and a lot of work has gone into making it user friendly and accessible for all. The Friends of Uddens &amp; Cannon Hill Woodlands do an admirable job of maintaining the woodland and all the work is undertaken by local and loyal volunteers. The mature woodland is a positive haven for all types of wildlife. It is also intersected by the Castleman Trailway and this is an important and very popular long distance trail way form Ringwood to Poole, Passing through Cannon Hill South with a safe pedestrian crossing over the bypass. It is used by walkers, horse riders, cyclists and commuters. The proposals for this site also appear contrary to National Planning Policy Framework guidance and East Dorset Districts own Core Strategy regarding protection of the Green Belt. Para 81 "Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land EDDC Core Strategy 8.8 "Wimborne and Colehill are set within the South East Dorset Green Belt. The Green Belt between the settlements is very narrow and maintains their separate identity. One of the main purposes of the Green Belt is to prevent coalescence of settlements, so this open area is particularly important to protect. The proposed plan to construct a waste incinerator and 40m high chimney billowing hazardous fumes towards nearby residential areas and local schools also appear to flout NPPF policies such as; NPPF para 110 " In preparing plans to meet development needs, the aim should be to minimise pollution and other adverse effects on the local and natural environment. Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework Furthermore, the extra vehicles that would have to pass through the Canford Bottom roundabout to access the site would only exacerbate the horrendous congestion problems already suffered by motorists at this bottleneck. The proposed access via Uddens Drive is also not a suitable or safe junction for the volume and type of vehicles this proposal would create. In summary, I object to the proposal on the following grounds; It would result in the loss of an area of woodland which is a well-used local amenity, together with a loss of habitat for wildlife It conflicts with NPPF Protecting Green Belt Land and Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment polices The proposal for an incinerator has serious potential to cause a detrimental effect on the health of nearby residents and children attending local schools The local road infrastructure is not capable of withstanding the volume and type of vehicle traffic this proposal would create I hope that the views of the local people are listed to and this proposal is flatly refused.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP270	Disagree	<p>This proposed site is going to be located in an area of outstanding GREENBELT of woodland and heath. The area is in constant use by walkers, cyclist and horse riders as well as families using the picnic areas. The Friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands do an amazing job of maintaining the area and looking after the area and wildlife. To gain access to this site via the A31 will be impossible during the morning, evening and at weekends due to the traffic jam that the residents currently endure on a regular basis and which is worse throughout the summer, when we become prisoners in our own streets due to the grid lock on the road. At present, sitting in the traffic jam looking at the heath and woodland is preferable to looking at a recycling centre with incinerator with an approx. 40ft chimney, which is not the view to offer visitors to the area. Access via Wimborne Road East would be used to avoid the jam on the A31 and trying to cross the Canford Bottom roundabout which already backs up both ways without the additional traffic trying to drop off waste will become impassable. Any increase of people fly tipping around the area due to traffic jams is also of concern. As previously mentioned in the first consultation document having purchased our property with pylons in close proximity and throughout the area was our choice, but having our first mortgage application refused due to the pylons by Northern Rock (who lent to anyone), it will give problems for future mortgages with pylons and a recycling plant and incinerator all within 250m of a lot of properties. The dust of mineral extraction, heavy goods lorries, more traffic and a loss of green spaces and woodland would be disastrous for the area. Please leave this area alone as we already have an increase in traffic due to the expansion of the industrial estate.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP278	Disagree	<p>I am very shocked and extremely saddened to hear that the woods at Uddens, Stapehill are to be considered for use as a Dorset County Council Waste Plant serving Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole. I moved to Stapehill 11 years ago and since then the residents have been subjected to a series of life-changing development submissions, firstly the now monstrous and dangerous Canford Bottom roundabout improvements for the 2012 Olympics which were lengthy, inconvenient and pointless. Accidents now occur daily, this had never been a black spot before the changes. Following that, the threat of a large Gypsy and Travellers Transit site on the woods at Uddens, which, incidentally, we have not yet been informed is not to go ahead, and now the alarming proposal of a Waste Plant, residential, commercial and to include an incinerator on the very same green belt woods! I simply cannot believe that the authorities want to develop the only recreational green belt area that the residents of Stapehill have within walking distance of the village, including it being our pedestrian access point to the Cannon Hill plantation north of the A31 and a trailway for cyclists, walkers and horse riders alike! The people making these decisions obviously do not appreciate how well used this area is on a daily basis! Has anybody considered the dramatic impact on the plentiful local wildlife too! In addition, Wimborne Road West is already an extremely busy road with a very large number of commercial vehicles entering and exiting the industrial estates, to avoid the permanently congested A31, and heavy local traffic; I cannot begin to imagine how much more congestion this additional residential and commercial traffic would create! Stapehill Abbey is presently being developed as residential housing and we will have to accommodate these new road users too! There must be alternative sites or the option to, at least, restrict the development to the original Blunts Farm proposal with access directly from/to the A31 from the larger of the industrial estates. PLEASE! PLEASE! PLEASE! Think again, Uddens Woods, Stapehill, is not the right place for this plant. Yours desperately, Stapehill Resident &amp; family</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP280	Disagree	<p>I object to the proposal on the following grounds: (1) As other consultees have already commented, the proposals for this site are contrary to both the National Planning Policy Framework guidance (Para 81) and East Dorset Districts own Core Strategy regarding protection of the Green Belt (EDDC Core Strategy 8.8). This site is located in an area of Green Belt of woodland and heath. The area is in use by walkers, dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders, all of whom currently benefit from using this area for healthy outdoor exercise. (2) As a daily commuter on the A31 and the surrounding area, drivers already suffer from regular gridlock due to the inadequate current design of the Canford Bottom roundabout and Ferndown Industrial Estate roundabout. The local road infrastructure is simply not capable of withstanding the current volume of traffic using it and is definitely not capable of supporting the additional volume and type of vehicle traffic this proposal would create. This point is already acknowledged in the report (p. 65). Encouraging extra traffic to turn on and off of the A31 from/to Udders Drive at speed is not a sensible idea as this is neither a suitable nor safe junction for the volume and type of vehicles this proposal would create. (3) A proposed recycling centre with incinerator with a 40ft chimney will adversely affect local resident's quality of life (housing in this area 87,700 properties) and the pollution and dust will represent a health risk/danger to residents, users of the woodland and the natural environment around it. Having an incinerator this close to large tracts of woodland also constitutes a major fire risk. These points are again in contravention of the NPPF (para 110).</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP284	Disagree	<p>This small triangle of woodland, which is a designated Greenbelt, is These woods are as precious to the local people of this area through which runs the Castleman Trailway and the 256 Cycle Route which run from Poole to Ringwood. These woods are used on a daily basis by horse riders, dog walkers, cyclists, (some of which are family groups especially during week- ends and school holidays) walking groups and elderly people enjoying the fresh air and exercise. Many workers from Uddens and Ferndown Industrial Estates cycle or walk through as a safer route from Colehill than using the Canford Bottom Roundabout. 'Friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands' have over the years arranged regular work parties to enhance the trailways and have created 'natural' play areas for children. With donations from members of this group and various grants kindly donated by District and County Councillors they have, in conjunction with the Forestry Commission, constructed and placed many picnic tables and perch benches over the area, which are greatly appreciated by us all. The work by this group is ongoing. A Waste Site so close to the local community would pose a health hazard and encourage vermin. The Wimborne ByPass borders the proposed site and any loose waste could be blown onto oncoming traffic. The volume and frequency of the traffic along Uddens Drive that this development would generate would be a danger to the local community, some of who can only access their property via Uddens Drive. Before you even consider this Woodland as an option please visit the area, come and talk to us and then you will see the reasons for our concerns.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP287	Disagree	I would like to lodge my opposition to the proposal to remove green belt land in Cannon Hill Woods to supply a waste treatment and household recycling plant. Surely there are other sites that are already spoilt that would be more appropriate. Not only are the woods constantly used and enjoyed by ramblers, dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders, they are teeming with wild life including deer, voles, snakes, slow worms, foxes, owls and many other species of bird life . The green belt appears to be constantly under threat and to use woodland that provides a splendid recreational facility for such a destructive purpose as waste treatment seems to be short sighted, especially given the large increase in homes planned for the Wimborne and Colehill area	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP290			
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP296	Disagree	I strongly object to the proposed development. Please acknowledge my objection in writing.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP298	Disagree	My objections to the proposals for the site are twofold: - I enjoy the fresh air in my garden. The prevailing winds are from the south-west. The thought of toxic fumes from an incinerator arriving on the wind is appalling. We in Bracken Road are in direct line and on the leading edge of a substantial built up area (I see that assurances are being given that an incinerator will not in fact be built on the equivalent Mannings Heath site - increasing the likelihood of one being built on other sites). - Traffic will be a major snag. I have seen it suggested that 100 lorries will visit the site every day plus more than 250 cars per day from the Brook Road site. A substantial part of these will approach and return via the Canford Bottom system exacerbating its inadequacies - a little extra holiday traffic can already gum up the works. Whether the actual access is via Uddens Road, Ferndown Industrial Estate on A31 (more lights?) it is going to add significantly to the already heavy local traffic.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP317	Disagree	Sir, I understand that DCC intend to agree to the development of a waste plant at Cannon Hill South. Firstly, I wish to record my very strong objection to this or any development of this type in the area. Secondly I wish to registration my disappointment in the lack of information from the council to local people on this important matter. This may have been an oversight or an action plan seen as a way to ensure the least opposition as possible until the project was under way. Either way had it not been for the friends of uddens and cannon hill woodlands, I would not of known about it	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP321	Disagree	I object to the proposed inclusion of the triangular piece of Green Belt SW of the A 31 as part of the Blunts Farm area currently in the frame. This precious piece of peaceful woodland/Green Belt is an essential counterbalance to the current Ferndown and Uddens developments and is widely used for recreation including Mountain-biking, Running, Walking and horse riding. Its loss to this possible end use cannot be cost-effective if the external costs associated with its loss are properly evaluated. Please remove this plot from you list.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP324	Disagree	Objections to the development in or around Ferndown for Incinerator waste units or waste handling Grounds for objection Pollution fall out for chimneys Short term health concerns Long term health concerns Noise Pollution (DCC have still not built the planned and promised noise barrier running between Ferndown Industrial Estate and Bracken Road / Lesson Drive) Waste litter from deliver lorries and the site itself as seen within other local waste site areas Loss and use of Green belt area Inability of the current road infrastructure to support current traffic let alone the large traffic movements proposed for this development. Significant impact of backed up congestion in the area It is on a critical and well know traffic blackspot with traffic system which does not work Cole Hill roundabout inability to take more large traffic, one lorry blocks each traffic light section which stacks up congestion Residential infrastructure expansion planned over the next 10 years will have a significant impact on existing road capabilities. This will seriously increase current traffic problems. Incinerator plants have already been historically rejected in Ferndown.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP335	Disagree	the land is wonderful green belt and was railway line that is now perfect for cycling safely and walking safely away from busy roads in area of lovely woodland and to have a toxic waste station attracting smells insects and massive traffic in an area where the stupid roundabout traffic lights causes summer chaos and massive queues who in right mind would add to traffic in this area. local resident	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Forestry Commission	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP345	Disagree	<p>The position of the Forestry Commission has not changed since our letter of 12th February 2016 and the points outlined in that letter still stand and are re-iterated below. We object to the inclusion of Blunts Farm as a site for a household recycling facility and even more to it as a site for a waste vehicle depot, a bulky waste transfer/treatment and/or residual waste treatment facility. As indicated previously, we would be keen to consider a local biomass CHP energy scheme to help support the on-going management of the significant areas of heathland and the lack of any market from the products of this management as part of a scheme to provide energy to the businesses within the area to be developed. There will be a need to make the difference between a biomass energy scheme and a municipal waste energy from waste plant clear in the plan as both will be considered a waste treatment or residual waste treatment facilities. The prime reason the site was taken out of the Green Belt was to allow a supply of much needed land for employment purposes hence it being identified for the provision of B1 (Office and Light Industrial), B2 (light industrial) and B8 (Warehousing and Distribution) as a natural extension to the Ferndown and Uddens Industrial estates. There has never been any intention for the land to be used for waste purposes along the lines you have identified. The Forestry Commission, East Dorset District Council and Ferndown and Uddens Improvement District have all worked together on a common goal to enable Blunts Farm to be used in the future for employment purposes as a natural extension to the existing industrial estates. There is an opportunity to provide modern, well designed industrial space which is currently not available at Ferndown or Uddens Industrial estates. This would in turn help some of the older properties to be re-developed and improved. The proposal to use up to 5.5 hectares of the developable area of the site would greatly undermine the remainder as an attractive location for industrial users and is likely to 'blight' the development. This is compounded by the triangular nature of the site making large areas undevelopable. There is also the presence of a SNCI on the property together with the need for an adequate ecological buffer on the western and northern boundaries. As the land is allocated for employment purposes, we would expect that arguments would need to be submitted with any proposed development stating how the waste disposal site will create jobs in the areas, as it is not a labour intensive use for the land and not compatible with the modern, well designed industrial space that is proposed on the site. In addition, there is a requirement in policy FWP8 (Blunt's Farm Employment Allocation, Ferndown) that the site be subject to a detailed development brief subject to public consultation. As the public appear to be against the development of a waste site in the area, it would be difficult to develop a strategy that would be acceptable to the public. Although there is the possibility of extending Nimrod Way to access the site in the future, this has still not been confirmed or agreed and there is uncertainty with respect not only to the access but also to the layout of any site. Uddens Drive is the current access but is unlikely to be adequate for the development of the entire site for employment use. The uses you propose would result in the whole of the development being less attractive for the intended use as employment land. The deleterious impact on the neighbouring businesses and residential properties remains the same. It's noted that the Draft Plan now includes the extension of the area of search to include the rest of the Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates, where they may be opportunity to redevelop an appropriate site or extend the existing facility operated by The Dorset Waste Partnership within the timeframe covered by the Waste Plan. This is more in line with the National Planning Policy for Waste (October 2014) giving priority to the re-use of previously developed land. Consultation responses have been consistent to those received during the Gypsy Site process undertaken by the County in respect of the area of land to the west of Blunts Farm which is part of the severed Cannon's Hill Plantation and still currently within the Green Belt. This remains a valuable local asset and therefore not suitable for the scale and extent of potential uses outlined in the Dorset Waste Plan consultation. Despite the inclusion of the site in Background Paper 2 published in June 2015, the Forestry Commission has always objected to the inclusion of Blunts Farm for use as a site for waste management or disposal facility. Previously the objection of the landowner to the inclusion of the site has been used as a reason for discounting sites. As we object to the proposed use of the site for waste management or disposal, with the exception of a biomass energy scheme, the proposed allocation will not be deliverable in the short to medium term and therefore casts doubt on the soundness of the plan.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing a preferred site to meet the needs identified. A separate report has been prepared to respond to the issues raised. However, the WPA authority has been unable to find a suitable alternative site to Blunts Farm and the adjoining Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estate to develop a HRC to serve the local community.</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP348	Disagree	We are writing to place on record our many concerns at the thought of a Waste Plant complete with incinerator and possible 40m chimney being built on land south of the A31, known locally as Uddens Woodlands. To build such a plant in that very sensitive area is completely in the wrong place, as not only would it deprive local people from using the woodlands as a place of enjoyment and for walking ones' dogs (thus exercising), it would also destroy the Castleman Trailway that runs from Poole to Ringwood, which again is a source of enjoyment for many people. Another huge point which should be taken into account is all the extra traffic (100+ lorries daily has been mentioned, plus all the extra cars should Brook Road Centre be closed), which would add to the already congested roads in the area and especially at Canford Bottom roundabout, which at times is gridlocked. Our final concern is from fallout fumes from the proposed siting of a 40m high incinerator chimney, which could jeopardise fresh air for miles. Also, in hot weather the smell from all the waste would be awful and would certainly increase the risk of vermin and flies contamination. Surely, it is possible to find a more suitable site that would not cause so much distress to the many people who live in the surrounding area of Uddens Woodlands. An acknowledgement of this letter would be appreciated.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP352	Disagree	I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the possibility of using the Canon Hill South site as a huge waste plant. I live opposite the woods and frequently use the lovely woods for walks and taking my grandchildren cycling. There are far too few places to go walking through woodland, therefore, the current ones must be protected at all costs. The traffic problem due to the new large roundabout is dreadful, can you imagine what would happen if another 100 lorries a day were to take place. The Castleman Track is used daily by numerous walkers and cyclists. I urge you to find a more suitable site as a matter of urgency.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP356	Disagree	I object strongly to the proposal for a waste plant at Uddens Farm on several grounds. Access via the A31 - an already congested area is going to cause more issues as traffic increases significantly - particularly lorries delivering waste products. The proposed facilities will be taking away a much valued amenity area used by countless people. It is a key community resource, a green space, it's used by people on the Castleman Trailway, dog walkers, horse riders, bike riding, children's play, wildlife and general walking. Around 675 properties lie within 250m of the Blunts Farm, with a further 101,000 homes within a five mile radius. Pollutants from smoke generated by an incinerator will blow across the residential area as the wind blows predominately from that direction towards the housing estates. Is there going to be an open discussion where people are invited to view the proposals being put forward and ask questions?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP372	Disagree	We have lived in Ferndown for nearly 40 years and regularly walk our dogs across Cannon Hill Plantation. We cannot believe that consideration has been given to this green belt area of natural beauty being utilised for a Waste Deposal Plant and associated facilities. The impact of additional traffic would be a nightmare as the Ferndown bypass is inadequate and the Canford Bottom roundabout is an absolute nightmare. In the spring there are several species of birds nesting and the area is also used by cyclists and horse riders. We appreciate that no one wants this facility near them but we would hope a better alternative can be found that has less disruption to the lives of local residents.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP376	Disagree	I am writing to object to the planning permission for the new recycling and incinerator site being built - great concern as to the effect it will have on health with the pollution from the incinerator burning plastic etc causing cancer, as so close to homes and schools. Please don't let this go ahead!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP381	Disagree	I wish to object to the proposed siting of an incinerator and waste disposal site at Uddens. Wimborne Road East is already congested and despite the modifications to the Canford Bottom roundabout traffic in the area is a major issue. This proposal will bring many heavy commercial lorries into the area with significant and unacceptable consequences. Traffic volumes will increase, the nature of the vehicles will change with consequent detrimental increase in emissions and congestion will ensue. The site is close to a significant residential area and the effect will be felt by those residing in the whole of Ferndown. The effect on the environment from such a plant will harm our surrounding area. This plan should be shelved at the earliest opportunity as it is not in the best interests of the residents of Ferndown.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP384	Disagree	<p>Reference WP01. Proposed subject matter. My wife and I would like to add our names to the many hundreds of protesters you will have already received with regard to the proposed misuse of a public amenity. We have lived in the Colehill area for nearly 50 years and apart from inevitable housing development, it has always been a wonderful experience to enjoy the surrounding areas of natural beauty such as Cannon Hill and Uddens woods. It would be a non-returnable countryside rape of this area which would not only eliminate the facilities available to walkers, horse riders and others who just want to relax between shifts at Ferndown Industrial Estate, but the prospect of the whole of the Bournemouth/Poole and East Dorset conurbation bringing its waste for incineration or transfer is a deplorable concept. We have already had to put up with the total waste of money in the form of the "Hamburger Roundabout" designed to allow traffic to get to the Olympic Games at Weymouth more quickly which has resulted in huge traffic problems. Now you are suggesting allowing even more lorries and cars onto the surrounding roads, particularly from Wimborne if Brook Road is closed. We are not aware as to how Christchurch/Bournemouth/Poole get rid of their waste at the moment but we have not heard of any problems so would this proposal be a forerunner to the giant Unitary Authority we hear rumours about which would be enable every local council to dump their rubbish in someone else's back yard. In this instance on an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. "Fly Tipping" is illegal. Please acknowledge receipt of this e-mail.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
The Barn Nursery	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP387	Disagree	<p>I definitely disagree. I am horrified at the very thought of this proposal of a waste plant being developed in Uddens Woodlands -Canon Hill south. I am the owner of The Barn Nursery School which has been in existence for 42 years. There are 45 children on the register ages 2 -5 years. The Nursery is located at Stapehill Farm which has a common field boundary to the proposed waste site. The children delight in a Forest School Club experience in Uddens Woodlands which provides a natural education, by using the woodland's resources it meets the development matters of national curriculum - the Early Years Foundation Stage. It has been commented in our recent successful Ofsted inspection as how beneficial it is to be able to use these rural and natural resources. Therefore my main concerns and reasons are: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The 40 metre chimney omitting fumes which could have an adverse effect on the young children's health.</li> <li>2. Odour and pests from the rubbish piles waiting for clearance/disposal.</li> <li>3. Immediate danger of heavy vehicles directly passing the nursery entrance - there is approximately 80 car movements daily transporting young children to and from the Nursery. Consequently would parents feel they could send their young and vulnerable children to a Nursery School with such possible health hazards and danger on the doorstep. This could be closure of a very popular, thriving and unique to the local community - farm based Nursery School. I do you will consider my comments and look forward to hearing your reply, </li></ol>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP390		<p>Thank you for informing me of the proposal of the waste management site in Uddens Woodlands - South Cannon hill Plantation. I would like you to take my points into account from this consultation. I strongly disagree. I have been farming at Stapehill Farm and my father before me. Over many years I have seen the increasing residential development which has left my farm and the woods as a rural oasis in this area of search - a well valued recreational resource for the ever increasing local community. During this time I lost land and many acres of woodland were lost due to the Ferndown Bypass. My reasons are of disagreement: - 1. Stapehill farm has a common field boundary with the proposed waste plant site - it is so close to the site what will the detrimental effect on my farm land be? 2. Fumes, noise and light 24/7. 3. Farm animals could be effected grazing on contaminated grass from the neighbouring proposed waste development. Would the waste plant also cause me a rat problem? 4. Traffic on Uddens Drive will be intolerable - will it be a hazard as I take Farm Vehicles in and out of my entrance. 5. I am very concerned of the health hazards to my family. 6. Considerable devaluation of my property. I do hope you take my points into serious consideration,</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP393	Disagree	<p>I am writing to disagree with the above proposal to put a waste plant and incinerator on the woodlands south of Canon hill Plantation "Uddens Woods. The reasons for the disagreement which I hope the planning officers consider are: - The Uddens/ferndown site is Green Belt Land. It is a popular recreational amenity for local residents using the Castle Main Trailway for cycling, horse riding and dog walking. It is the entrance to the Canon hill Plantation. The footpaths have been used for over 50 years. The woods are a haven to wildlife "nesting birds, deer, badgers, foxes and the protected species of smooth snakes. With the ever increasing surrounding suburbs it is really important the wildlife have an area of safety. What other towns have this on the doorstep. I work at The Barn Nursery which is based at Stapehill Farm and is adjacent to the site. The Barn Nursery is a rural nursery with a strong outdoor ethos. The Nursery school children are aged 2 " 5 years we use the potential site as part of the children's learning " in a forest school club. Uddens woods is just the right distance for the children to walk. These visits to the woods provide such a range of learning and discovery "a wonderful outdoor classroom. Not only do we use the woods but the meadows on the farm adjacent to the site. We would welcome any planners and councillors to come and visit our nursery and see for themselves first-hand the learning our nursery children achieve. I also use the woods for recreation walking my dog and baby in a pushchair daily. It is a short walk from where I live in Coppice Avenue, in Ferndown "the woods have good pushchair access and natural shade unlike Ferndown Common and St. Georges Park. The further congestion this would bring, as a resident of Ferndown working in Uddens. I already spend much time in traffic jams along Wimborne Road West. Secondly, at the moment beyond Uddens Trading Estate, Uddens is a quiet cul-de-sac. The Nursery School entrance is up a quiet lane next to Uddens woods, will the amount of lorries to the waste site cause a hazard to the parents bringing their children to Nursery. The incinerator " this is perhaps the biggest concern and why this site would be unsuitable " how safe is the incinerator to be placed next to a children's Nursery school, grazing farm animals and many residential homes in Uddens, Stapehill, Colehill and Ferndown. I hope this brings some important issues why this site should not be used for a waste plant and incinerator. It is a beautiful place which is green belt for a reason to protect it from the already built up surrounding area. We have already lost woods for the Ferndown Bypass. Please do not take any more for this proposed site. Thank you for taking the time to read my letter in this consultation,</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP398	Disagree	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed incinerator. This was previously debated at great expense to the tax payers some years ago, and then a traveller's site was proposed for this area. I would like to ask why can any attractive green area not just exist, for the enjoyment and pleasure of the local community and the benefit of nature - why does it have to be on some plan, often brought up again after years have passed? Yes, waste is a big issue and we do need to plan, but we do already have 3 waste areas, Hurn, Longham and Brook Road in Wimborne. Surely it is possible to extend one of these to increase capacity, rather than build one on green belt land. Previously we were advised that the site would have lorries accessing it, approximately 200 per day, which would be 400 extra trips in or out of the area. The capacity would be such that the waste from Dorset alone would not meet its capacity, and it would be possible to generate revenue by also processing waste from outside the county. Do we have the road infrastructure to do this? I would strongly suggest we do not, as any Friday after midday the roads in Ferndown can be a solid mass of traffic, adding significantly more housing (at the Staplehill Abbey site and other sites) and the increase in the number of large lorries can only add to this existing problem. Given that it is so close to natural areas, residential areas and Hampreston First School I think this proposal is highly unsuitable from an environmental perspective, it's unknown what the long term health implications of such an incinerator could be. Previously it was mentioned that this technology is new, and not enough data has been gathered about it to know if this is the best option for this site. I recall a party of councillors travelled to Germany to visit similar installations and there was a court case involving residents and the council. Surely enough public money has been spent on those past proceedings, it seems farcical to be embarking on the same road again. The woodland has recently been enhanced as a community resource with picnic benches and a lot of clearing has been done, there is the Castleman Trail Way, a cycle trail, lots of people walk dogs and ride horses or simply walk and enjoy the wildlife. Such green oases are few and far between in our ever more developed environment. We should look to protect these areas and enhance them. I urge you to look again at this plan and to check the suitability of other sites or different options within Dorset. Ferndown, Wimborne, Staplehill and Hampreston deserve better.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP402	Disagree	<p>I am writing concerning the proposed waste plant at Uddens Woodlands. I walk in Cannon Hill plantation every day and it is beautiful you see the changing of the seasons, there is a lot of wildlife and research has shown that walking in woods has mental health benefits. All these things will change if a waste plant is on our doorstep. It could bring animal pests and spread disease to the wildlife. The air will be polluted from the 40m proposed chimney and increase congestion on already busy roads. The Canford Bottom roundabout at busy times is a nightmare and you want to put more Lorraine's into the mix. Why does Brook Road need to be closed and why are we taking waste from Poole and Bournemouth? I don't want a waste plant on my doorstep!</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP405	Disagree	As a member of the friends of uddens woods, I was recently helping out on a work party event. This was a number of days before we received news of the waste plant proposals. Throughout the whole day we all commented on the number and range of people using the beautiful space that we were all working on. Walker's bike rider's picnickers with children running around and helping us, searching for the bat boxes that we installed years ago .children a few years older searching out for the one that has their name on it. Horse riders marvelling at the improvement we have made to their bridle ways. A true community space .Since we heard the news every evening we take our walk we look around and cannot imagine the space being taken from our community and being replaced by business and traffic. Working together on these woods has been an absolute joy and brought people together. The woods provide both physical and mental health for swathes of the Cole hill and Ferndown communities and this should not be compromised. The damage to the wildlife of the area doesn't bear thinking about and the increased traffic which is already at breaking point makes this option really untenable. Any backlog of traffic will immediately impact canford bottom causing more frustration for locals and holidaymakers alike. I would like to state clearly that I object to this proposal because it will utterly spoil the fragile environment ant mental wellbeing of all who use the area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP408	Disagree	I would like to object to the proposed site at Cannon hill ref WP01. As a resident I am extremely concerned with regard to this wholesale industrialisation of my neighbourhood. As far as I can tell if this goes ahead there will be a huge increase in traffic and what is currently an outstanding and historical greenspace enjoyed by a whole community will become a concrete hell. It has taken me so long to object because I cannot really believe that anyone would honestly consider doing this to a recreational area that is so well used and needed by the wider community. But it seems this is the case and yet again I need to take the time to protect our precious woodland. An area that the whole community has invested time energy and passion in preserving, through our membership of the friends of uddens woods. I object on the grounds of traffic pollution. Noise pollution. Contamination of a former green belt site and on behalf of the wildlife and humans that need this space.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP411	Disagree	Destruction of woodland and recreational facilities. Eyesore Traffic already heavy on A31 Unsuitable exit Uddens Drive and Wimborne Rd west for increased vehicles "heavy and cars Impact on residential properties	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP414	Disagree	We were very sorry and alarmed to hear of the proposal of closing Brook Rd and concerned about the now proposed site from Blunts Farm to Cannon Hill South to establish several ideas. Cannon Hill South us an all-weather walking area, ride likes, walk dogs and horses etc I understand there are almost 6000 new homes planned and so more recreational p[laces are needed not less.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP417	Disagree	Uddens Woodllands " Cannon Hill South Please register my objection to plans at the above site for Waste vehicle depot HRC Bulky waste transfer & treatment facility Probably to include commercial waste Probably to include an incinerator Probably to include import of waste from all over Dorset and beyond My main objections are Destruction of green belt woodland Destruction of amazing biodiversity Destruction of wildlife Environmental pollution Emissions, smells and contamination Health and safety hazard Traffic and congestion " on al already overloaded A31 " especially the Canford Bottom Roundabout I objected to the earlier plans at almost adjacent Blunts Farm the latest proposal is even closer to my property. The Blunts Farm site was turned down "I quote from Community Magazine 5 May 2006 Controversial new waste treatment facilities are not to be built in Ferndown. A government inspector has rejected a proposal at Blunts Farm on the edge of town because of its possible impact on green belt land It is not 2016 " nothing has changed This site is too close to people's homes in Ferndown, Stapehill and Colehill	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP421	Disagree	Until recently I lived in Cannon Hill Gardens. While I was living there, there were various planning proposals put forward -mobile phone masts, a camp for travellers and gravel extraction. And now it is suggested that it would be a suitable site for waste handling. This is green belt woodland used by an awful lot of people, walkers, dog walkers, horse riders, mountain bikers, on a daily basis. It is also home to a wide variety of flora and fauna. On what planet can this area be considered suitable for this kind of development? It is so unfair on local residents who have had years of worry over previous plans. This proposal would be life changing for so many people. There must be a better place. Also, this plan completely ignores the disaster that is the relevant stretch of the A31. I have driven from St. Ives to Wimborne this morning. It took very nearly 40 minutes!! Thanks to the sheer weight of traffic and the very slow clearing roundabout at Canford Bottom. To deliberately force more traffic on to this road would be madness and of course a lot of traffic would start using the lanes through Uddens. It seems to me that local planners will not be happy until a pretty town like Wimborne is completely spoiled. Congratulations. It won't be long!!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP434	Disagree	I wish to make comments regarding a waste disposal plant being installed so close to a built up area which contains a large population of elderly people in bungalows which lie west of the proposed site. We will suffer air pollution affecting our health. Also unable to have windows open during warm weather. Being a driver of a vehicle the congestion on our local roads from lorries in both directions bringing in waste and extra cars from Brook rd. site being closed. The value of our property will drop and finding buyers will become difficult when they find out about the proposals. I moved from Winchester in 2006 and at that time an incinerator in Chandlers Ford near Southampton was closed down because of air pollution so to build another one to cause air problems to people's health.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP466	Disagree	I strongly object to the new waste and recycling plant being sited at land near Blunts farm Ref WP01. It would impact on important woodland and be a loss for future generations, I use the trails through this area regularly.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP482	Disagree	I object to this proposed siting of a Bulky Waste facility at WP01 Ferndown" area of search, the road network is at full stretch currently, the loss of green belt land, the closeness of current properties, whose value will fall, the high risk noise, smells, flies, health problems to residents nearby or down wind of the facility at any given time.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP483	Disagree	<p>I disagree to the use of this section of land WP01 being used for this purpose for many reasons. Increased traffic on busy built up and often congested highway system, causing more risk to other road users and pedestrians, riders and cyclists alike. This would be in the thousands of public vehicles per week, plus the impact of the plant staff traffic and additional HGVs to the area. The chimney that is proposed for the plant would with the wind in any direction cause discomfort to the surrounding area, through both deposits, and odours. This area would affect schools, businesses, recreational ground, wildlife, plant life, residents and visitors to the area. Noise that would be created would have a massive impact in many ways, to any neighbouring businesses, residents and wildlife. This area is usually a very tranquil and relaxing space. The castleman trailway would no doubt be affected, passes through this area which is a very popular route for commuting and for pleasure in many different modes of travel. This trailway has had many thousands of tax payers money invested in opening the route and keeping it open for all, and giving a right to roam, and relax. The schools that use this woodland locally would also be affected, possibly affecting the early years of young people's lives, these years have been proven to be so very important to the development in later life. There is a nursery school within a 5 min walk. The wildlife in the area is really being focused on, various local wildlife groups are active in this area. This is such a valuable area to our wildlife that has an ever decreasing green area to inhabit. Green space for all and the freedom to roam is of great concern, myself and my young family use this woodland to relax, unwind, and as a meeting place for friends and relatives, it saves us and many people that I know, and witness on a daily basis using their motor vehicles, and reducing the carbon footprint as they have local forest and usable green area to use on their door steps. We often see people of all ages and ability, on horseback, bikes, wheelchairs, (and crutches). People in their lunch breaks from the local industrial units use it to relax and unwind at lunch, and also as a carriage way to the workplace. This is a truly valuable section of rural England, and it used by 1000s, and needs to be kept for that purpose.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Chestnut Grove Residents Association	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP487	Comment	<p>The residents of Chestnut Grove are unanimously against the use of the Area of Forestry Commission Land South West of Blunts Farm (within the Green Belt) for any part of the Waste Plan. To say that we viewed the proposal with disbelief is an understatement, particularly following findings of the government inspector some years ago on a similar proposal, who agreed with local residents that this was not a suitable site for such an operation. In more recent times we had the plans for a Gypsy &amp; Traveller Transit Site in the same location. This resulted in a 6,000 name petition being submitted. When will the council accept that this woodland is a community asset of great importance? It is regularly used by dog walkers, ramblers, cyclists, horse riders who would otherwise be forced towards the sensitive Lowland Heathland sites of Holt Heath, Ferndown Common and Slop Bog. It is a key mitigation site. Our residents have close links to the Friends of Uddens &amp; Cannon Hill Woodlands who have spent many voluntary hours working in conjunction with the Forestry Commission and Dorset Countryside Ranger Service to improve this woodland for the benefit of the local community, users of the Castleman Trailway and woodland wildlife. Picnic benches, perch benches, all weather paths, noticeboards, area maps and interpretation boards, bird &amp; bat boxes are part of efforts that have gone in to making the woods the welcoming and accessible area they are for children, the elderly and infirm alike. We are not a NIMBY group and accept that the Blunts Farm site will eventually be developed, ideally though as an extension of the Industrial Estate creating much needed growth and employment opportunities. We understand access would be from the more appropriate Nimrod Way. The destruction of the triangle of woodland (South West of Blunts Farm) known as Uddens Woodland or Cannon Hill South, for any form of development would be totally unacceptable to us.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP509	Disagree	Ferndown Area of Search - disagree most emphatically - traffic, pollution, loss of amenities.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP520	Disagree	I disagree for the following reasons Noise Pollution Traffic Wildlife Loss of green space for our children	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP521	Disagree	This proposal is horrendous!! We have lived close to Cannon Hill woods for the last 15 years, and twice daily take the dogs through the woods. They are a very special place, with beautiful views and wildlife.....through the years we have seen deer, foxes and once a badger! Our children have enjoyed playing in the woods and once a month the whole family go for a cycle ride. To change this environment to a waste facility would be heart breaking for all local residents!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP529	Disagree	I am shocked to hear that the area near Blunts Farm (Ref: WP01) is being considered for a new waste and recycling plant. It has an impact on the designated Green Belt and is way too close to residential areas (with many OAPs and young families). The woodland is a popular choice (for both local and others) for walking, outdoor activities, cycling, etc. Furthermore, A31 is a key route to West Dorset, Devon and Cornwall and it (and the local roads) is already heavily loaded during normal days, and very bad during weekends and holiday seasons.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP537	Disagree	I have lived here for 20 years and i do not want it to deteriorate into an industrial estate polluted by waste incinerators and excessive transport. We must protect our green belt and those who live in it.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP542	Disagree	These are my objections to this proposal: NO on transport re: A31 + Canford Bottom Roundabout + Old Thatch junction NO on transport re: adding to delays + extra traffic volume + too many large lorries on Canford Bottom Roundabout + private cars with trailers at Canford Bottom Roundabout NO on pollution re: emissions + smell + vermin NO on amenity re: loss of green belt + impact on leisure facilities NO on location re: site is not central for a strategic facility NO on environmental impact re: too much housing too close + schools + businesses + other workplaces nearby This site is totally unsuitable and should be withdrawn.	Your comments are noted. However, the strategy for the future management of waste in Dorset relies upon the development of new facilities for the generation of waste and a move away from landfill in the early part of the Plan period.

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP548	Disagree	<p>Re. - WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment and WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Bulky Waste Management Specifically - Traffic congestion " i.e. in an area that is already heavily congested with private, commercial and holiday traffic the proposals will significantly increase traffic volumes. Apart from the general congestion there will be impacts on air pollution, noise, accident levels and the general resultant deterioration of the quality of life and quiet enjoyment of the area by its residents. It should also be considered that there are already several residential developments in progress in the area (and more are planned!) and consequently there will be a significant increase in the local population with associated vehicles which will compound the current congestion issues. Impact on Roads " the roads in this area are far from well-maintained with potholes and crumbling verges etc " the increase in traffic volume and notably heavy commercial lorries carry waste to and from the site will result in ever faster breakdown of the road surface and its general integrity. Impact on the environment and proximity to housing and schools " the effects of the proposals which incorporate Bulk Waste Management and Residual Waste Treatment will be smell, discharges into the atmosphere (via chimney), seepage into ground and water table, litter pollution, vermin (rodents and foxes), seagulls and other scavenger birds (i.e. noise and guano) plus dust and noise. Do you know what carcinogens and toxins will be produced and which groups will be put at risk? Loss of green belt "enjoyed by ramblers, walkers, dog walkers, wildlife including rare species e.g. Sand Lizard, Adders, bats and an abundance of native flora! Line of Sight "the proposed chimney at between 70 and 100 mts will be visible for many miles and will be a blight on the horizon for many people. Impact on Property Values "clearly those properties close to and on route to these proposed sites will be devalued because of the mess, smell, noise, congestion etc. Quiet enjoyment of the surrounding areas - Residents in the immediate and surrounding areas will suffer diminution in the overall quality of their environment and loss of the quiet enjoyment that is currently being experienced. Additionally, vulnerable groups such as infants, pregnant women, aged residents, those with respiratory conditions etc will be at increased risk because of the general pollution that will result from these proposals</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Natural England	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP620	Comment	<p>WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment/ Bulky Waste Treatment/ Household Recycling Centre &amp; Depot The identified area of search raises a number of concerns, there are existing high levels of public access in parts of the site which would be displaced by any proposal, potentially onto nearby protected heathlands. An assessment under the Habitats Regulations may be required. In addition there are known to be records for both species of rare reptiles and likely also to be bats in the woodland as well as SPA birds such as nightjar. An assessment would need to be carried out unless a narrower AOS was defined with much reduced impacts. To the north is a county wildlife site and adjacent SSSI and specially protected site, these should be excluded from the AOS.</p>	Your helpful comments are noted and will be considered further when developing the preferred site. As suggested the SSSI will be removed from the Area of Search if this site is to be retained in the final Plan.

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP727	Disagree	There is great unhappiness in East Dorset at the proposal for a Household Recycling Centre with bulky waste and treatment facility on the Uddens and Cannon Hill woodlands. There appear to be no special circumstances to warrant the release of this Green Belt site just off the A31 and several of our Members have asked me to draw your attention to their strongly held feelings about this matter. The site has been used for many, many years by walkers, cyclists, horse riders, dog walkers and others all the year round. It is also used by a local nursery school as an outside activity area. Access to the proposed HRC either from the A31 or from Uddens Drive would be difficult and add to the already severe traffic congestion in this area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP716	Disagree	I read with disbelief about the proposal to locate a household recycling centre, a bulky waste transfer and waste treatment facility with a 40metre chimney blowing carcinogenic material over the area, on land comprising Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands, Dorset. This unspoilt area of green belt Woodland and open area is enjoyed for quiet recreation by many people of all ages. In addition, it provides home and shelter to many species of wildlife. Access could only be off the A31 Ferndown bypass or the Wimborne Road West both busy routes. The volume and type of traffic this proposal would generate would make these roads even more difficult for residents and through traffic. Bearing in mind the proximity of this proposed site to residents, Ferndown and Uddens Industrial estates and the Canford bottom roundabout, I believe this proposal must not become a reality.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP697	Disagree	The north-east part of this proposed site includes the whole of SU00/060 Ferndown Bypass Site of Nature Conservation Interest. This site comprises dry and wet heathland/acid grassland mosaic habitat running between the bypass and the dismantled railway line. This habitat is fragile and vulnerable, and the site forms an important link to the nearby Slop Bog and Uddens Heath SSSI. Dorset Wildlife Trust wants to see the whole of the SNCI removed from the proposed site, and with a buffer to ensure no adverse effects on the SNCI from future waste transfer/treatment facilities on the site. It would be preferable if the whole of the triangle of land between the old railway line and the bypass from the southern boundary of the SNCI north-eastwards were removed from the proposed site. If opportunities arise during the term of the plan for a waste facility within the existing Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estate, DWT would welcome this, and regard it as much preferable to development of the land to the south-west within the area of search, at Cannon Hill Plantation, which is Green Belt land containing mixed plantation woodland, and therefore clearly of considerably higher wildlife value. Additionally the displacement of the considerable amount of informal recreation which is practiced on the land to the SW of Blunts Farm would have the potential to impact upon the nearby internationally designated heathlands sites.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised Further thought will be given to removing the SNCI from the Area of Search and the provision of an appropriate buffer.

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP681	Disagree	<p>I have a number of concerns regarding the plan and the effect it will have on the areas adjacent to the proposed site. Road congestion, with regular; traffic jams' is already a serious problem in Wimborne Road East/West and Ferndown bypass both leading up to the Canford Bottom roundabout. The access requirements to the new site by many thousands of extra vehicle journeys each year can only exacerbate the congestion problem. This could reach unmanageable levels if the Brook Road site is closed. I understand this could mean an extra 100,000 car trips from Wimborne across the roundabout the new proposed sites. National road networking authorities spent millions of pounds on the Canford Bottom roundabout. This project was paid for to improve the flow of the heavy traffic load through Ferndown to the west country especially at holiday times. This national project was to benefit the local area as well as the national as a whole. It seems perverse that a localised plan to massively increase traffic volumes at this roundabout should frustrate this national planning. To avoid the roundabout, a large proportion of the traffic from Bournemouth, Poole and Christchurch could use Stapehill Road as a short cut through to Uddens Drive. This road is very narrow and currently has a vehicle weight restriction imposed on it. However, a substantial increase in car traffic on this road would be dangerous. This would not only apply to the residents but the many visitors to national tourist attraction at Knoll Gardens. Traffic trying to cross Wimborne Road West to Uddens Drive would cause much congestion as well as increasing the possibility of car accidents considerably. A new set of traffic lights could of course make it safer. However this would increase traffic congestion considerably in Wimborne Road West. There would now be two sets of traffic lights within 100metres of each other. The East Dorset area has the largest population of people aged over 65 in the country. The higher health problems and service requirements of this elderly population already places a great burden on local services and the NHS. Extra traffic can only worsen the level of bad air pollution in the area. This must adversely affect the fragile health of this older population many of whom have respiratory problems Not only will this cause distress to local residents but put an intolerable extra burden on the already overstretched local services. In Wimborne Road East, we have one of the larger school sites in Ferndown. During the 40+ week academic year, both early morning and mid-afternoon there is a steady flow of young people walking beside and crossing the road. Whether the road crossing is controlled or made recklessly, the danger of accidents offered by extra traffic movement is apparent and well documented. I understand a number of young people suffer from asthma and related health problems which will be detrimentally affected by increased air pollution. Within the proposal are plans to build an incinerator with accompanying 40 metre chimney. The prevailing wind in the area is west, right across the heavily populated areas of Ferndown. Smell and pollution are a known feature of these incinerator sites. The operation can only be viable if it operates 24 hours/7 days a week. Apart from the smell and pollution created by such an operation, the noise pollution across a heavy populated area like Ferndown for 24 hrs a day would be totally unacceptable for community living. The prevailing wind would further accentuate these problems to the Ferndown population further increasing health and social problems in the area. The population will not be able to negate these negative problems by recreational activity. One of the major recreational areas south of the A31 will be swallowed up to accommodate the proposed plan. Residents will thus not only lose access to the Cannon Hill and Uddens site but the safe access to wider recreational areas reached by use of this site. No absolute guarantee can be given with regard to the control of vermin. It is stated that the waste will be kept within buildings and the walls would act as a barrier and deterrent to vermin movement. Householders for many centuries have tried to stop vermin entering and leaving their homes at will. It is highly unlikely that the proprietors of the waste site will be any more successful. Surrounding the industrial estate is green belt land and this could act as a breeding site for the vermin. How far the vermin will travel after they mature is very much a matter for conjecture. I trust the points raised by myself and others will make the waste planning team consider that the environmental and health impact of their waste plans in the proposed WP01 area are too great to consider as a viable option.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP725	Disagree	<p>We live within the proposed affected area of the new treatment plant at Uddens Wood. We live on an unmade road with no speed limit that links Wimborne Road West and Stapehill Road as we are close to the junction to the industrial estate our road is regularly used as a cut through. All the residents in the road object to this situation and are very concerned that the added pressure on the roads adjacent to the industrial estate will just increase the pressure on the roads in the area and therefor adding to the pressure on the residents in Award Road. As things stand at the moment, the pressure on the road system between 7.30am and 9.15am and 4.30 and 6.30pm means all the road system is completely blocked. By adding this recycle plant to the area it will mean that there will be no break from the traffic jams for the whole day and increased pressure at busy times. The residents maintain this road and we cannot control the amount of traffic and the speed they drive, there are families with children and elderly residents that live in the road which will make it increasingly unsafe to walk and drive in the road.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP610	Disagree	<p>DCC have ignored infrastructure development in East Dorset's biggest town for too long. No more development without highways improvements.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Individual</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WP592</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Disagree</p> <p>The proposed use of this site is entirely without merit. 1. Inadequate transport links The A31 is notorious throughout Hampshire and East Dorset for congestion and accidents. Especially at commuter time and during the holiday season, the A31 barely copes with the weight of traffic on it and long queues can build up, especially between the David Phipps roundabout and the Canford Bottom Roundabout (CBR) “exactly where this sites extra traffic would be concentrated. I notice, looking at Dorset County Councils twitter feed today (for the first time), that there are constant tweets about accidents and delays on the A31. So DCC should be aware that the A31 makes this proposal unworkable. The CBR has long been a bottleneck. Improvements were made in 2012 with the installation of some 70 sets of traffic lights to support the redevelopment of the CBR into a hamburger junction with the A31 through the middle and local roads circulating the outside. In spite of this, long queues still build up particularly on the A31, on the carriageway of Ham Lane from Longham to the CBR and on the carriageway of Wimborne Road West from Ferndown towards the CBR where I have observed long queues stretching back past Uddens Drive even in times of otherwise light traffic, when the opposite carriageway moves freely “and this happens at unpredictable times, not just during the rush hour. This situation will not improve. In 2012 I asked the Highways Agency if they would return after completion of the CBR junction; test queue lengths against the shorter projected ones they had modelled and published; and tweak the junction to make sure queue lengths actually matched the projections. The answer was, No. Residents from Wimborne and Colehill (including the planned, large housing developments) would be driving round the CBR in huge numbers to get to a HRC and then trying to get out of Uddens Drive, turning right towards the CBR to get home. This would be an almost impossible task, whether traffic is moving or stationary on Wimborne Road West. An added problem is Stapehill Road, which joins Wimborne Road West virtually opposite Uddens Drive: the combination of the three roads is already recognised as a danger point, and adding in so many extra vehicles would be unwise. Anyone who lives and travels in this area knows that the road network here is at breaking point. Nobody who understood this would propose the development at Uddens. It must go elsewhere. 2. Proximity to housing, workplaces, nurseries, etc It cannot be right to put tips and incinerators so close to settlements. The associated unpleasantness and health risks (smells, noise, vermin, airborne pollution, possible toxins, etc, as well as spoiling the landscape) mean that any such facilities should be sited where the fewest people will be affected by them. The site at Uddens is surrounded by Colehill, Wimborne, Ferndown and Longham, as well as smaller settlements such as Stapehill and Hampreston. As well as a lot of housing, there is an industrial estate, schools, pubs, farms, garden centres, etc near the site. In a rural county like Dorset, there must be places where few if any people will be affected by the health risks associated with waste disposal: waste facilities should be sited there. 3. Destruction of a community amenity The site at Uddens Woods (referred to in this document as land SW of Blunts Farm) is not some random, disused area ripe for development. It’s a mature forest, part of the Cannon Hill and Uddens Plantation, the two parts of which are linked by a bridge over the A31. It’s been a recognised community resource for more than 30 years, used by thousands of people for activities as diverse as dog walking, rambling, cycling, horse riding, photography, painting, birdwatching and simply for the enjoyment of being in the countryside. The local community support the forest by joining regular work parties organised by the Friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands, in conjunction with the Forestry Commission, to improve the plantation for residents use. There’s a trailway through it. For many people, the forest is the reason we chose to live here. It’s the only amenity we have; we need this amenity, and there is no reason to put waste facilities here when they could just as easily go elsewhere. In planning terms, if this is taken away, people will have to get in their cars to find other open spaces to use, which will also increase pressure on those spaces. 4. Use of green belt land The forest at Uddens forms part of the Green Belt and therefore should not be touched. The argument for using Uddens Woods is very peculiar. It seems to go: We wanted to put the waste facility on Blunts Farm, but that was green belt, so it was disallowed; now Blunts Farm is no longer green belt, so we want to put it there, but the owner said no, so we want to put it in Uddens Woods. BUT UDDENS WOODS ARE GREEN BELT, TOO! This makes no sense whatsoever. It’s my understanding that if green belt land like this is taken away from a community, the community must be given similar land of equal or greater value as an amenity. Where are you going to find the same area of mature forest rich in biodiversity, right on our doorstep, to give to our community? You can’t. This proposal must be disallowed. 5. Destruction of a forest rich in biodiversity The plantation supports an amazing array of wildlife, including protected species such as bats. The fauna in this area include deer, squirrel, bat, mouse, vole, shrew, grass snake, slow worm, frog, toad and many different types of birds, dragonflies, butterflies, moths and beetles. Walking in the woods, one sees an amazing number of different fungi. It would be criminal to destroy this habitat and kill off all of this wildlife. Let’s not have any box-ticking nonsense about reptile surveys and the like. It would simply be wholesale destruction,</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
---	---	--	--	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
				<p>and it must not go ahead. 6. Local residents not informed of these proposals I only learned of the proposals and the consultation from an article in a local community magazine. There was no personal notification from Dorset County Council, even though I live next to Cannon Hill plantation and a couple of minutes away from the CBR. On seeing the article, I looked at the News page of the council’s website and only found articles about Weymouth and two items exhorting people to cycle and to walk in the woods with their children “both activities which many people here love to do in Uddens and Cannon Hill Woods. To me this was the height of hypocrisy. I’ve seen no posters, leaflets, notices on lampposts, meetings or roadshows about this. DCCs news-sheet Your Dorset arrived last week and I can’t find anything in that. The only publicity I’ve found is multiple tweets about commenting on the Waste Plan- and that’s because today I was trying to find anything DCC had said about it, for the purposes of this comment. I feel the council has failed in its duty and acted unfairly towards residents. 7. Previous proposal disallowed A similar proposal was disallowed in 2006. This document makes no mention of the history of this proposal, and there is no acknowledgement of the strong local opposition to the previous proposal. 8. Proposal is contrary to government guidelines Considering Uddens Woods, this proposal is contrary to many sections of the governments National Planning Policy Framework, including #69 Planning policies and decisions; should aim to achieve places which promote opportunities for meetings between members of the community who might not otherwise come into contact with each other; safe and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas. #70 To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community’s ability to meet its day-to-day needs #73 Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. #74 Existing open space should not be built on; #75 Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. #80 Green Belt serves five purposes: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; — to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; — to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; — to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and — to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. #81 Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. #83 Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. Please summarise as: Transport links in this area already at breaking point and will not be improved. Residents and workers health and enjoyment of homes/workplaces would be adversely affected by smell, noise, pollution “facilities should be sited away from centres of population. Proposal would mean the destruction of a green belt forest rich in biodiversity which has been a much-used, well-loved community amenity for 30+ years. Local residents not adequately informed of these proposals. Previous proposal disallowed amid strong local opposition. Proposal is contrary to government guidelines on community resources and the green belt.</p>	

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WVP594	Disagree	<p>Thank you for your letter advising us of the details of the proposed Waste Plan. I wish to register my objection to the proposal of a Waste Centre at Ferndown Industrial Estate/Uddens Woodland. I was surprised at this proposal, as such a similar plan has been rejected previously and the salient points of that are still valid. The destruction of greenbelt was not considered appropriate previously, and National Planning Policy Framework supports its retention. The environmental impact of this proposal would be devastating; the pollution from incinerating waste risks the health of local people, of which there are many as the site sits alongside and between many residential properties, The Barn nursery, and within approximately one mile range of Hampreston and Ferndown Schools. In addition to gambling on the impact of toxins and potential carcinogenics being discharged into a residential area using unproven technology, there are obvious quality of life issues- the inevitable smell, noise and dust created by this scheme. The destruction of Uddens Woodland would be a shameful waste of an irreplaceable local resource, a valuable habitat and a much loved area for recreation which will be even more important in the future when more housing stock is added to the area as planned. Ferndown Industrial Estate/Uddens seems here to be recommended as a good site for its transport links. Whilst this may have been the case in the past, it is clear that the vast overdevelopment of the industrial estate and the unsuccessful alterations to the Canford Bottom roundabout have left the area of Stapehill and the A31 in a regular state of congestion. This proposal invites significant traffic from the general public, in addition to large waste vehicles, whilst not having the infrastructure to support it. The Industrial Estate should be reserved for employment land, for which it was designed, which we have been led to believe is a priority, hence the recent destruction of habitat for a protected lizard species to create the Cobham Gate development. Drainage in this locality is a problem and would be likely to create a particular issue at the Uddens site. Residents of this area will continue to resist projects which are detrimental to the life of the families and elderly people who live here. I strongly urge you to think about the future wellbeing of our children and our community, and reconsider the inclusion of Ferndown Industrial Estate/Uddens in the Waste Plan.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WVP596	Disagree	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposal for the following reasons: The pollution and environmental impact of a waste centre and incinerator would be damaging to the large local community, in which this site is nestled, as well as in the wider locality, affecting homes, schools and pre-schools. Toxic fumes and potentially harmful carcinogenic pollutants generated by an incinerator would devastate the local area, as well as the dust, smell and noise it would create. The destruction of habitat, greenbelt and valued local amenity woodland at Uddens Woodland would be an unforgivable loss to our community. Additional traffic on an already strained road system would add unnecessary pressure on the local network. Drainage at Uddens Woodland would be problematic for development. I feel the Uddens/Ferndown area proposed is inappropriate for this type of scheme, and would cause significant harm to this residential family area. I urge the council to reject this site for the Waste Plan.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP567	Disagree	This is green belt land and should be protected as such. The area is used by many people for recreation and is an asset Traffic is bad already in this area	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP584	Disagree	I object to the proposal for reasons including: 1. Generally the site location is unsuitable, being near to housing and nature facilities, while the resulting increase in traffic density is unacceptable given the existing congestion in the Ferndown area. There are more suitable remote sites in Dorset. 2. The inevitable pollution and nuisance. 3. The increase in traffic congestion. 4. The loss of existing countryside and damage to adjoining countryside.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP738		As a Ferndown Town councillor, I'd like to strongly object to the proposed site at Blunt's Farm. Many local residents have expressed concerns about noise, pollution, smells and traffic. Local roads will not be able to support the increased traffic levels. There are also concerns about the implications for public health on building an incinerator in a populated area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP585	Disagree	Traffic congestion issues Destruction of woodlands and natural habitat The woods are used by lots of dog walkers and families for recreation. It will cause pollution to affect many local households. Object most strongly to this proposal going ahead.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP595	Disagree	There is already too much traffic in this area, the tailbacks from the Canford Bottom roundabout are ridiculous. The A31 is also overcrowded with gridlock on both the A31 and Wimborne Road happening regularly. There were similar plans for a Waste Plant back in 2005 (?) and the traffic has increased dramatically since then with the expansion of the Ferndown Industrial Estate - which is still growing. The area around the site is green belt used by many people for leisure and should be left as such.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP605	Disagree	<p>I completely disagree with your proposals for a waste plan for this area. In Section 5 WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' you have said that "The Ferndown area is well located for a strategic site to serve the needs of Bournemouth Dorset and Poole ..." Following on you have said "Key Development Considerations - TBC" why is nothing further written here?? - Further information is therefore required. Ferndown is not "well located". It is not in central Dorset, but is within East of the County, so how can it be acceptable to bring in traffic from North/West Dorset? The extra time lost in transporting waste to Ferndown from North Dorset is so short sited and the additional traffic costs/fumes surely should be considered. From your map in point 4.4 I note all the Strategic Waste Facilities (Blue) are all to the East of the County - why??? I disagree with all aspects of the WPO1 proposals - Bulky Waste transfer/treatment, Residual Waste Treatment, HRC and Waste Vehicle Depot. There are several reasons I disagree with the waste proposals: - a) Traffic/Roads With an already choked road network, more so in the summer months, which has exasperated by the Canford Bottom "roundabout" which has caused such problems instead of easing/helping the local traffic as many HGV's and lorries avoid using the bypass and come through Ferndown, which cannot cope much longer with this. The access proposed through Uddens would not ease this situation and why would you not propose the access via the A31 - because it is ill planned. b) Forest/Heathland and many habitats and recreation area Local development is not permitted within specific distances of SSI's so how can a waste plant be acceptable?? Why would you even consider green belt when other areas could be looked at. It is so important to keep these areas safe from industrial development, when so many people use Cannon Hill Woodlands. There are many nesting birds and reptiles that have habitats in this area. c) Employment within Ferndown Industrial Estate. You say "the WPA has been made aware that as Blunts Farm is developed business currently located at Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates may choose to re-locate to Blunts Farm, opening up opportunities for the development of a waste facility." The key point is "may choose". Many companies will not relocate and some have other sites in other areas of the Country so will simply close their Ferndown site. The local employment will fall for local residents. How can this be acceptable in such uncertain times?? EDDC and DCC must take into consideration all the views and comments made during this consultation. There should also be a well-advertised public meeting to address some questions not answered.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP613	Disagree	<p>The proposed location of a bulky waste management plant is not appropriate for Blunts Farm and certainly not for the green belt land to the SW of Blunts Farm for the following reasons: Risk to health from air pollution and noise affecting numerous residential areas in the immediate locality due to prevailing winds. Loss of green belt forest which is continuously visited, enjoyed and maintained by a large number of local residents and visitors. The area is habitat for a variety of wildlife including protected species of bats. There is no reasonable access for waste vehicle traffic. The local roads are already overwhelmed with traffic from the industrial estates and passing traffic on the A31, with large queues forming for Canford Bottom roundabout during all peak times. This will be exacerbated by any additional traffic and increase the risk to health of local residents from increased exhaust emissions.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP615	Disagree	I strongly object to the new waste and recycling plant being situated near Blunts farm ref WP01. Not only do I find the proposal a blatant contradiction of government restrictions on the use of green belt land, it would clearly be damaging to local residents use and enjoyment of said land as well as financially limiting the development and prosperity of the local area. Any such plans privately would constitute a public nuisance.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP630	Disagree	We are very disappointed that this proposal is being reconsidered. The site is due west of Ferndown in the direction of the usual prevailing winds. This would bring airborne smells and pollution directly to our homes. This is before we consider the impact on the already hopeless road system. Try to go either down ferndown bypass or Wimborne road west. Or try the Wimborne bypass in either direction! On 90% of occasions you need to allow at least an extra 30 minutes for your trip. Add a waste recycling site to this and it will just be gridlock. Do not proceed with this site as it will overload an already saturated road system.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP655	Disagree	Re: development proposal to build a Dorset wide transfer station and waste incineration facility at Cannon Hill south (preferred site) or south west of Blunts Farm & Uddens plantation. We found out about this proposal only a few days ago, not by being respectfully informed but from reading the letters to the editor page in the Blackmore Vale Magazine. We strongly object to the proposals for the following reasons: 1. Noting that these facilities are intended to serve Dorset as a whole and that income from small traders and leisure facilities are important for local jobs and local taxes, anything that obstructs what is already an inadequate road network cannot be good for Dorset. 2. To consider placing such a large waste incinerator facility so close to such a highly and expanding populated area, with all the risks of combustion effluents, given the regularity of the westerly winds descending on the population, including schools, nurseries and old people's homes, etc, we consider irresponsible, particularly at a time it is nationally recognised we need to support and enhance the health of the younger and older generations. 3. The loss of rare species such as wild orchids and beautiful special woodland which is vital for walkers, dog users, cyclists and horse riders etc to keep healthy, plus the mobility of wild species moving between wooded areas to east and west. 4. When the wind is in a westerly direction, especially in the autumn, we note that the area of special scientific interest called Slop Bog is liable to be contaminated from combustion effluents, without the apparent consideration for the inevitable drop in property values in the area, can local people expect to be compensated financially should this dreadful proposal go ahead. Thank you for taking our comments on board.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP659	Disagree	Regarding the recent proposal to establish a Waste Vehicle Depot, Household Recycling Centre and a bulky waste transfer and treatment facility on the green belt Uddens Woodland area would add serious problems to an area that is mainly residential. Wimborne and its surrounding area are already fast disappearing under bricks and mortar with a huge amount of building in the pipeline. A smelly noisy waste dump of this scale will be one more horror in what was a lovely area to live in. Any woodland is hugely valuable to people and wildlife alike, and therefore should be preserved. The volume of traffic crossing the Canford Bottom roundabout is already causing huge problems with vehicle noise and exhaust fumes. If a waste dump is sited in the same area the infrastructure would be totally overwhelmed by many extra lorries and cars visiting the site daily and gridlock would ensue. As for the fallout fumes from the huge chimney blanketing the area, it does not bear thinking about. Ask yourselves, please, would you honestly want to live in such an area? Please please preserve this woodland and find another site for such a large facility. It is so important to us who live here and absolutely vital to our precious and fast declining wildlife.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP662	Disagree	I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Draft Waste Plan Update which I have recently viewed on the internet but prefer to make my comments by letter. I appreciate the need for a more substantial waste/recycling plant as we producing more products and packaging which require, where at all possible, to be disposed of in a more environmentally friendly manner. I would however ask the question as to why the Uddens Industrial Estate has been 'earmarked' as an alternative to the previously suggested Blunts Farm site. It is my concern that the Uddens site would result in a huge increase in traffic on an already busy road - Wimborne Road West - which I understand the bypass was built to relieve. It does so, to a certain extent, but I am assured that many satellite navigational systems do not consider the bypass as an alternative to driving through Ferndown on either of its two roads. I feel that large vehicles would increase the traffic on Wimborne Road West detrimentally to Ferndown and feel that the previously suggested site, Blunts Farm, some 8 yrs ago, would be far better served by the Ferndown bypass to divert traffic from populated areas. I, in the most strong terms, also object to the proposal's inclusion of an incinerator. It is acknowledged that waste incinerator systems produce a wide variety of pollutants which are detrimental to human health. Incinerators release TOXIC METALS, DIOXINS, AND ACID GASES. Burning plastic is recognisably carcinogenic and it would be highly irresponsible for DCC to proceed with this proposal. Our children and our grandchildren will suffer from the ill effects of an incinerator on or near the environment in which they live and which the council is bound to protect for generations to come.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP665	Disagree	As a resident of Stapehill, I wish to strongly object to your proposal for an industrial incinerator and waste treatment at Uddens Drive. The woodlands are used for recreation for the people of the local area and should be developed for this use not waste disposal. The traffic on Wimborne Road West is often jammed from Canford Bottom roundabout (whoever thought this up?) all the way back to the Old Thatch. There are numerous accidents at this crossroads, a waste lorry nearly killed me last week! So I'm certain increased traffic and lorries are inappropriate. Green Belt building at Stapehill Abbey will impact this traffic flow and strain local resources. I cannot see any benefit in employment for the area. I therefore object.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP668	Disagree	I have viewed the information contained on the website re the above waste plan but prefer to send a written response. I understand and accept the need for a new waste/recycling plant although I would ask why this site has been chosen in place of the Blunts Farm site. The Uddens site would result in a huge increase in traffic on an already busy road, Wimborne Road West, which the bypass was built to relieve. It does so admirably and I do not understand why it is deemed appropriate to increase the traffic on Wimborne Road West when an appropriate site is already identified and which would be served by Ferndown bypass. However, my main objection to this proposal is the inclusion of an incinerator. It is acknowledged that waste incinerator systems produced a wide variety of pollutants which are detrimental to human health. Incinerators release TOXIC METAL, DIOXCINS, AND ACID GASES. Burning plastics is recognisably carcinogenic and it would be highly irresponsible for DCC to proceed with this proposal. Our children and our grandchildren will suffer from the ill effects of an incinerator on or near the environment in which they live and which the council is bound to protect for generations to come.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP672	Disagree	As a retired consultant physician, I read with great concern that the woodland area at Uddens Drive south of the A31 near the old Thatch and accessed by Wimborne Road West, is the present County Council's preferred site for the development of an industrial waste treatment centre. This includes a 70-100m high chimney for the incinerator. I cannot believe the County Council expects to execute this. I oppose most strongly for the following reasons: 1. This land is part of the green belt woodland south of the A31 forming part of the Cannon Hill/Uddens Plantation. Loss of land which currently promotes better health through cycling and walking activities. 2. Biodiversity and plants and animals. 3. The site is very close and adjacent to residential and workplace areas. 4. The prevailing south/south west winds will distribute particulate matter and fumes to these area in (3) and beyond. 5. The passage of additional heavy lorries through residential areas, increasing traffic flow on an already very congested A31, Canford Bottom roundabout, Uddens Drive, and Wimborne Road West. To avoid heavy traffic flow and A31 congestion, lorries would take alternative routes through residential areas with associated increases in noise and pollution. 6. As a physician, I strongly object because of the potential adverse effects on health caused by diesel fumes; particulate emissions from the incinerator, fumes from same and increased traffic noise. All these are known to affect health and are detrimental. This site is completely unsuitable. The Council needs to rethink.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP678	Disagree	<p>Proposed Waste Plan for Ferndown (Blunts Farm and associated area) Site Ref. WP01 I am writing to register my objections to the proposed plans for waste at the above site. I have looked at the overall plan for Dorset and noticed as usual that nothing on the scale proposed for Ferndown is listed anywhere else in the county. Do you think that because it is mainly an elderly population that we do not care or you can slip this under the mat as your attempts at notification are laughable. I have been informed that Facebook and Twitter will carry the latest news. They are not the tool of information for most people and even the younger generation would not think to check the plans via this method. You state that after exhaustive searches these sites have been selected for suitability. How can anyone think it suitable to impose a site of this scale on the edge of a growing town and pollute the air quality for the population? The traffic around Ferndown is already gridlocked on many occasions and the addition of 100,000 plus vehicles for a Household Recycling Centre plus the waste vehicles returning frequently to offload their collections will create more congestion. Air pollution from these vehicles will also affect the health of local residents who often walk along the routes taken. The HRC along with the recycling, sorting, building, will create an environment for vermin and the smell from so much rubbish will make life very unpleasant for residents nearby. It is also proposed for an incinerator again to deal with the waste for the whole of Dorset. This was stated to be totally unacceptable in the last plan in 2005/6 by the Government Inspector and nothing has changed. This would not be conducive for anyone planning to open a business on the Trading Estate. It beggars belief that anyone could possibly think this is a good idea. The only place for a super waste site is far away in open countryside away from any residential population. We have more than enough open space in Dorset or will it be too near Dorchester. It appears that when any undesirable site is required to be a gypsy site or waste disposal, then Ferndown is first choice. Until the plans are more explicit then our objections are of a general nature but these will be firmed up at the next stage.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP714	Disagree	<p>This was probably the reason for the unnecessary Canford Roundabout. The idea of 250 lorries in one direction bringing rubbish from the whole of Dorset to this area has been secretly agreed without public consultation and according to your map the 5 bulk sites marked in blue are all concentrated in our Ferndown side of Dorset. Why? I haven't even mentioned the stinking chimney here just 2 miles away.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP719	Disagree	<p>More heavy lorries. Exhaust fumes. Smoke from chimney plus smells. Schools in the area. House prices will drop. I do not think an incinerator should be built in an urban area. What about the health of the public.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP722	Disagree	This is our green belt area and again near residential properties. Increased heavy traffic to and from the area would cause more pollution in a small area already having traffic congestion problems. And will not improve your (Council) green footprint. The areas are used by all ages as recreational areas as well as wildlife disturbance. You cannot pollute our lovely area with wholesale pollution from 40-70 metre chimney bellowing out carcinogenic material. This must be away from thickly populated areas, Central Dorset, Dorchester in fact. See what Prince Charles likes on 'his' town doorstep. Regarding Map 5, blue sites are all concentrated local to this area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP734	Disagree	Since your last try about a waste dump and high chimney 70-100m high, so much has happened in Ferndown and Wimborne. Many homes have been built, more people and cars on the road, care homes have been built - one near the site. So many planes going over Ferndown large and small. The roads around here won't stand for big lorries, they are in a bad state. We have school in Ferndown and so many children. They are our future, and so is their health is our priority.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
S C A Group Ltd	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP65	Disagree	As a business (SCA Group) located in woolsbridge industrial park we have concerns about the potential increased volume of traffic during the construction and the operational phase in what is already a heavily congested road, the increased noise pollution that this potential new site will cause and the amount of dust and environmental problems associated with waste management.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP498	Disagree	Why would we want an extra waste site at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate when we already have 2 waste sites within a 10 minute drive? one in Ferndown Industrial Estate and one in Sandheath Fordingbridge. Woolsbridge ind est falls into the catchment area of these 2 operating and existing sites therefore dealing with all current waste being produced. The traffic flow in and out of Woolsbridge ind est would be significantly increased to an estimate of 80 extra plus vehicle movements per day!! Strongly disagree with this application the impact on the local environment and local housing area will be greatly reduced!! DISAGREE	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP536	Disagree	I object to this proposed site at Woolbridge Ind Estate - it is too close to existing residential areas and will add pollution from the waste burning site as well as unacceptable levels of increased heavy vehicle traffic up & down the already busy Horton Road.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Natural England	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP624	Comment	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Residual Waste Treatment/ Bulky Waste Treatment There are sensitive specially protected designated sites to the west and east, Natural England advice that we would require some further information to conclude that the southern site would not give rise to concerns about aerial pollution effects (dust and NOx).	Your helpful comments are noted and will be considered further when developing the preferred site.
Dorset Wildlife Trust	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP700	Comment	The southern section of the proposed development site lies adjacent to SU00/053 Woolsbridge Farm Carr Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) which comprises wet woodland and unimproved neutral grassland, BAP priority habitats supporting a number of Dorset notable plant species. As with the current outline planning application for mixed employment development, Dorset Wildlife Trust would want to see a substantial buffer between any waste treatment facility and the SNCI. The ditch which runs down from the existing industrial estate, alongside the proposed site drains directly into the SNCI so there will need to be strict measures in place to ensure that there is no possibility of pollution into the fragile wet woodland habitat if waste materials are being treated. This would probably require a totally enclosed building with appropriate technology to ensure that there is no rain/run-off contact with waste, oil interceptors or other pollutants. Similar impacts will have to be assessed on the adjacent internationally designated heathlands.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised Further thought will be given to the provision of an appropriate buffer from the SNCI as suggested.
Individual	WP02 Woolsbridge Industrial Estate - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP578	Disagree		Noted
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP157	Disagree	Mannings Heath Industrial estate proposal As the owner of Unit B, The Outlook Ling Road I do not see that the siting of a waste plant directly next to a number of offices that support small business and employment opportunities for the local economy makes any sense. Staffing is hard enough as it is without having to compete with potential odour and noise pollution from large rubbish trucks. Furthermore the close proximity to Tower park, the leisure facilities and Tesco's surely makes this not an option for such a facility.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
T A Colbourne Limited	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP174	Disagree	<p>I am the principal of a business which is situated just across the road from the site described in the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Waste plan as a preferred site for, and I quote: "Municipal Solid Waste (waste from the householder) and commercial waste". Our understanding of this proposal is that the site be used for the emptying and processing of bin collection lorries, potentially from the whole of the three towns conurbation and as far away as Bridport. We do not consider this a suitable site for a number of reasons: Nearby housing, offices, the leisure centre, supermarket, car dealerships and small manufacturing businesses will be affected by the inevitable smells and dust arising. Wherever there is food there is vermin, however well controlled, it will be an additional problem to the food outlets which are within 200 metres of the site. Ling Road does not have the capacity for the vehicle movements involved. There is parking in the road, but this is usually occupied. If an HGV - or any vehicle - is held up for any reason, it creates a dangerous situation. The writer has witnessed a number of near misses and the road was closed recently as the result of a collision. Lorries do use the road for "stacking" whilst waiting to unload. The noise level from the traffic movements and the waste process will be unacceptable to the people working in nearby offices and homes. The increased lorry movements will not encourage people to cycle or walk to work and will make the route more dangerous for those who already do so. There have been a number of fires at recycling centres recently including one at Sita in Mannings Heath Road within the last five years. It will be difficult to attract new employees to the area, who might not feel they want to work next to a bin emptying facility. This is particularly relevant to this company as we are seeking to recruit apprentices and trainees. The facility does not add to the local economy, indeed it is a waste of a prime site with one of the best aspects in the area, which would be much better used for the sort of mixed development that has taken place nearby in recent years. That includes office, retail outlets and car dealerships. Housing is also an option it is situated between areas of housing development. The paragraph under the heading "Adjacent land uses" is clearly prejudicial as it mentions a foundry and recycling and makes no reference to housing, offices, restaurants, retail warehouses, entertainment centre etc. either immediately adjacent or nearby. The marked plan appears incorrect in that it outlines land already subject to planning permission for industrial units. To conclude these remarks and I would make one final point. Poole does not collect food waste separately from households. Are there plans to do this? Or is Poole (It's a Beautiful Place) just to host the food waste from the whole of the rest of the county?</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP183	Disagree	<p>I work daily in Unit B, The Outlook, Ling Road. I am very concerned this proposed Treatment Site will result in: Substantial increase in the number of lorries on Ling Road causing an increase in noise, traffic issues and pollution; Due to the nature of the treatment there is very likely to be unsavoury odours and dust which will make working in our offices very difficult as the proposed site is on two sides of our property; There will be an increase in vermin, again due to the nature of the treatment centre; Furthermore there are very many local businesses in the direct vicinity who will suffer from this development.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP188	Comment	<p>As a Poole resident I was appalled to learn that Mannings Heath is being considered for a food waste site. I have several clients operating their businesses in very close proximity to the land in question and I can only see it as detrimental to them in terms of acquiring good staff and retaining them, client relationships, and decreased value to their commercial properties. Safe access to their property for themselves and their staff will be threatened with the significant increase in lorry movements, which at times is already an issue. In addition, as a regular user of the leisure facilities at Tower Park I can only see this threatening to one of our very few tourism venues in the Borough of Poole with odour nuisance, threat of increased vermin, and at an elevated position, creating a particularly unattractive visual impact. I wish to log a strong objection to the consideration of this site for future proposals. With extensive numbers of residential properties in close proximity, a high level use tourism venue and many threatened businesses on its doorstep, it is clearly not an appropriate position for the acceptance of food waste acquired from across the county.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP205	Disagree	<p>I would like to strongly disagree with the proposal to use Mannings Heath as a bulk waste treatment. I routinely work in this area and as a company we work hard to promote and grow employment and business opportunities across the borough and the wider UK. First impressions count for everything and having a bulk waste site dealing with household and commercial waste right on your doorstep is not the image that an employer wants to present to potential employees or business partners. This should not be considered as a suitable site for a number of reasons: a. Reputational damage. There will be an impact on SME image and damage to potential business and employment opportunities - if this transpires it may lead to financial litigation due to loss of earnings; b. Increase in air pollution and smell. This will have an inevitable impact to health and increase in respiratory conditions due to the air pollution it will cause; c. Vermin and rodent increase. Adding yet more waste to an area that already has a number of large facilities processing waste (Tesco, Tower Park) will cause an increase in the vermin and rodent population.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP208	Disagree	<p>I am a resident of Parkstone, within close proximity to the proposed new waste site at Mannings Heath.. Firstly, I am shocked that this is the first time I have heard of these proposals which I have seen, by chance, in the Bournemouth Echo this morning, as my Council you have not seen fit to notify residents of your plans? Let me start by saying that I fully appreciate that Poole is a growing urban area and waste disposal is a large, and increasing, problem for the Council. However, the proposed site at Mannings Heath is wholly unsuitable for several reasons Its proximity to housing is a grave concern (156,750 residential properties within 5 miles) as, despite theoretical reassurances from the proposed operator, emissions will affect local residents including those like my neighbour who suffer from breathing problems and rely on oxygen, the local schools where children play outdoors as well as the remainder of the local population who may have their lives curtailed by this plant. Whilst the operator will doubtless make all efforts to reduce this impact, they cannot eliminate this or take account of weather and the direction of the prevailing wind will mean that the impact will be most felt in the Oakdale and Parkstone areas. This will also have a detrimental effect on housing prices when we are already facing an uncertain market owing to the BREXIT vote. The proposed location next to Tower Park is frankly astonishing. Poole has few attractions when compared its neighbours - a soulless quayside, dead High Street, no notable town centre attractions - and it would seem to beggar belief that the Council would wish to blight this successful commercial enterprise with additional traffic, emissions and noise. Visitors to the many restaurants, and to Tesco, will doubtless think twice about visiting when a waste site is sited so very close to food retailers. The additional traffic, estimated at an additional 70 HGV movements per day, on roads that are already crowded and often gridlocked is also unacceptable. Assuming this estimate to be accurate (and it is probably very conservative and will doubtless rise in time) the additional burden will create further traffic problems and will further reduce the quality of life for Parkstone, Oakdale and Canford Heath residents. So, in summary, Mannings Heath is wholly unsuitable and should be rejected. I am not unsympathetic to the need for an additional waste site for Poole however this should not be sited in an area that is so densely populated and has considerable economic value to Poole, when there are out of town sites that are more suitable. In this time of economic uncertainty it would seem to be commercial suicide to make Poole even less attractive to residents, visitors and commerce; the Council should rethink the location of the waste facilities with due regard to the tax payer and their quality of life.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP218	Disagree	I am a resident of Canfor Heath just across the road and within very close proximity to the proposed new waste site at Mannings Heath. I strongly disagree to the proposed site at Mannings Heath for several reasons Poole is a very small town that has already suffered since last recession period due which there hardly any good restaurants and shops left. Look at the Poole Quay or high street, its all very dead and deserted. The only place that has some charm left is the Tower Park. You will destroy this as well. There will be so much traffic, noise, pollution that it will badly affect the area. There are times during peak hours when traffic moment is so slow, this will add to the existing Burdon of small roads and junctions. Already thousands of houses are planned to be built in next decade which will significantly increase the traffic. And for that reason initially the increase of 70 HGVs will considerably increase in future. There is no guarantee that it will not affect people's health or the smell will be contained such that it will not affect the nearby areas. This will have a negative impact on local business, housing prices, heath of people. Ultimately this will affect the quality of life which was the only reason we brought the house in Poole. The way Poole is growing outwards this site will soon be at the heart of the city. For these reasons I believe that the proposed site should be away from town and residents.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP261	Disagree	I totally object to the proposed Mannings Heath site. This sits within close proximity of the densely populated residential areas of Canford Heath, Oakdale, Parkstone and Alderney and is situated close to many schools. It cannot be proven that these waste incineration plants do not have adverse health risks, and it would be incredibly risky for Poole council to agree to this. Furthermore, the site would sit just yards from the Canford Heath nature reserve. Tower Park leisure complex is again just yards away, and people may choose to avoid using the complex with concerns over health risks, in turn leading to a loss of revenue and loss of jobs. As it stands, the roads surrounding the site are incredibly congested, and there are already large volumes of lorries using these relatively narrow roads, including the stone quarry. It would be dangerous to have more lorries on the roads. The area has already suffered large disruption due to the erection of the new Audi garage causing traffic chaos, and it would be unfair for locals to experience this again in such a short space of time.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP308	Disagree	I strongly object to the Mannings Heath site development. I understand that there is a need to manage waste and that the spatial concerns of landfill are significant, however I believe we need to look at a greener longer term strategy generally. I agree that incineration reduces the bulk of waste but it does not make it disappear, more ominously it transforms it into a significant pollution problem. Incineration is a major contributor to global pollution and a whole range of health problems. Do we really want to be producing carcinogenic Dioxins amongst residential area? The transport links are already overwhelmed with the Dorset Way, Mannings Heath Road, Ling Road and the Ringwood Road almost at gridlock during the rush hour and during the summer with the Tower Park visitor traffic it is even worse. The proposed increase in traffic flow is significant and would not be sustainable without serious congestion problems.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP342	Disagree	As a local resident and working in the heart of the proposed scheme I must object to the site being considered for waste treatment. Recycling is important but not at the expense of the local environment where the public spends leisure time. The scheme will end the leisure facilities and shopping in Tower park and send more visitors away from the area towards Bournemouth. I urge you to consider siting these works away from these facilities where families and children are often seen on foot.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP379	Disagree	Please register my objection to the proposal to site a recycling plant at Mannings Heath, Poole. The site is unsuitable as it is located very close to dense housing, a major leisure centre, a large supermarket and employment centres. The additional traffic will make an already difficult area to transit even more so and cause damage to already less than ideal road surfaces. The strong odours will have an effect on the surrounding area and its residents. The potential increase in vermin and insect life could also increase potential health problems.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP396	Disagree	I am registering my concern at your plan for the above at Mannings heath. This is a concentrated residential area, also has popular children's leisure facilities at Tower Park. The increase of odour across the area and the increase of pests irrelevant to the increase of traffic movement i.e. lorries in an already busy area, means that this would have an extremely negative effect on the area and the local residents	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP436	Disagree	I would consider this proposal a worst case scenario. The area has benefitted from The Outlook and Acorn Business Parks attracting high technology and service businesses to the area. The recent fire at the scrapyards highlights the unsuitability of this area for further development of this kind. Far better would be promoting the area as a technology and science park befitting the type of businesses such as Sun Seeker, etc. This proposal risks driving these businesses out of the area. With Tower Park being the only major recreational facility in the area, any plan to increase HGV traffic in the area by 100 movements a day mixing with Tower Park visitor traffic many of whom are children cannot be considered acceptable. Moving onto the proposed waste types to be processed fuel/food waste/household waste all these increase the risk of smells, vermin and fire hazard which surely cannot be considered acceptable due to the concentration of the general public in the area both working and visiting Tower Park	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WVP497	Disagree	Why would we want an extra waste site at Woolsbridge Industrial Estate when we already have 2 waste sites within a 10 minute drive? one in Ferndown Industrial Estate and one in Sandleheath Fordingbridge. Woolsbridge ind est falls into the catchment area of these 2 operating and existing sites therefore dealing with all current waste being produced. The traffic flow in and out of Woolsbridge ind est would be significant increased to an estimate of 80 extra plus vehicle movements per day!! Strongly disagree with this application the impact on the local environment and local housing area will be greatly reduced!! DISAGREE	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WVP502	Disagree	I disagree with this proposal (WP03 Mannings heath). The office building I work from is directly next to both these sites (The outlook, Ling Rd). The surrounding area has a large number of office buildings, car dealerships, housing and the popular Tower park complex and would be detrimental to all of these. The proposal to turn this area into a household waste dump is completely out of context with the recent development of the rest of the area. See below a number of reasons for my disagreement to this proposal: - The odour the disposal facility would produce. - The large increase in vermin such a disposal facility would bring. - The noise level would increase significantly due to the general running of the disposal facility and the increase of lorries/trucks that would use the surrounding roads. - The area is not suitable for such a large increase in vehicular traffic, - Safety concerns that the facility would bring with the large increase in vehicular traffic and the increase risk of fire such a facility would bring. - Health issues that may result in working next to such a facility. - Increase in general litter in the surrounding area due to this disposal facility. - The negative effect it will have on all the surrounding businesses in maintaining a healthy and positive working environment; attracting employees; attracting future customers. Let's keep Poole a beautiful place and keep largely populated areas like this free from waste disposal facilities that are obviously harmful to the area and better suited elsewhere.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WVP523	Disagree	I am one of the unfortunate few who face living within the 25m range of this proposed facility. We already suffer from rats, the stink from Sita, LGVs ignoring the 7.5 ton restriction at the junction of Mannings Heath Road and Ringwood Road, dust, rust and smells from the foundry, as well as the large amount of noise from this site at night. Poole Council's Environmental and Consumer Protection have done pretty much nothing to improve the situation. I had to resort to taking the foundry to court in order to win compensation for the damage caused to my property by foundry dust. The Council's permit system is roundly ignored and not enforced. Therefore I have absolutely no faith in any promises made about mitigation of smells, noise and dust from the proposed waste site. It will simply be a case of it gets built, and the residents can put up with it. This site is close to a hugely popular leisure centre and supermarket, and very close to Canford Heath / Newtown and Parkstone. Surely it is better to close and redevelop the existing Sita site to entirely remove the waste facility in such a built up area, and not add further to the discomfort of those living closest, who already have to put up with so much. There are other out-of-town sites with better road access that would be better choices for this type of activity.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO3 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP539	Disagree	<p>I work adjacent and opposite the proposed site at Mannings Heath and strongly object to the sites use as a Material Waste Recycling Centre. With the close proximity to Tesco and Tower Park Leisure facilities, I find it unbelievable that this site has been proposed with the inevitable smells and dust arising. There will also be the obvious increase in lorry movements, on an already busy road, that people use to avoid the queuing traffic up Old Wareham Road. If the route back to the Nuffield is via the Dorset Way, then that will increase the queuing traffic trying to navigate the roundabout, as the junction is always a bottleneck due to the queuing traffic up Old Wareham Road. I've seen various traffic surveys being carried out over the years but nothing ever done about it. I wouldn't be surprised to see lorries queuing in the road and causing traffic mayhem, like already occurs when a lorry parks up, on occasions, for whatever reason. I believe the site is already being used for some form of Material Recycling, with offices recently being installed and for the last two years, they have had large bonfires for the 5th November, no doubt left unattended overnight and still burning the following day. I don't know what they are burning but it stinks, probably the non-recyclable plastics. Have the council carried out a traffic survey on Ling Road, not to mention the amount of children walking to school and people walking to and from Tesco or Tower Park from Parkstone. I find it incredulous for the council to even have this site under consideration, it should never been on the short list, of which there are far better suited sites than Mannings Heath.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP553	Disagree	<p>We strongly disagree with the proposal to use Mannings Heath as a bulk waste treatment site. As the owners of two businesses on Tower Park, we work hard to promote our business and grow employment. We welcome around 300k people to our attractions each year. We are part of the leading employment sector in the area, some 5k people which contributes to a visitor spend of around £218m p.a. clearly, and any down turn in our business will have knock-on effects in the wider community, reducing employment opportunities and negative impacts in the supply chain. First impressions count for everything and having a bulk waste site dealing with household and commercial waste right on your doorstep is not the image that any business wants to present but as ambassadors to visitors from around the globe this would be a disaster. Impressions aside we have some real concerns about an increase in air pollution and smell. Some of our business is outside, especially in the summer when food waste deteriorates very quickly and the inside uses forced air handling, any hint of air contamination would be terminal to our operation. It would necessitate enclosing the entire business with a building and a change to the air conditioning to ensure adequate ventilation "we would seek to pursue the cost of the capital cost of this installation together with a monthly payment to cover the additional costs associated with this, from the operators, if the Mannings Heath site was used. Any smell at all would toll a death knell to our businesses and I am sure many of the others at Tower Park. We offer visitors and locals the opportunity to bring their families to a healthy, fun activity, who will want to bring their families to a place where there is the potential for their health to be impacted adversely, their ability to enjoy themselves compromised or be involved in traffic issues including the increased risk of accident with heavy vehicles due to poor road infrastructure? We and our staff are concerned about job security, the smell, pollution, road movements of heavy vehicles and inadequate road infrastructure. Clearly there is the potential to affect the popularity of Tower Park, and in turn employment opportunities and the wider supply chain. It undoubtedly would affect the general impression of Poole as a visitor destination. We appreciate the need to find waste sites, of course, but we consider that this site is wholly inappropriate due to the proximity to one of the jewels in the crown of the Poole visitor economy and the potential negative impacts on the local economy. We also believe that there are better uses of this particular parcel of land.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WP653	Disagree	<p>It has been brought to my attention that 'Dorset County Council' are planning to put a 'Waste Plant' very near my house and as the crow flies seconds. My concerns are many as I have a lovely wildlife garden, pond, birds, etc enjoy being in it having my windows open in good weather and entertaining family (grandchildren), friends' holding some charity events. So the thought of all this to be put into 'jeopardy' is upsetting and alarming. The proposed site is in an elevated position behind Pool's popular leisure facilities Tower Park, a place for families to eat etc; so my concerns are many! - Odour across the area - Pest pollution 'Rats' - Risk of fire (huge fire at the moment at Trigon, Wareham) - As well as having a negative visual impact on the area. As a conservationist belonging to Dorset Wildlife Trust, I hope that you will see that this is completely the 'WRONG PLACE TO PUT THIS PLANT'.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP03 Mannings Heath 'Area of Search' - Bulky Waste Treatment	2016WPP675	Disagree	My objections: The proposed huge treatment facility would result in dust, fumes, smoke, pollutants, smells, loud noise, and pests in an area close to homes, schools, work places, Tesco and Tower Park. The thermal, chemical/biological treatments could increase pollution and be hazardous. An 8m high building and 40m chimney discharging potentially polluting exhaust gases would overlook and overshadow many homes and businesses. Canford Heath, a huge residential estate, is located below the facility site and would be exposed to pollution. The facility would be visible from much of Poole and the Purbecks because of its height and location. 100+ HGVs per day would make worse the already very busy roads. The Highways Authority has concerns over existing lorry movements. Increased emissions would cause deterioration in air quality, already a health concern. Waste could come from Bridport, Dorchester etc increasing lorry miles. A more central location could be considered such as the site at UKAEA at Winfrith.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Natural England	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Bulky Waste Management	2016WPP626	Comment	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Residual Waste Treatment/ Bulky Waste Treatment Natural England have concerns about this proposal which lies adjacent to specially protected sites, in particular in relation to water pollution and aerial pollution effects arising from treatment processes and additional vehicle movements. These issues should be flagged up at this stage and be identified clearly in the WLP policy approach.	Natural England have concerns about this proposal which lies adjacent to specially protected sites, in particular in relation to water pollution and aerial pollution effects arising from treatment processes and additional vehicle movements. These issues should be flagged up at this stage and be identified clearly in the WLP policy approach.
Wessex Water	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Bulky Waste Management	2016WPP761	Comment	No apparent issues for Wessex Water; no current public sewer apparatus in the vicinity of the proposal.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	WP05 Eco-Composting, Parley - Bulky Waste Management	2016WPP703	Comment	The proposed extension of this site would bring it adjacent to the Dorset Heathlands SPA/Dorset Heaths SAC/ Hurn Common SSSI so close consultation with Natural England would be needed to ensure no adverse impacts on this internationally designated site. Ecological mitigation and long-term restoration would need to be agreed.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP3	Disagree	<p>I believe proposing a sizable waste management site in an AONB is wrong to begin with. The site identified south of Sunrise Business park will be opposite a new Lidl; if planning is granted as is expected. The impact of the Lidl site will be a considerable increase in vehicle movements on what was green field agricultural use land. That is a big enough impact on the area. To site a waste facility across the road from a large food outlet would be unfortunate and inappropriate. We already have a waste / recycling facility on Shaftesbury lane. The provision of a significant number of residential properties almost opposite that facility in recent years means a large number of people now reside in what was formerly undeveloped land. The northern half of Shaftesbury Lane has had an industrial / business development bias. With a large number of houses having been built in the last few years and the likely approval of the Lidl site, the area appears to have a more domestic bias emerging. That means a greater number of people will be living in and around your proposed waste management site - in an AONB next to a stud with thoroughbred horses in the paddock on the opposite side of the roundabout. An area that will see traffic movement increase once a Lidl is built. Is the area to be housing and domestic or industrial? Having granted planning for all the housing off Shaftesbury Avenue and the Lidl application very likely to be approved, I feel the proposal to site waste management site south of Sunrise Business Park is highly inappropriate. It would show a lack of town planning oversight and inappropriate mixed use of the area. A waste management site should be away from conurbations of houses and shops. To build such a facility would be contemptuous of residents, showing a complete disregard for the AONB and the environment. And opposite a large food outlet! I am strongly opposed to the proposal.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP9	Agree	<p>The Sunrise site was the most sensible of the options for the Blandford area and I am glad to see it has been adopted.</p>	Your support is welcomed, see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP12	Agree	<p>I appreciate finding an appropriate site for this facility is difficult as appropriate land within the bypass is scarce. Negative: outside the bypass; it is a greenfield site; it is within an AONB. Positive: good access from A350 "less affected by holiday and event traffic; no water courses; closer to principal user base than some previously suggested options.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP13	Disagree	I do not agree with this proposed site if it is going to jeopardise the proposed Lidl site which is most important to local residents. Also the houses built near this site are already overlooked by a number of industrial sites which cause traffic, noise and pollution problems.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP14	Disagree	The proposed waste management site in Blandford is within 250m of several business premises on the Sunrise Business Park all of which will be negatively affected by a large waste management facility on their doorstep. Employees in particular will have to deal with smells associated with the waste vehicles, garden waste, food waste etc, noise disturbance and increased air pollution as a result of vehicles moving in and out of the site. The current roundabout, which may be used to gain access to the proposed site is dangerous enough without adding a steady stream of large, slow waste vehicles not to mention additional traffic to the proposed Lidl site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Blandford Forum Town Council	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP15	Agree	The Town Council has no objection to DCCs preferred site, Land adjacent Sunrise Business Park, Blandford Forum for a replacement Waste Management Centre to serve Blandford and surrounding areas	Your support is welcomed
Country Image	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP19	Disagree	The proposed site will affect those employed on Sunrise Business Park. The location is prone to be windy and litter from the proposed site is likely to be a serious issue. Smells, noise & air pollution will also be a problem. The proposed waste management site will be detrimental to retail customers visiting businesses on Sunrise Business Park, as well as employees. Parking is already a major concern on Sunrise Business Park, during the working week cars are parked on both sides of the road limiting access for any vehicles. During the school holidays Sunrise Business Park is additionally busy with parents taking their children to Crazy Monsters Play Park, cars have to park on the road due to lack of a car park.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP26	Disagree	I appreciate it is hard to find new sites for waste disposal, but it should not be in an AONB. It will also affect employees at Sunrise Business Park and if the new Lidl proposal goes ahead it will be inappropriate to place it close to a food store. If no other alternative is found and it goes ahead, then it is absolutely vital that it is well disguised from the road (Sherborne is a very good example of this) and set back as far as possible. However I really hope that an alternative can be found.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP29	Disagree	<p>We are a dairy products manufacturing business employing local people, sited on Sunrise Business Park, Blandford, and we object to the proposed locating of the waste site for the following reasons: 1. Air borne bacteria As yoghurt and dairy product manufacturers, we have a product that is highly susceptible to airborne bacteria. Although we do what we can to minimise the ingress of such bacteria into our production environment, we do have to have our building open from time to time each day to receive deliveries etc. Therefore we cannot totally prevent the ingress of such bacteria. The siting of a waste management facility in such close proximity to our premises would have a serious impact on our product and could endanger the hygiene standards of our operation, and so adversely affect the health of our customers. 2. Product taint from smell For the same reasons as 1, the odour coming such a site, due to the breakdown of organic waste products in such close proximity, would also adversely taint the products we manufacture. 3. Mould spores Locating a waste site like the proposed one could increase the amount of mould spores in the air, which would again contaminate our working areas and our finished products making them unsellable. 4. Traffic issues The roundabout from which the proposed waste site would be accessed is already under considerable pressure from existing traffic, from the North and from the East directions. This will already be exacerbated when the new Lidl supermarket site is constructed on the west of that roundabout. Adding an additional entry / exit point to that roundabout for the waste site will only make the traffic situation even more dangerous and lead to more tailbacks and delays for road users in the area. 5. Lidl Supermarket development opposite proposed waste management site The Lidl supermarket development that is marked for the location opposite the proposed site will likely to also have concerns about having a waste site so close to its premises "particularly in respect of waste food products and the avoidance of vermin in and around its operating areas. In summary, we do not feel that the proposed location for this site is at all appropriate and this site should be withdrawn from the options being considered. We would also insist on a full independent report looking directly into the air pollutants mentioned above. If the proposed development went ahead, we may have no option but to relocate and would then expect the council to cover the substantial costs involved in relocating our business and all additional costs incurred by our company.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Pinder Cox	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP30	Disagree	<p>We would like to register our objection to the proposed location for the waste management centre. Our premises (and many of those around us) are currently used as offices and the location of the waste management centre will attract vermin to the area, and in the summer a problem with flies and the smell. While you may be taking into account the adverse effect upon the AONB are you taking into account the adverse effect upon the local businesses?</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
MVS Blandford Ltd	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP47	Disagree	<p>We as a company trading on the sunrise business park are against the proposed site. If the site is approved and the access is through the sunrise business park the traffic management will affect every business on the estate. Parking is limited and many businesses use the roads for parking, which is also limited and often cars are parked on both sides of the roads especially during school holidays. Traffic movement would be detrimental to all businesses on the sunrise estate and especially the ambulance service response times if the estate is congested. If the entrance is off the original roundabout, then this will also cause issues as people travelling from all routes travel at speed and almost use the roundabout as a chicane. It is not uncommon at the current site for traffic to be backed up onto the main road with people queuing to gain access. If this was the case on the A350 road this would be very dangerous to say the least. Traffic issues aside there would also be an issue with air pollution, smell, litter and insects due to rotting food and garden waste which would be very unpleasant and possibly hazardous for the businesses on the estate.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP143	Disagree	<p>The Cranborne Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Partnership is very concerned at the appearance of the Blandford Waste Management Centre and Waste Vehicle Depot in the draft document (WP06 Land South of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford). As you indicate this is a greenfield site within the Cranborne Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are nationally important and designated by government as the finest landscapes of the nation. The importation of waste to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and its treatment therein is not perceived as compatible with the purposes of designation, which are conserving and enhancing natural beauty. The proposed development would contrast and conflict with the inherent landscape character of this part of the AONB. The AONB Partnership is also concerned that the Draft Waste Plan Update implies that the site is supported by the Blandford + Neighbourhood Planning process. However this AONB has made it very clear in our consultation response to the Neighbourhood Plan Group that this is amongst a number of elements within the Draft Neighbourhood Plan that contrast and conflict with AONB aims, objectives, and policies. As I am confident you will be aware, paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF apply to this site and that paragraph 116 has a number of extremely testing criteria. Paragraph 116 starts from the presumption that permission within an AONB for major development would be refused. This AONB is also concerned that in the key development considerations in your document it is acknowledged that there are likely to be adverse impacts upon this Area Cranborne Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It would, I advise, be more appropriate to reword that key consideration along the lines of the design, layout and landscape treatment of the site shall ensure that there will not be adverse impacts upon the AONB. Whilst the mineral planning authority has received earlier responses about this locality from this AONB team it is disappointing that the site is being proposed in a published document without further engagement with the AONB team. That lack of engagement appears to be an avoidance, on behalf of the waste planning authority, of its duty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. The Cranborne Chase AONB Partnership is of the view that the potential waste site south of Sunrise Business Park is not an appropriate development within one of the nation's finest landscapes and therefore OBJECTS to the proposed site allocation.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP312	Disagree	<p>The need for an improved waste facility for Blandford is not questioned I suggest the proposed location should be moved North West beyond the Sunrise Business Park, with access off the C13 Shaftesbury Road for the following reasons; It would avoid the need to alter the existing roundabout at the junction of the A350 Blandford By-pass, Shaftesbury Lane and the C13 If relocated further North West of the Business Park, access off the C13 would cause less traffic congestion. The C13 is capable of handling the extra traffic, failing which the first 500metres from the roundabout would be widened. The prevailing wind would carry any litter into open countryside, not the adjacent Business Park The site now proposed would increase the distance of the Waste Site from residential properties at Kites Corner and the 153 houses within 250m. The site I am proposing is probably owned by the same person who would still be willing to sell the land. Strenuous efforts have been made by the Council to encourage Lidl to build a supermarket on the Blandford Heights Ind Estate ,– adjacent to the A350 at its junction with Shaftesbury Lane. If the present plan for a waste management centre goes ahead, it may well prejudice Lidls plan as they would be unlikely to proceed knowing that a waste management site is due to be constricted within 75m of the supermarket entrance. This risk cold be minimised by relocating the waste site northwest on the C13 road beyond the Sunrise Business Park as I have proposed.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Savills	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP341	Agree	<p>Comments on behalf of the Davis Coats families on the Dorset Draft Waste Plan Update - Additional and Emerging Preferred Waste Site Allocations - Blandford Policy 1 of the Blandford Neighbourhood Plan, recently submitted to North Dorset District Council, allocates land on the northern and eastern edges of Blandford for housing, employment, education and community uses to meet the long term needs of the local community. The Neighbourhood Plan now faces Examination and a referendum. If approved it becomes part of the Development Plan for the area. As part of this the policy of land adjacent to Sunrise Business Park is identified as suitable for employment uses, as part of a mixed use development north and east of the bypass. A major local employer, who has to date been unable to find a suitable site in Blandford to amalgamate his various businesses in the town, has expressed an interest in the front part of the site, with a new purpose designed access from the Sunrise roundabout. Proposals for this fifth arm to an enlarged roundabout have been drawn up by highway engineers and it is understood DCC highways have not offered any objection. The supporting text to the Policy 1 states that: This proposed waste use would share the same access to the Sunrise roundabout as provided for the industrial use. The policy also proposes the provision of a new two form entry primary school site immediately adjacent to the east of the industrial sit and waste site. Officers from Dorset County Council (DCC) who are responsible for both projects are confident that the two uses are compatible. The industrial site and waste site would both have substantial landscaped boundaries, which would assimilate both sites into their surroundings, helping lessen any impacts on the AONB or neighbouring users such as the proposed school or occupiers of the Sunrise Business Park. With a new purpose built waste site it is understood through improved design of these waste facilities amenity issues are substantially reduced. Savills acts on behalf of the landowners. On their behalf discussions with the interested industrialist are well advanced and there are ongoing discussions with DCC regarding the waste site. On 28 June DCC Cabinet agreed the minutes of the Dorset Waste Partnership Joint Committee of 13 June. It was resolved: (i) That the proposal for a new strategic waste facility in central Dorset to include a household recycling centre, waste transfer station, and potentially depot and vehicle maintenance workshop be approved; and (ii) That taking an option on a suitable site(s) in the Blandford area and land purchase subject to planning consent ..... Be approved. Savills on behalf of its clients supports the allocation of a waste site adjacent to the Sunrise Business Park and will continue dialogue with DCC to facilitate this development. It is also hoped that Policy 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan will be considered at Examination in the Autumn with the potential for the Plan to be adopted late 2016 or early 2017. If the policy is endorsed this will further facilitate the proposal. As part of its submissions on the Neighbourhood Plan Savills on behalf of its clients submitted the following supporting documents: · Masterplan · Landscape and Visual Assessment · Flood Risk and Drainage Report · Heritage Assessment · Highways Report · AONB Impact Report All of these documents can be made available to the County Council if required.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

<p style="text-align: center;">North Dorset District Council</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WP559</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Disagree</p> <p>The Council notes that Land South of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford (WP06) has been identified as a preferred site for a waste management centre/depot to serve Blandford and its surrounding villages. As outlined in NDDCs response to the consultation on the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Waste Plan (2015) the area of land being considered is located outside of the existing settlement boundary as defined by the North Dorset District Wide Local Plan (2003). It is also outside of the employment growth areas identified in the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (2016) (LP1). Furthermore, as the site is situated within the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB, in line with paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) there is no presumption in favour of major development unless it can be clearly demonstrated that it is in the public interest for the development to go ahead, having regard to: the need for the development and the impact on the local economy; the scope and costs associated with developing elsewhere, outside of an AONB or meeting the need in an alternative way; and the impact on the environment, landscape and recreation opportunities within the area and the extent to which these impacts could be mitigated. In addition to paragraph 116 of the NPPF, Policy 4 of LP1 sets out, amongst other things that Within the areas designated as AONB and their setting, development will be managed in a way that conserves and enhances the natural beauty of the area. Proposals which harm the natural beauty of the AONBs will not be permitted unless it is clearly in the public interest to do so. In such instances, effective mitigation should form an integral part of the development proposals. Developers will be expected to demonstrate how they have had regard to the objectives of the relevant AONB management plan for the area. Page 42 of the Draft Waste Plan Update states that it is understood that North Dorset District Council has identified a need in principle for employment land. However, NDDC did not make such comments in response to the consultation on the Draft Waste Plan (2015) and the Inspector in paragraph 28 of his report on the Examination of the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 details that he is satisfied that sufficient land is available, across the District as a whole, to meet employment needs. Furthermore, the Inspector details in paragraph 84 of his report that concerns were raised by representors regarding the fact that employment growth sites in Blandford have limited capacity or appeal and that additional sites should be identified, for example to the north of the town. He sets out that one of the alternative sites being promoted, adjacent to the Sunrise Business Park, lies beyond the town's by-pass and within the AONB. This land may be available but there is insufficient evidence, at this time, to satisfactorily demonstrate that the balance should be tipped in favour of identifying more land for employment purposes, as against the protection of the setting of Blandford and in particular the AONB. In any event the Council has confirmed that in the longer-term sites beyond the by-pass will be considered. Given the comments set out above, and the fairly negative assessment that the Land South of Sunrise Business Park receives in the Draft Waste Plan Sustainability Appraisal, NDDC considers that alternative options should be given further detailed consideration, particularly the potential option of expanding the existing waste management centre located on the Holland Way Industrial Estate. If DCC does decide to identify Land south of Sunrise Business Park for a waste management centre/depot as part of its pre-submission draft waste plan then the relevant policy should, amongst other things, aim to ensure that the harmful impacts on the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs that would result from new development are satisfactorily mitigated. NDDC would be happy to engage with DCC in developing a policy that aimed to provide such a safeguard. DCC would also need to be satisfied that an appropriate access could be created to the site. NDDC notes that on both page 42 of the plan and on page 5 of the document titled 'Report on comments to the Draft Waste Plan site options and officer response - May 2016' reference is made to the fact that the site is being progressed outside of the Waste Plan process through the Blandford+ Neighbourhood Plan. As I am sure you are aware Section 61K of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 considers 'excluded development' that cannot be covered by neighbourhood plans. County planning matters (minerals extraction and waste development) are identified as 'excluded development'. In terms of the large scale strategic growth to the north and east of Blandford proposed by the Blandford+ Neighbourhood Plan, it is considered that Policy 1 in the emerging Blandford+ Neighbourhood Plan does not conform with the strategic policies of the recently adopted North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 including Policy 16 (Blandford). On this basis it is deemed that Policy 1 in the pre-submission neighbourhood plan does not meet one of the basic conditions relating to the preparation of a neighbourhood plan. The revised submission version of the Blandford+ Neighbourhood Plan, as submitted to North Dorset District Council at a date following the response to the Waste Plan by the landowners agent (of which the quoted text of the submission plan by the landowners is not consistent with that in the neighbourhood plan as submitted July 2016), does not seem to overcome officers concerns on this matter.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Highways England	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP862	Comment	This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. Comments remain the same.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP840	Comment	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided below. Overall EA position "No objection in principle to this proposed waste site allocation provided that the following points can be addressed. In addition, various studies will need to be undertaken at the planning application. Flood Risk Whole site in FZ1. Site 5.3Ha "FRA required in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF to consider surface water management. Fisheries and biodiversity The site should be assessed for its ecological value and ability to support protected species e.g. Any hedgerows surrounding the site should be retained where possible, where not possible appropriate mitigation and compensation measures should be put in place. Hedgerows are important habitats for wildlife including birds and bats and some have the potential to support the protected dormouse. Opportunities for enhancements in and around the development should be considered. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 109 recognises that the planning system should aim to conserve and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible. Paragraph 118 of the NPPF states that if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused and that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged. Article 10 of the Habitats Directive stresses the importance of natural networks of linked habitat corridors to allow the movement of species between suitable habitats, and promote the expansion of biodiversity. Groundwater and contaminated land The site is close (~300m), but outside, a Source Protection Zone 1. Waste permitting Any Environmental Permits/ Exemptions required for activities at this site would need to be obtained. Consideration should be given to the prevailing wind direction (SW). Once built, litter from site will be prone to being blown in the direction of the existing Sunrise Business Park. Any waste material used during the construction should be handled in the correct manner, using the appropriately licenced waste carriers etc.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP06 Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford	2016WP899	Comment	Objection 3 "Site WP06 "Land south of Sunrise Business Park, Blandford. SUEZ do not recognise any need for a further waste management centre site in Blandford, given that there is already an operational Waste Transfer station and household waste recycling centre in Blandford, within the established industrial area of the Sunrise Business Park. SUEZ consider that no need has been demonstrated for an additional site, particularly one located on a green field site.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further. It is the WPA's understanding that this site is unsuitable for expansion and may not be financially viable.

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP10 Wider area of land at Stanford Hill, Dorchester Waste Management Centre	2016WPP21	Comment	I am particularly interested in the recycling facilities in the Dorchester area. I am disappointed that any redevelopment of Louds Mill remains in the plan. I recognise that this area already has this use, but had it not already had this designation, there is no way that planners and members would accept the proposal. It is low lying and accessed through a residential area that has a poor road infrastructure. A one way system as proposed would make the current unacceptable situation worse. The proposal for Stinsford Hill is better than that for Louds Mill because of the access problems would be less, but it is very low lying and its location would do nothing to improve air quality of the High Street as it would increase rather than decrease vehicle movements. The development would also break an essential element of the current strong development boundary between the urban area of Dorchester and the countryside. It would be ribbon development at its worst. What is missing is a proposal for a recycling facility (and possibly a waste transfer station) somewhere in the vicinity of the Monkeys Jump Roundabout. This roundabout is scheduled to be redeveloped to help resolve the increasing congestion following the development of Poundbury, and the recycling requirements could sensibly be built into this development. There are many advantages: there is already an industrial gas from crops plant nearby, Poundbury is already a mixed residential/office/industrial zone, the site would have the best road access that the area can offer, it is well drained, and being elevated and very windy so it would have minimal anti-social impact compared to any other site offered.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further. It is the WPA's understanding that this site is unsuitable for expansion and may not be financially viable.
Dorchester Town Council	WP10 Wider area of land at Stinsford Hill, Dorchester Waste Management Centre	2016WPP27	Comment	Considered by Dorchester Town Council's Planning and Environment Committee on 6 June 2016. Draft Minerals/Waste Sites Plan Update 2016 Committee members had looked at the update to DCC's Draft Minerals/Waste Sites Plan and were disappointed that Louds Mill was still identified as the preferred site for Dorchester's household recycling centre. Members considered that the wider area of land identified north west of Stinsford Hill should be the only household recycling centre for the town as this was a much more appropriate site being away from residential areas. The Committee reiterated the comments made at their meeting held on 21 September 2015 about these sites and agreed that these should be resubmitted to DCC. Resolved That DCC be advised that Dorchester Town Council considers that (Site WP10) Stinsford Hill is their first option for a Household Recycling Centre and Waste Transfer Facility and that it does not support the use of (WP11) Loudsmill for any use as a future waste site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Stinsford Parish Council	WP10 Wider area of land at Stinsford Hill, Dorchester Waste Management Centre	2016WPP127	Comment	<p>Stinsford Parish Council rigorously opposes the development of a Waste Management Centre on this site for the following reasons:- Risk of water contamination “ there is a Grade 1 chalk stream and a Chalk Major Aquifer of Principal designation under the site. Insufficient transport infrastructure “the Stinsford Hill roundabout is heavily used and, due to the current lane structure, is a site at which there are many near misses in addition to a number of collisions. It is very difficult for vehicles to cross the roundabout and the traffic flow on the A35 when travelling between roundabout and the B3150 and Slyers Lane. This would make access to the proposed site not only difficult but potentially dangerous. Additionally, movements by private vehicles out of Dorchester would also place increased pressure on Greys Bridge, a Grade II Listed Building, and generate greater congestion along the B3150. This stretch of road is heavily used and slow moving during rush hour periods, and at weekends, particularly in the summer. A new access to a waste site off of the A3150 would further exacerbate this. Considerable improvement and modification of the existing roundabout and highway would be required to ensure the safety of cars both entering and exiting the proposed site as well as those on the A3150. Impact on landscape “ This site is part of an unspoilt, undeveloped agricultural landscape which forms a key part of the landscape and visual setting for Dorchester. The development of any waste facility on this greenfield site would irreparably damage this setting and context. Impact on ecology “ The impact of development works alone would have a considerable impact upon the ecology of this agricultural habitat. In addition, a Waste Management Centre would attract vermin which would, in turn, impact upon the agricultural use of the adjoining fields and could pose a threat to animal health, particularly the pig units belonging to Kingston Maurward College. Impact on tourism - The uninterrupted view across the water meadows towards Dorchester also has cultural significance as this was described in detail by Thomas Hardy in The Mayor of Casterbridge and attracts visitors to the area as part of the Hardy Trail. The revised site is higher up the hill than that originally proposed and will be visually more intrusive. The Parish Council consider that it is entirely inappropriate to site a Waste Management Centre in such an obtrusive site alongside the main route into and out of Dorchester to the east. Impact on the residents of the parish “ Stinsford is the smallest of the parishes surrounding Dorchester and yet it is being proposed that it host the Waste Management Centre for the whole of the Dorchester area and experience the denigration of greenfield sites and negative impact upon the transport infrastructure to benefit the residents of the wider area. The Parish Council believe this to be inequitable. The Parish Council consider the site at the Old Radio Station to be better suited for the provision of a waste transfer management centre to serve Dorchester. Whilst this site is within the AONB, it is already developed and has better existing access. Developing on a brownfield site in this location would have less impact on the local environment than the proposed greenfield site at Stinsford Hill.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
West Dorset & Weymouth & Portland Councils	WP10 Wider area of land at Stinsford Hill, Dorchester Waste Management Centre	2016WP133	Comment	<p>WP10 Stinsford Hill, Dorchester “ proposed waste facility incorporating a combined waste transfer station, household recycling centre and vehicle depot The expanded site raises concerns due to the sensitive nature of the area. The site is located on the main entrances to the town from the east and hence would form part of a gateway to the town. In addition, the development of the site has the potential to cause harm to local landscapes. Any development would therefore need to carefully consider this sensitive location and minimise the impact upon it. In addition to the sensitive nature of the location, the site suggested is being promoted by the landowner as part of a larger option for the future expansion of Dorchester. In his report on the examination of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan, the Inspector highlighted the need to consider the long term development needs of Dorchester. In doing so, he made reference to the land to the north, incorporating the site being proposed for the waste facility, as one of the options that needed further consideration. The district council will be considering growth options for Dorchester through the review of the Local Plan. The review is at an early stage, with consultation on issues and options programmed for the New Year, and no decisions have been made between the various options for development. It would therefore be premature to base the decision on the location of the waste facility on the possibility of future larger scale development. However, any development of a waste facility in this location would need to have regard to this future possibility, meaning that there may be a need to consider minimising any conflict between residential and the non-neighbourly uses associated with a waste facility, integrating any development within the landscape, presenting an attractive well designed entrance to the town and minimising the impact on the road network. Sites proposed in the summer 2015 consultation document form an alternative option for meeting needs in the Dorchester area. The 2015 consultation includes separate sites for a waste transfer facility at the former Radio Station on Bridport Road, the expansion of the existing household recycling centre at Louds Mill and a new waste vehicle depot at Charminster Depot. The sites are in general in less sensitive locations and offer opportunities to mitigate the potential impacts of development. However the suggested expansion of the Charminster Depot is in close proximity to existing and proposed residential areas. Having regard to the concerns raised above in relation to the Stinsford Hill site, the Council would prefer to see the waste facilities combined on a single site to minimise impact on neighbouring areas.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP10 Wider area of land at Stinsford Hill, Dorchester Waste Management Centre	2016WP491	Disagree	The current sites being offered at Stinsford Hill and Old Radio Station, Dorchester will affect the flows of traffic on what is already a regularly congested A35. Loudsmill is poorly located due to old and historic access & nearby residential which has recently expanded in the area. The site at Charminster would be my suggested best alternative from those offered as the A37 suffers less through traffic. Radio station is poorly related from the town and very visible from Maiden Castle Ancient monument & in the AONB As suggested by another person who commented there is nothing shown within the wider Dorchester town boundary of the by-pass such as within the remaining 15 years of planned development for Poundbury that I suggest could have incorporated such a facility. Poundbury now has schools shops, cemetery and large residential element and a waste facility there would be all part of such a scheme developed for what is effectively nearly a new town attached to Dorchester. Stinsford Hill may be a better opportunity in transport terms if the existing roundabout could be utilised but will still generate more traffic on A35 corridor I think which would be an adverse effect. For Charminster a better vehicular access should be considered depending on amount of vehicle movements anticipated. Presume a link to A37 could be considered? Still suggest there should be options within the larger Poundbury land allocation for such a facility.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further. It is the WPA's understanding that this site is unsuitable for expansion and may not be financially viable.
Individual	WP10 Wider area of land at Stinsford Hill, Dorchester Waste Management Centre	2016WP544	Comment	Would it not be better to add a residual waste treatment facility to one of the sites around Dorchester, rather than cluster them far away in the east of the county? This facility would then be central to the entire county which it would serve.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Highways England	WP10 Wider area of land at Stinsford Hill, Dorchester Waste Management Centre	2016WP870	Comment	This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. Concerns remain the same. Assessment of traffic impacts is needed before Highways England could agree that this site was suitable in principle.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Environment Agency	WP10 Wider area of land at Stinsford Hill, Dorchester Waste Management Centre	2016WP841	Disagree	<p>Objection to this proposed waste site, due to potential impact on groundwater boreholes at Eagle Lodge. Groundwater We would object to any application for development of a waste site at this location. It lies within 50m, and directly up gradient of, Wessex Water's Eagle Lodge abstraction. Whilst it may be possible to design controls to reduce risks from the facility (sealed drainage etc) It would be preferable to consider other sites instead. Flood Risk Previously, for WD05, we commented that most of the site was in Flood Zone 3. But now we understand that a wider area of land is under consideration, although we note that the red line boundary shown on the submitted plan still includes the previous parcel of land shown to lie wholly within Flood Zone 3. We note that up to 2 hectares is required for Waste Management Centre hence there should not be any problem applying the sequential approach and positioning the centre wholly within Flood Zone 1; there is approximately 5 hectares of land (defined by the red line boundary) shown to lie within Flood Zone 1 on the submitted plan. Given the red line boundary still includes the parcel of land shown to lie within Flood Zone 3 our previous comments (as below) still apply for that part of the site shown to lie within Flood Zone 3 /risk of flooding from surface water: FZ3 so Sequential Test may be required by the Local Planning Authority. Sequential Approach required. Detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) required to assess fluvial flood risk, and other sources of flood risk. Extensive flooding also shown on our surface water maps. FRA also to include surface water management. There may be restrictions on use of soakaways, depending on the nature of the site (e.g. contaminated/ high groundwater levels). If there is an Ordinary watercourse on site "Land Drainage Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) may be required. LLFA should be consulted on the proposed waste site. Environmental Permit The site has one property within 15m of it which would mean a bespoke permit being required or the site. Also each of the types of site mentioned would have to have sealed drainage to reduce any impact of an incident from affecting the nearby watercourse and groundwater SPZ1.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Wessex Water	WP10 Wider area of land at Stinsford Hill, Dorchester Waste Management Centre	2016WPP762	Comment	The site falls within a groundwater source protection zone and close to water supply boreholes on adjacent land. This site is not acceptable to Wessex Water without considering the risk of contamination to the public water supply. The site is less than 100 metres from Wessex Waters Eagle Lodge Boreholes which provides drinking water to customers in the Dorchester area. As the proposal is within the Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1) of Eagle Lodge and close to the River Frome SSSI the Environment Agency will need to be consulted to consider if the proposal represents an acceptable environmental and public health risk which can be appropriately mitigated. We advise that robust risk assessments with any mitigation measures are undertaken to satisfy the Environment Agency and Wessex Water before any permission is granted for this site. Existing water supply pipelines cross the site and no construction will be permitted within 5 metres of these mains. A diversion of these mains may be required to allow appropriate development of the site. See plan extract below. There is an existing sewerage pumping station on the south western boundary of the site; no construction must take place to impede access arrangements; no construction within 3 metres of the connecting existing public 300mm foul sewer Land adjacent to existing sewage pumping station. Negligible impact from odour and noise issues affecting development site.	Your comments are noted and will be considered further. It is the WPA's understanding that this site is unsuitable for expansion and may not be financially viable.
Historic England	WP10 Wider area of land at Stinsford Hill, Dorchester Waste Management Centre	2016WPP802	Disagree	WP 10 Land North West of Stinsford Hill, Dorchester. The following important heritage assets are within approximately 500 metres of the site: the Stinsford and Lower Bockhampton Conservation Area; the Church of St Michael (Grade 1 LB) with Hardy associated monuments; Kingston Maurward House (Grade I Listed Building), the associated Grade II* historic park and other Grade II Listed Buildings . The site is also likely to form part of the setting of the historic town of Dorchester. Unfortunately neither the Site Assessment Report (April 2016) nor the Sustainability Appraisal appear to consider the relationship of the site, and future development and activity, to these assets. It will be important that you do so and demonstrate, through the application of evidence, that there has been special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of any affected listed building or any features of special architectural that they possesses - a statutory test. Likewise it will be equally important for you to determine the relationship of the allocation site to the designed landscape and layout of the Kingston Maurward historic Park and its wider landscape setting; and then to establish whether development would affect its significance. Similarly you will need to determine whether the direct and indirect effects of development would preserve and or enhance the character and or appearance of the Stinsford and Lower Bockhampton Conservation Area (another statutory test). Finally, we note the concerns of the Councils Landscape Officer and the likely impact of development on the wider landscape setting of Dorchester. Historic England would encourage you to engage District Council heritage expertise to address the above and ensure NPPF heritage matters are applied.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Dorset Wildlife Trust	WP10 Wider area of land at Stinsford Hill, Dorchester Waste Management Centre	2016WP707	Comment	The majority of the original proposed site in the Draft Waste Plan falls within the Flood Zone 3 and DWT therefore considered it unsuitable for waste management facilities. The expansion of the area for consideration as a proposed waste site will allow the possibility for the development to be away from the flood zone, but will still require close consultation with the Environment Agency.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorchester Town Council	WP11 Loudsmill, Dorchester	2016WP28	Comment	Considered by Dorchester Town Council's Planning and Environment Committee on 6 June 2016. Draft Minerals/Waste Sites Plan Update 2016 Committee members had looked at the update to DCCs Draft Minerals/Waste Sites Plan and were disappointed that Louds Mill was still identified as the preferred site for Dorchester's household recycling centre. Members considered that the wider area of land identified north west of Stinsford Hill should be the only household recycling centre for the town as this was a much more appropriate site being away from residential areas. The Committee reiterated the comments made at their meeting held on 21 September 2015 about these sites and agreed that these should be resubmitted to DCC. Resolved That DCC be advised that Dorchester Town Council considers that (Site WP10) Stinsford Hill is their first option for a Household Recycling Centre and Waste Transfer Facility and that it does not support the use of (WP11) Loudsmill for any use as a future waste site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
	WP11 Loudsmill, Dorchester	2016WP82	Comment	I feel that any development to the Loudsmill site would surely have a negative effect on traffic through the local residential streets. Currently St Georges Way is already at a single slow of traffic due to parking on the street which cause issues with any vehicles coming through to Loudsmill. The only other access through to the site would be Lubbecke Way when the development is completed which would then see the problem with St Georges Way simply shifting onto another street, not to mention the added problems on Lubbecke Way of the ambulance station, youth centre, dog walkers and wildlife from the river. Surely any proposed development to Loudsmill that would see an increased flow of traffic would need to have a consideration for an alternate access route that does not impact upon residents?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP11 Loudsmill, Dorchester	2016WP29	Comment	The use of a single track, at certain points, unadopted road to access and leave this facility has never been and will never be safe or acceptable. Other traders and their customers using this area add to the congestion. For this reason I disagree with this section of the document.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP11 Loudsmill, Dorchester	2016WP514	Disagree	<p>PROPOSALS FOR THE DORCHESTER RECYCLING CENTRE I understand that the County Council are consulting on possible new waste sites for Dorchester. I have concerns about the possibility of the current recycling centre at Loudsmill in Dorchester continuing in an expanded scheme. You will see from my address that we live very close to the recycling unit and even with its current size, it has been clear to me ever since we arrived here that, from a traffic point of view, its position is most unsatisfactory. The access, all the way from the beginning of St Georges Road at Fordington Cross, is not suitable. Every journey has to be undertaken with extreme care because vehicles are allowed to park on both sides of the road and negotiating the several bends in this situation can be quite hazardous as you cannot be certain what is coming at you from the other direction. I see from reports in the local press that you have already carried out a survey of the number of vehicles using the access road to the site i.e. 116,000 vehicles and around 1000 HGVs each year which illustrates how constant the problem is. Extreme caution is especially needed when emerging from Fenway Close and St Georges Close because many of the vehicles tend to travel past the road junctions at a very fast pace - I am sure that in excess of 30 mph is often the case. I think some motorists believe that, having reached the flyover, they are out in the country and a speed limit does not apply. I have heard that there is a suggestion that, on completion of the estate at St Georges Meadow, traffic will be diverted via Lubbecke Way where vehicles also are allowed to park on one side of the road, thus reducing the width. Surely, the same arguments apply. Despite the possibility of a part alternative route being offered, if the County Council proceeds with the option of expanding this centre, the residents of St Georges Close and Fenway Close, in particular, will still be faced with large volumes of traffic passing their road junctions each day and if traffic calming is not part of the change, the hazards will continue. In conclusion, I would like to suggest that a site outside of Dorchester, where no residential properties are affected, would be a better option.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Highways England	WP11 Loudsmill, Dorchester	2016WP871	Comment	This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. Comments remain the same.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Environment Agency	WP11 Loudsmill, Dorchester	2016WP842	Disagree	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided below. Flood Risk Small part of site is within FZ2. Some flooding is shown on our surface water maps. If there is an Ordinary watercourse on site "Land Drainage Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) may be required. LLFA should be consulted on the proposed waste site. Water quality Site is close to the River Frome, which is a SSSI. Groundwater SPZ2. This site is in a more sensitive location on the Chalk Major Aquifer of Principal designation. While we have no in principle objection, any development will require a more detailed risk assessment and will be subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. Any existing contaminated land will require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options appraisal in accordance with CLR11. Other EA depot near to this proposed waste site (Other side of St Georges Road) Flood Risk FZ2 so Sequential Test may be required by the LPA. Sequential Approach required. Detailed FRA required to assess fluvial flood risk, and other sources of flood risk. FRA also to include surface water management up to the design event. There may be restrictions on use of soakaways, depending on the nature of the site (e.g. contaminated/ high groundwater levels). Groundwater and Contaminated land Detailed risk assessment required at the site allocation stage. Waste/ Environmental permitting Impacts upon amenity should be considered bearing in mind the locations of resident and control measures put in place to reduce effects from odour, dust etc. The waste hierarchy should be considered for outputs and processes Biodiversity Ecological survey may be required at planning application stage.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Wessex Water	WP11 Loudsmill, Dorchester	2016WP763	Comment	Extension to Household Recycling Centre adjacent to the sewage Treatment Works. Wessex Water supports proposals and is willing to partner schemes for access improvements where appropriate. We note that proposals allow for site extensions with alternative locations and options at Stinsford Hill to relocate with increased capacity. It should be noted that any future proposals to remove nitrates from sewage discharges at the site will require land for additional plant, however there are no current commitments to undertake this work	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	WP11 Loudsmill, Dorchester	2016WP708	Comment	The site is within the flood plain of the River Frome SSSI, with the river flowing just 70 metres to the north. The site is surrounded by an extensive system of drains and water meadows, with a number of the drains and ditches flowing from alongside the site directly into the river. For these reasons Dorset Wildlife Trust does not believe that this is a suitable site for further waste facilities. The adjacent area of Cricket Bat Willows which have been recently felled needs to be subject to restoration planting to protect the river from adverse impacts and to restore more natural habitat adjacent to the SSSI river. DWT would wish to see this site restored and managed as a part of the River Frome Rehabilitation Plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Mowlam Metalcraft	WP11 Loudsmill, Dorchester	2016WP551	Comment	<p>Re. Proposals affecting Louds Mill Recycling Centre As occupants of Unit 3, Louds Mill Lakeside Industrial Estate, we would be reluctant to lose the Recycling Centre at Louds Mill as we (and neighbouring units) feel we get increased publicity and trade from passing users of the centre. However please appreciate that the congestion currently caused by the users awaiting opening times of the centre frequently blocks access through the partially single track of St Georges Road and often upsets our customers, also delaying ourselves and our supplier's deliveries. We strongly feel that the best way to reduce this congestion would be to adopt a one-way system with traffic entering on a new 2-lane route, whereby users of the recycling centre can have their own lane for queuing/accessing the recycling centre. This would enable us to have clear access alongside, with all traffic exiting back through the single track of St Georges Road. If possible, we would gratefully appreciate for such new 2-lane access to run within view of railway users, enabling us to gain further publicity whilst travelling to our premises in our lettered-up company vehicle(s). This would be particularly appreciated if the proposed new 2-storey recycling centre should block line of sight from the railway to our (and neighbouring companies') current elevated signage, having already invested in signage for this purpose. It is of some concern that your Draft Waste Plan Update 2016 designates St Georges Road as a residential street only, which seems to disregard the existence of Louds Mill Lakeside Industrial Estate partway along the road. Any new route must please be suitable for use by large commercial vehicles such as our steel delivery lorries and not just HGVs accessing the recycling facility.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP11 Loudsmill, Dorchester	2016WP556	Disagree	<p>Having lived in this area and used Loudsmill Site for years I am of the opinion it is in quite the wrong place. The approach road to Loudsmill is bordered by businesses which need to be serviced and easily accessed at all times. My latest hold up was meeting a large flatbed lorry with a tractor on board which took up all of the road from one of the businesses and there are often hold ups due to large vehicles clearing the Loudsmill Site and the quantity of cars queuing up to offload their waste. There is often not enough room for two vehicles to pass safely. Dorchester is expanding in size and as sewerage from the whole of Dorchester comes down to the sewerage plant (including Poundbury) I think there will be great demand on these services in future and an expansion of the waste centre will cause chaos and misery to many who live at that end of town. Please put good and safe access as a priority to your planning considerations and look at the need to spread these utilities to other parts of the town and not everything down St George's Road where cars are often parked both sides of the road due to not having garages. I am aware of the realignment of the road through Lubbecke Way but many people live on the East side of town and will continue to use the old route.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Highways England	WP12 Old Radio Station, Dorchester Transfer Station & Waste Vehicle Depot	2016WP868	Comment	This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. The development of this site has the potential to impact the SRN and previous comments still stand. However, Highways England welcome the decision not to allocate the site in the Waste Plan, for a HRC/Depot, which may have generated significant movements of private cars and HGVs on and across the SRN.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	WP12 Old Radio Station, Dorchester Transfer Station & Waste Vehicle Depot	2016WP843	Comment	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided below. Flood Risk If there is an Ordinary watercourse on site "Land Drainage Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) may be required. LLFA should be consulted on the proposed waste site. Water quality No specific designations apart from SPZ3. No significant water courses in surrounding area. Groundwater SPZ3. This site is in a more sensitive location on the Chalk Major Aquifer of Principal designation. While we have no in principle objection, any development will require a more detailed risk assessment and will be subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. Any existing contaminated land will require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options appraisal in accordance with CLR11. Flood Risk Flood Zone 1. Other flood risks may be present and should be assessed. Detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) required at planning application stage. This should also include surface water management. There may be restrictions on use of soakaways, depending on the nature of the site (e.g. contaminated/ high groundwater levels). Groundwater and Contaminated land Detailed risk assessment required at the site allocation stage. Waste/ Environmental permitting Impacts upon amenity should be considered bearing in mind the locations of residents and nearby business and control measures put in place to reduce effects from odour, dust etc. The waste hierarchy should be considered for outputs and processes. Biodiversity Ecological survey may be required at planning application stage.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP12 Old Radio Station, Dorchester Transfer Station & Waste Vehicle Depot	2016WP730	Comment	<p>The current sites being offered at Stinsford Hill and Old Radio Station, Dorchester will affect the flows of traffic on what is already a regularly congested A35. Loudsmill is poorly located due to old and historic access &amp; nearby residential which has recently expanded in the area. The site at Charminster would be my suggested best alternative from those offered as the A37 suffers less through traffic. Radio station is poorly related from the town and very visible from Maiden Castle Ancient monument &amp; in the AONB As suggested by another person who commented there is nothing shown within the wider Dorchester town boundary of the by-pass such as within the remaining 15 years of planned development for Poundbury that I suggest could have incorporated such a facility. Poundbury now has schools shops, cemetery and large residential element and a waste facility there would be all part of such a scheme developed for what is effectively nearly a new town attached to Dorchester. Stinsford Hill may be a better opportunity in transport terms if the existing roundabout could be utilised but will still generate more traffic on A35 corridor I think which would be an adverse effect. For Charminster a better vehicular access should be considered depending on amount of vehicle movements anticipated. Presume a link to A37 could be considered? Still suggest there should be options within the larger Poundbury land allocation for such a facility.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted and will be considered further. It is the WPA's understanding that this site is unsuitable for expansion and may not be financially viable.</p>
Individual	WP13 Charminster Depot Waste Vehicle Depot	2016WP7	Disagree	<p>Residents close to Charminster depot have recently been affected by the installation of a salt barn at the depot site, without any notification to local residents, or clear placing of notices. This has caused an increase in noise and disturbance; the addition of the proposed vehicle facility is objectionable for the following reasons: Predominant wind direction is Westerley - this means that odour from fuelling, wash down and residual vehicle odour will affect the majority of homes within 250m of the site as they are largely to the East of the facility Local residents already suffer from increased noise from the depot now that gritter lorries are filled there, both from the facility (vehicle noise, shouting from site workers etc) and increased volume of traffic on Wanchard Lane. The addition of vehicle movement, wash down noise etc, plus the high volume of additional traffic on Wanchard lane will have an unacceptable impact on local residents. Waste vehicles operate from early morning, thus the vehicle movements will cause a noise problem Will any additional facility require lighting - impacting the light pollution in the area Wanchard lane is a narrow country route not designed for a high volume of HGV traffic, the corner at the junction of Wanchard Lane and Sodden lane is already hazardous to vehicles approaching Charminster from the A37 At busy periods vehicle access the A37 from Wanchard lane is difficult in either direction; the addition of HGV traffic may cause serious impact on the safety of accessing the A37. HGV traffic returning to the site from Dorchester will be forced to turn right across the busy A37; this is already a position which sees accidents and near misses on a regular basis. Very recently a serious accident occurred when a vehicle turning right was hit from behind - additional HGV traffic can only make the situation worse. Traffic approaching from Dorchester often takes to the grass verge opposite Wanchard lane to avoid waiting for the right turning vehicle - this probably contravenes the highway code or Traffic Act. How will the vehicle movement be managed?</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP13 Charminster Depot Waste Vehicle Depot	2016WP8	Disagree	<p>Comment Residents close to Charminster depot have recently been affected by the installation of a salt barn at the depot site, without any notification to local residents, or clear placing of notices. This has caused an increase in noise and disturbance; the addition of the proposed vehicle facility is objectionable for the following reasons: Predominant wind direction is Westerley - this means that odour from fuelling, wash down and residual vehicle odour will affect the majority of homes within 250m of the site as they are largely to the East of the facility Local residents already suffer from increased noise from the depot now that gritter lorries are filled there, both from the facility (vehicle noise, shouting from site workers etc) and increased volume of traffic on Wanchard Lane. The addition of vehicle movement, wash down noise etc, plus the high volume of additional traffic on Wanchard lane will have an unacceptable impact on local residents. Waste vehicles operate from early morning, thus the vehicle movements will cause a noise problem Will any additional facility require lighting - impacting the light pollution in the area Wanchard lane is a narrow country route not designed for a high volume of HGV traffic, the corner at the junction of Wanchard Lane and Sodden lane is already hazardous to vehicles approaching Charminster from the A37 At busy periods vehicle access the A37 from Wanchard lane is difficult in either direction; the addition of HGV traffic may cause serious impact on the safety of accessing the A37. HGV traffic returning to the site from Dorchester will be forced to turn right across the busy A37; this is already a position which sees accidents and near misses on a regular basis. Very recently a serious accident occurred when a vehicle turning right was hit from behind - additional HGV traffic can only make the situation worse. Traffic approaching from Dorchester often takes to the grass verge opposite Wanchard lane to avoid waiting for the right turning vehicle - this probably contravenes the highway code or Traffic Act. How will the vehicle movement be managed</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Charminster Parish Council	WP13 Charminster Depot Waste Vehicle Depot	2016WP79	Disagree	<p>Charminster Parish Council objects to this proposal on three grounds; the area is too close to the new residential development, secondly, there will be disturbance for residents particularly due to the time of day of operations (i.e. early mornings) and thirdly, this proposal will extend the industrial land in Charminster which will affect the character of the village.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP13 Charminster Depot Waste Vehicle Depot	2016WP442	Disagree	<p>I am in broad agreement with the concerns raised by others who have commented here. The proposed vehicle depot would likely increase pollution (air, noise and light), create traffic jams and cause disruption to residents. All this will change the character of the village. However, my main concern is one of safety for the walkers, runners, cyclists, horse riders etc who regularly use the narrow lanes around the proposed site. I believe there is a real safety issue associated with increasing the volume of traffic on Wanchard Lane. The junction between Wanchard Lane and North Street is already dangerous for both traffic and pedestrians and increasing traffic (particularly HGVs) here would be irresponsible.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP13 Charminster Depot Waste Vehicle Depot	2016WPP479	Disagree	<p>Again, as a resident I'm very concerned for the safety of walkers, runners and cyclists. It is one of the few roads to allow our children to learn the bicycle, and both myself and my partner run along that road and am concerned for the early morning heavy traffic increase. In addition, when there was work on one of the other roads causing a diversion down Wanchard lane the traffic from the A37, down Wanchard lane to the road to North street do not consider pedestrians or children and go too fast over the blind hills. More traffic is very unsettling, especially if it has to leave either down Wanchard lane, into North street near the local school run area, or onto the A37 the exit of which sees fast moving traffic with little visibility of traffic coming from Yeovil direction, as Ross indicates is already seeing safety issues. Furthermore, I'm already unhappy at the increased noises from the Depot (especially strange sinewave and popping noises which are very frequent at the moment and I've already phone to complain about). Can safety, traffic concerns, noise and pollution really not increase [what analysis has been done?] and if they do, what grounds do we as local residents have for compensation, especially as all these changes have come since our family recently moved into this once quiet, safe village area? I just cannot see the logic or sanity of starting to place such heavy traffic and increased traffic in such a quiet area, very close to school areas, very small quiet lanes used by local village communities and a new housing development. Are/have all these parties truly informed and consulted?</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP13 Charminster Depot Waste Vehicle Depot	2016WPP486	Disagree	<p>Increasing the works activity at the Charminster Depot Waste Vehicle Depot is an unacceptable on top other recent development in the area and the planned large residential development at Charminster Farm; next to this facility. The S/W side of charminster has already been forced to accept 70 new properties which will bring with it significant construction site traffic and ongoing residential traffic; along small congested and narrow roads. Adding further HGV and workers' commuter traffic to A37, Wanchard lanes and North street, will just compound the inconvenience, noise and risk. Traffic noise along the A37 already makes the lives of nearby residents a misery, and now WDDC are planning to increase it; whilst providing no solutions or assistance to current road noise reduction issue. The A37/Wanchard lane turn off junction, especially across the oncoming speeding traffic is already a major hazard. I see no mention of how speed on this road will be managed and current limit enforced or better still reduced. Therefore I'm total opposed to this increased use of the site, and it should be dismissed totally or at least reviewed and replanted to minimise the traffic and noise issues.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP13 Charminster Depot Waste Vehicle Depot	2016WPP490	Disagree	<p>Please do not inflict further traffic noise and pollution on the residents of SW Charminster. The main access route to the proposed site via A37 is extremely busy throughout from early morning till late at night with both HGV and commuter traffic causing misery to those that live adjacent to it. This development would only increase this. With the charminster farm development already set to significantly increase traffic in the area we don't need more. The DCC and WDDC do nothing to reduce noise and speed on this section of the road, yet continue to consider further expansion in the area. The turn off into wanchard lane is inadequate and already presents potential accident hazards.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP13 Charminster Depot Waste Vehicle Depot	2016WP506	Disagree	I also disagree strongly with the proposed development. It will massively increase the amount of traffic on this narrow road. I have personally seen more than one near miss between pedestrians and large lorries on Wanchard lane. The lane is regularly used by cyclists, dog walkers and horse riders. It is unsafe to increase the amount of traffic on this road. It will increase pollution and noise levels in the area and will change the character of the village. Turning from North street on to Wanchard lane, large lorries and cars often do not keep to the correct side of the road, while cars coming from the industrial estate and depot often drive too fast down Wanchard lane towards North Street. Living on the North Street/Wanchard Lane junction - I see this happening every day. Increasing the traffic on this road will lead to an accident.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Highways England	WP13 Charminster Depot Waste Vehicle Depot	2016WP869	Comment	This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. Comments remain the same.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

<p style="text-align: center;">Environment Agency</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WP13 Charminster Depot Waste Vehicle Depot</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WP844</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Disagree</p> <p>Objection to this proposed waste site, due to potential impact on groundwater. All of site is in SPZ 1, we therefore provide the following comments. Overall EA position “We would object to certain activities at this site, because it is located in a groundwater Source Protection Zone 1. This is discussed below along with some other points we wish to raise. Groundwater and contaminated land The proposal is for the development of a waste vehicle depot. The depot may include wash down facilities, fuelling facilities and possibly a vehicle workshop. The site is situated in a groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 1 and we would therefore draw your attention to Table 6.1 on page 60 of our document Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3) <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwaterprotection-principles-and-practice-gp3">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwaterprotection-principles-and-practice-gp3</a> . Table 6.1 outlines the EA position statements that apply to activities in SPZ 1. We would use these position statements to guide any consultation response to a planning application. From the information supplied it would appear that the following position statements are of most relevance: Storage of pollutants (fuel etc) associated with a depot: We will object to the new and increased underground* storage of hazardous substances in SPZ1. We will agree to such storage on principal and secondary aquifers outside SPZ1 only if there is evidence of overriding reasons why: (a) the activity cannot take place on unproductive strata, and (b) the storage must be underground (for example public safety), in which case we expect the risks to be appropriately mitigated, as noted below. Where such storage already exists we will work with operators to assess and if necessary mitigate the risks, including an aim to change to above ground storage. We will object to any redevelopment scheme involving retention of underground storage of hazardous substances in SPZ1 unless there are substantial mitigating factors. For all storage of pollutants underground we expect operators to adopt appropriate engineering standards, meet the requirements of PPG 27: Above ground oil storage tanks as a minimum standard and have effective management systems in place. These should take into account the nature and volume of the materials stored and the sensitivity of groundwater, including the location with respect to source protection zones. * Underground storage constitutes storage whereby the tank is not wholly visible on a permanent basis and/or is not accessible from ground level; any tank that is partially set in the ground in a secondary containment and is totally accessible and wholly visible will be considered to be an above ground tank. However, any oil storage tank that is not wholly underground will need to comply with the Oil Storage Regulations (in England); in Wales, we expect similar standards. General position relating to the location of non-landfill waste activities: Inside SPZ1 we will only object to proposals for new development of non-landfill waste operations where we believe the operation poses an intrinsic hazard to groundwater. We will oppose such new developments via the development planning system. For any other nonlandfill waste operations that are proposed in SPZ1, when considering any environmental permit application we will usually require detailed risk assessment and additional mitigation measures to be put in place to manage any risks to groundwater. Accordingly, we will raise this as a serious concern when responding to any planning application consultation. In sensitive groundwater locations, we will therefore strongly encourage parallel tracked environmental permit applications with planning applications. Outside SPZ1 we will agree to proposals for new developments of non-landfill waste operations where risks can be appropriately controlled by an environmental permit or a relevant waste exemption. Discharges to ground: Inside SPZ1 we will require all sewage effluent discharges (new or existing) to hold a permit. All permit applications will be considered on the basis of risk assessment and the appropriateness of the discharge with respect to the local environmental setting. Where necessary we will use a notice to stop any unacceptable discharge. Inside SPZ1 we will object to any new trade effluent, storm overflow from sewer system or other significantly contaminated discharges to ground where the risk is high and cannot be adequately mitigated. If necessary, we will use a prohibition notice to stop any such existing discharge. Flood Risk Some flooding shown on our surface water maps. If there is an Ordinary watercourse on site “Land Drainage Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) may be required. LLFA should be consulted on the proposed waste site. Water quality River Cerne about 250m from site. Flood Risk Flood Zone 1. Other flood risks may be present and should be assessed. Detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) required at planning application stage. This should also include surface water management. There may be restrictions on use of soakaways, depending on the nature of the site (e.g. contaminated/ high groundwater levels). Groundwater and Contaminated land Detailed risk assessment required at the site allocation stage. Waste/ Environmental permitting Proposals should consider potential impact of fuelling in SPZ1. Close proximity to school so potential public interest / dust / noise / odour. Biodiversity Ecological survey may be required at planning application stage.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
---	---	--	---	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP13 Charminster Depot Waste Vehicle Depot	2016WP729	Comment	<p>The current sites being offered at Stinsford Hill and Old Radio Station, Dorchester will affect the flows of traffic on what is already a regularly congested A35. Loudsmill is poorly located due to old and histoic access &amp; nearby residential which has recently expanded in the area. The site at Charminster would be my suggested best alternative from those offered as the A37 suffers less through traffic. Radio station is poorly related from the town and very visible from Maiden Castle Ancient monument &amp; in the AONB As suggested by another person who commented there is nothing shown within the wider Dorchester town boundary of the by-pass such as within the remaining 15 years of planned development for Poundbury that I suggest could have incorporated such a facility. Poundbury now has schools shops, cemetery and large residential element and a waste facility there would be all part of such a scheme developed for what is effectively nearly a new town attached to Dorchester. Stinsford Hill may be a better opportunity in transport terms if the existing roundabout could be utilised but will still generate more traffic on A35 corridor I think which would be an adverse effect. For Charminster a better vehicular access should be considered depending on amount of vehicle movements anticipated. Presume a link to A37 could be considered? Still suggest there should be options within the larger Poundbury land allocation for such a facility.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Wyatt Homes	WP13 Charminster Depot Waste Vehicle Depot	2016WP588	Disagree	<p>The extension of the existing Depot is inappropriate given its village setting and taking into account operational needs and the availability of alternative, more suitable options. The Sustainability Appraisal, which assessed four separate locations for a Waste Transfer Facility and Vehicle Depot, concluded that the Old Radio Station, located to the west of Poundbury, performs most favourably, mainly due to it being previously developed land and potentially having the least impact in terms of traffic. The question must then be asked as to why the Old Radio Station site has been discounted when the merits of using that site for the proposed waste vehicle depot include: Previously developed land with no ecological or archaeological constraints; The Old Radio Station is located in an isolated position, away from residential properties; It is located on a main transport route (A35); Site is predominately vacant and unused. Conversely, the Sustainability Appraisal identified some of the negative reasons why the site in Charminster should not be developed as a waste transfer facility and vehicle depot, including: The site, being green field land is likely to have ecological interest; There would be an impact on the landscape through development of a green field area and additional traffic movement; Noise impact to the residential properties located in close proximity; Traffic generation and increase in the number of vehicles anticipated to operate the transport depot and the increase in the number of employees; Impact on the quality of life for residential properties from increased vehicle numbers The Existing depot already brings a host of issues which cause detriment to the residential amenities of existing occupants of the village of Charminster, including: Additional traffic on Wanchard Lane, which is a narrow country road, not designed for a high volume of heavy goods vehicles; Concerns of highway safety when heavy goods vehicles exit the village from Wanchard Lane onto the A37; Hours of operation (waste collection vehicles leave very early in the morning) causing noise and disturbance through vehicle movement, workers on site and wash down of vehicles These grievances would be exacerbated if the vehicle depot was extended to the Charminster Farm site to the west. Moreover, no regard has been given to the residential development of 70 dwellings and a village hall on land at Charminster Farm, to the south of the proposed extension of the existing depot which has outline consent (Application Reference: WD/D/14/002784) and a reserved matters submission currently being considered by the Council. Indeed, concerns of the impact on residential amenity as a result of sharing the depot facilities would be extended to future occupants of the village. The efficient operating of waste management services in the Dorchester area would be best serviced by locating the vehicle depot, as part of a comprehensive facility, alongside the transfer station and household waste recycling centre at Stinsford Hill, the wider area of land at Stinsford Hill or the Old Radio Station. This would avoid unnecessary journeys between the vehicle depot and the operational sites, re-directing the traffic impacts and disturbance and allowing comprehensive and careful planning of a new facility. Prudent land use planning would always, where possible, ensure land uses with inherent conflicts between them were located separately. Removal of the existing depot in its entirety to an alternate location such as the Old Radio Station would improve the character of Charminster and the site could indeed be redeveloped for purposes more suited to its village setting. Conversely, the Old Radio Station, which is understood largely to be vacant appears less likely to be a suitable site for residential development. To conclude, the increase to the Charminster Depot existing facilities, outside of the settlement boundary, would be unsuitable, with detrimental impacts to the residential amenities of existing and future residents and on the character of the village.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Warehouse Services Ltd	WP15 Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath	2016WP10	Comment	<p>Should the plan proceed for the Holton heath site for Wareham as advertised, I would encourage the removal of the rumble strips placed on Blackhill Road, especially those positioned prior to and immediately adjacent to the Glenmore Business Park. Heavy goods vehicles, particularly those visiting Wareham and Purbeck waste site cause significant vibration particularly to the first floors of the 6 units on the Glenmore Business Park fronting Blackhill Road (Units 1-6). Further heavy goods vehicles traversing these strips will cause significant issues and I urgently invite members reviewing and considering this plan, to visit our/my premises in order to witness these long standing issues and the type of vehicles causing it - as this plan will result in a significant increase in the type of vehicle causing these considerable frustrations.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Wareham St Martin Parish Council	WP15 Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath	2016WP477	Agree		Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Highways England	WP15 Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath	2016WP865	Comment	This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. Comments remain the same.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	WP15 Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath	2016WP845	Comment	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided below. Overall EA position No objection to proposed allocation, provided nearby designated conservation sites would be protected. Flood Risk No flood risk concerns from our point of view; our Flood Risk Standing Advice applies in respect of surface water drainage. However, as this is major development within Flood Zone 1 the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) will be the planning consultee in respect of surface water drainage. Fisheries and biodiversity Constraints include a number of important designated sites (please see constraints column) and Natural England must be fully consulted. It has been identified there are sand lizard records very close to the proposed site "priority species and habitats must be protected. Waste Due to proximity of the site to the Holton Heath SSSI, a bespoke permit (Environmental Permitting Regulations) would likely be required to minimise impact to the environment. Reference should be made to the updated Fire Prevention Plan guidance (version 2, March 2015) concerning storage of waste and minimising fire risk. Pollution prevention Appropriate pollution prevention measures will need to be put in place at this site. Any further studies required? Not at this stage.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	WP15 Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath	2016WP709	Comment	The site lies in close proximity, and surrounded on 3 sides, by internationally designated heathland, and so close consultation with Natural England will be required to ensure no adverse impacts on these sites. However, the position of the site within the existing industrial estate means that the development of a waste transfer facility and vehicle depot should be possible without major impacts. The site is also immediately adjacent to a part of SY 99/062 Holton Heath Industrial Estate Site of Nature Conservation Interest, which comprises a long series of sections of road verge running on either side of Blackhill Road, Station Road and Holton Road. These verges contain a variety of different species-rich grass types, including neutral, calcareous and dry acid grassland with a large number of Dorset Notable species and two Nationally Scarce species. It is therefore important that the verge areas close to the proposed development are protected against possible damage as a result of the additional traffic, particularly any damage from large lorries which would be turning into the site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	WP15 Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath	2016WP893	Comment	WP15 Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath (WP PK 01 in original draft): Chapter 9 in the Update There is no problem with this site but we would wish for a habitats survey of it, in spite of the fact that it's already being used.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Purbeck District Council	WP15 Land at Blackhill Road, Holton Heath	2016WP694	Agree	Purbeck District Council raises no objections to the use of the identified site for a transfer station and waste vehicle depot. The only minor comments the Council has are that the supporting paper says that the green belt bounds Holton Heath on three sides, but the industrial estate is in fact surrounded by green belt; and the March 2013 planning permission for 16 industrial units on the site has not been implemented and therefore has expired.	Your support for this site is welcomed. The site assessment will be updated to reflect your comments.
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP23	Comment	There is already too much traffic and industrial noise in Stapehill. But yet again DCC and EDDC would rather develop a green belt site than fight their corner on a more appropriate site. Residual waste treatments are "industrial" in everything but name, and rightly belong on brownfield or semi-industrial sites. Land to the South West of Blunts Farm is used regularly by walkers, with and without dogs, and cyclists and gives ready access to the Castlemain Trailway. Their access via Uddens Drive is only acceptable because the bulk of traffic stops at the entrance to the Uddens Industrial Estate. Beyond that point there is no pavement or footpath, and the document does not address how pedestrians and cyclists will be safeguarded. Nor does the document address the traffic issues that will inevitably arise when a substantial additional number of vehicles look to enter and leave Uddens Drive at the junction with Wimborne Road West (a road that has its fair share of hold-ups at present) and conflicts with traffic entering and leaving Stapehill Road. Why the Councils did not consider restricting access to the Industrial Estates from Wimborne Road West to cars and vans only, with HGVs and LGVs using the bypass, I do not know. EDDC is at times over-protective of green belt areas, denying householders limited development of their own property. If they give up this proposed piece of green belt, how will they defend their limited development policy, or will it open the floodgates?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP24	Disagree	The land SW of Blunt's Farm is a well-established recreational area and has an active support group 'Friends Of Cannon Hill'. There are nesting birds using this land and also slow worms. The land is within Green Belt, also not mentioned in the plan is that the land contains part of the Castlemain Trailway and the National Cycling Network (route 256). Any redevelopment of this site will have an environmental and traffic impact in that the established and regular users will have to drive to alternative locations. The current access road to the Uddens Industrial estate is currently close to capacity with employee's vehicles and a combination of various goods vehicles including HGV. I am not convinced the plan makes the case for this area to be considered / used especially as residents can also use the existing Millhams Tip which is some 3 miles from this location.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP25	Disagree	As a Stapehill resident I and others have to contend with the noise, dust and traffic generated by the Ferndown Industrial Estate, which will become worse with the development of Cobham Gate (which residents objected to, and whose objections the council ignored). With a Waste Site on the estate this will only make the noise, dust and traffic worse than what it is at the moment plus we will have added smells. To reduce the amount of the estimated future waste then stop the over development of Ferndown / Stapehill area	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP31	Comment	The proposed site would be totally inadequate for the facilities being proposed. With 100 plus lorries a day and 100,000 cars per year using the facility this would cause gridlock on an already overwhelmed road structure. The A31 and surrounding roads are already under a consultation programme on <a href="http://www.highways.gov.uk/route-strategies">www.highways.gov.uk/route-strategies</a> . You should also note that the woodland is a natural habitat for woodland bats and many other species. The woods are used not only by dog walkers, horse riders and children using the wooden carvings provided by a local dog walker. If the A31 was improved and access was available then perhaps the brown site at the far end of Ferndown industrial estate could be used utilising the police station round a bout	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP35	Disagree	1. . . . The use of the land to the SW of Blunts Farm for a Waste Plant is wholly unsuitable (as is its use for a Gypsy & Traveller Transit Site). The area identified is Cannon Hill Plantation (South) also known locally as Uddens Woodland. It is a key community resource, a green space for those working on the estate, users of the Castleman Trailway, dog walkers, horse riders, bike riding, children's play, wildlife and general walking. 2. As much as I would like the Blunts Farm area to remain as pasture, I appreciate the need for the provision of B1 (Office and Light Industrial), B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Warehousing and Distribution) employment uses. As well as ancillary support services, such as cafes. We support EDDC Core Strategy for this site. The Blunts Farm site is much more appropriate for expanding the Ferndown Industrial estate to provide more job opportunities for skilled workers. 3. Any development of the Blunts Farm site for whatever purpose should incorporate a sizable buffer zone to the south west. Ideally the area from Uddens Drive to the current boundary of Blunts Farm. A heathland habitat scheme would suit this buffer zone. 4. Any development of Blunts Farm should be accessed from Ferndown Industrial Estate (or possibly directly off the A31). Uddens Drive is not suitable for this purpose.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP36	Disagree	As a resident of Wimborne, I feel that the existing HRC works well. I have now used it for almost 6 years as a very convenient and well managed facility. There is some queuing at busy times but this is not normally excessive and is justified by the convenience of the HRC for Wimborne residents. The proposed new site at Blunts Farm would require Wimborne householders to cross the A31 at Canford Bottom roundabout, which is frequently congested and this new site would only add to traffic flows. I am against any change to the existing site, but if this has to happen, any new facility should be on the Wimborne side of the A31. I also agree with other comments expressed regarding these proposals, which seem to be more for the convenience of the Council, rather than the needs of householders. Waste management is a key issue and over some years, householders have been encouraged to recycle and dispose of waste in a responsible manner. Nothing should be done which will make this more difficult.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP41	Disagree	The land to the SW of Blunts farm was not included in the original consultation document but has been added in now. It is well managed by the Friends of the Woods, a group set up to help protect this valuable greenbelt land from potential development into a traveller site. It is well used by walkers, runners, cyclists and horse riders as well as the general public as the only open space for Stapehill residents. Blunts Farm itself is designated employment land and therefore should be considered ahead of the woodland (with access ONLY from A31 or Ferndown Ind Estate) which is home to many species of birds, reptiles and other animals. The Castleman Trailway, designated cycle route and bridleway run through the site, there is no mention as to how people using these tracks would access the bridge over the A31 (which is in itself a public bridleway) In close proximity to the site are smallholdings, a livery yard with 20+ horses, children's nursery as well as the houses both in Chestnut Grove and those adjacent to Stapehill Farm. One of the proposed access routes via Uddens Drive is totally unsuitable. Already it is very dangerous at the junction with Wimborne Rd as lorries swing round on the wrong side of the road when entering the Drive from Wimborne Direction. The number of times i have nearly been hit head on both in my car and on horseback is scary. Once you get past the industrial estate there is no foot/cycle/horse path. If your figures are right of the numbers of vehicles that will use the site, that equates to 270 cars a day over 365 days of the year. Seriously do you think Uddens Drive will cope with this?????. I work close to the Brook Rd site and the dust/smell/flies at times is disgusting all of which are forms of pollution for the local residents along with noise pollution. Surely the Council should be considering areas where there is existing commercial development, good access or brownfield sites sitting dormant, for instance the land adjacent to the Ferndown Police station which has lain dormant and unused for as many years as the bypass has been there. I would ask the councillors who are in favour of this site to visit it and consider the lives of the locals using their only parish open site for recreation and exercise, the wildlife, the poor access from uddens Drive and the local resident's homes. I would add i am not one of those living near the site but have enjoyed the relative peacefulness at Stapehill Farm where I have kept my horse at livery for 25 years.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP43	Disagree	I simply cannot believe Cannon hill woods south is once again under threat. A little pocket of woodland in a built up area which is home to an abundance of wildlife and is a tranquil space for family recreational activities such as walking, cycling, running and horse riding. We fend off plans for gravel extraction and gypsy sites to now be faced with a waste treatment plant, surely greenbelt should stay as greenbelt not to be built on when the council feels it can. If this is given the go ahead it would: - *take away a safe and pleasant route which is used by residents to access Cannon hill Woods North (Colehill side), *cause horrendous congestion on Uddens Drive (I can envisage queuing cars and lorries back onto Stapehill Road at busy periods!) and add to that the noise and pollution this would in turn would cause. *the access simply is not be suitable from Stapehill Road (at present it is an accident waiting to happen with lorries struggling to make the turn from Stapehill Road) *be detrimental to the many species of wildlife that reside in the woodland. * cause effect to the numerous properties in close proximity to this proposed site - Noise and smells from the industrial estate already carry across to these properties and this would be exaggerated further. I am a Ferndown resident and use either Millhams or Brook Road waste centres with minimal fuss, therefore I cannot get my head around the need for another plant in Ferndown?? Please leave us with this pocket of greenbelt land for future generations to enjoy!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP44	Disagree	I simply cannot believe Cannon hill woods south is once again under threat. A little pocket of woodland in a built up area which is home to an abundance of wildlife and is a tranquil space for family recreational activities such as walking, cycling, running and horse riding. We fend off plans for gravel extraction and gypsy sites to now be faced with a waste treatment plant, surely greenbelt should stay as greenbelt not to be built on when the council feels it can. If this is given the go ahead it would: - *take away a safe and pleasant route which is used by residents to access Cannon hill Woods North (Colehill side), *cause considerable congestion on Uddens Drive (I can envisage queuing cars and lorries back onto Stapehill Road at busy periods!) and add to that the noise and pollution this would in turn would cause. *the access simply is not be suitable from Stapehill Road (at present it is an accident waiting to happen with lorries struggling to make the turn from Stapehill Road) *be detrimental to the many species of wildlife that reside in the woodland. * cause effect to the numerous properties in close proximity to this proposed site - Noise and smells from the industrial estate already carry across to these properties and this would be exaggerated further. I am a Ferndown resident and use either Millhams or Brook Road waste centres with minimal fuss, therefore I cannot get my head around the need for another plant in Ferndown?? Please leave us with this pocket of greenbelt land for future generations to enjoy!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP48	Disagree	<p>The land SW of Blunt's Farm is a well-established recreational area and has an active support group 'Friends Of Cannon Hill'. There are nesting birds using this land and also slow worms. The land is within Green Belt, also not mentioned in the plan is that the land contains part of the Castleman Trailway and the National Cycling Network (route 256). Any redevelopment of this site will have an environmental and traffic impact in that the established and regular users will have to drive to alternative locations. The current access road to the Uddens Industrial estate is currently close to capacity with employee's vehicles and a combination of various goods vehicles including HGV. I am not convinced the plan makes the case for this area to be considered / used especially as residents can also use the existing Millhams Tip which is some 3 miles from this location. I simply cannot believe Cannon hill woods south is once again under threat. A little pocket of woodland in a built up area which is home to an abundance of wildlife and is a tranquil space for family recreational activities such as walking, cycling, running and horse riding. We fend off plans for gravel extraction and gypsy sites to now be faced with a waste treatment plant, surely greenbelt should stay as greenbelt not to be built on when the council feels it can.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP51	Disagree	<p>I have read with disbelief and absolute horror about the proposals to locate a Household Recycling Centre together with a Bulky Waste Transfer and Treatment Facility serving, it seems, not only the local area but Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset on land comprising Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands, Dorset. This proposal must not be allowed to become a reality. This unspoilt area of green belt woodland and open areas is enjoyed for quiet rural recreation by many people of all ages, not just those whose houses adjoin it, but a large number of people from surrounding communities without the benefit of such a space. They appreciate the efforts of the strong band of dedicated Friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands supporters who help to keep it in good order for the enjoyment of all. In addition it provides home and shelter for many species of wildlife. Apart from the proposed facilities taking away a much valued amenity area, access could only be off the A31 single carriageway Ferndown bypass, a very busy road which is an important access to Wimborne and Dorset generally. Wimborne does not deserve to become known as the town just past the waste disposal depot. The current access to and egress from Uddens Drive is not good at present and has been an accident scene. The volume and type of traffic this proposal would generate would make this extremely dangerous and any traffic lights or roundabout would make the traffic holdups on this road totally unacceptable, so close to the recent Canford Bottom hamburger junction, which already can come to a standstill at busy times. By their very nature facilities of the sort proposed should not be located on amenity land close to residential areas, but in an area of industrial use. A far more suitable site would be adjacent to the large roundabout at the start of the Ferndown Industrial Estate just off the A31. This roundabout is mainly used for lorry parking but could easily provide an access point to a waste facility which would not be visible from the A31 Ferndown bypass. I note that this deplorable proposal has been agreed for consultation by the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals and Waste Advisory Committee and is therefore an early example of how the green belt areas of Dorset would be under threat if a single Unitary Authority were to be formed for Dorset. Bournemouth and Poole do not have a good record of preserving green areas and have now all but run out of open land on which to build. The large towns would wield their weight at the expenses of rural Dorset and the whole character of Dorset as a delightful area of countryside would be under extreme threat. If it is necessary for Authorities to join together it should be with those of like character and interests, rural areas linking with other rural regions and the larger towns joining together. A mix of the two would be a recipe for severe difficulties.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP54	Disagree	<p>I wish to strongly object to the proposed waste plant at Uddens Woodlands/ Cannon Hill South. I regularly walk through this area to access Cannon Hill on the other side of the bypass, it's a quiet beautiful area that saves those of us living on this side of the woods having to walk around the hideous Canford Bottom Roundabout and up to Colehill to get there. I don't need to walk along any roads at all as I can use the Castleman Trail ,which runs behind my home, to access the south side of the woods, and then cross the bypass to the other side. I live on Wimborne Rd West and the traffic here is already dreadful with the huge Ferndown industrial estate and its lorries vans and cars just up the road. We also have to contend with the massive amount of traffic using Canford Bottom Roundabout all day and the knock on effects from that. To add that volume of extra traffic using a waste plant just up the road would be complete madness and lead to us having an unacceptable and huge upsurge in traffic volume plus the smells associated with a huge chimney and rubbish rotting. Take it somewhere well away from our already compromised homes and roads PLEASE!!!!</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP57	Disagree	Cannot believe that the Council are considering this area. Reason the land has less value than other areas!!. How can you put a value on the right of people in built up areas to be able to walk, walk their dogs and ride in comparative safety and enjoy the wildlife in the process. This land deserves to be protected for the future. Also that area is totally unsuitable for the type of vehicles that would be using it.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP64	Disagree	I am writing to oppose fully any development of the Cannon Hill Wood site for your waste disposal plans on any Green Belt land. The fact this is your preferred site shows a great deal of disconnection from the local community who are already opposed to the Travellers site proposed there. Or any other development on Green Belt. Please could you confirm what future plans you or the council have for the development of the Brook Road site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP66	Disagree	We strongly disagree with this proposed site. Firstly we would like to say that there has NOT been a transparent democratic process with this proposal. We remember marching from Ferndown to the Ferndown Industrial Estate several years ago with hundreds of others objecting to this same site. It was rejected then. Now it has been resurrected without us knowing about it. We have only found out about it from the Echo newspaper. We would like to know why we haven't been informed about it otherwise. It would appear this proposal is being levered in by the back door. Our objections are the same as they were originally. Firstly where we live [and hundreds of other homes] is directly in line to prevailing winds with the proposed incineration plant chimney and concern over pollution. [ We are very cynical of assurances that the technology will prevent carcinogenic fumes] Secondly the traffic proposals for access to the proposed site from existing local roads is not very practical and will greatly increase traffic, noise and pollution. Thirdly it is not known how access will be provided to Cannon Hill plantation and the existing National Cycle Route.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP69	Disagree	Fumes Transport Road Links Residential Properties Its been turned down before why now?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP73	Disagree	I am writing to raise my concerns about the development of a waste sit in Cannon Hill Woods. I use these woods daily with my children and am not at all happy about the prospect of waste Lorries travelling to the site or the impact it will have on a beautiful nature resource. I oppose this strongly please find an alternative site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP75		I also disagree with the use of this land which borders the bridle ways and rural area of ferndown. The transport links to ferndown are poor at best with the options being the a31 via canford bottom roundabout or Wimborne road East both of which are heavily congested on a very regular basis and large HGV's will only add to this. Many local residents visit this area which is very pleasant and an incinerator and waste plant would seriously damage this area and I fear that the area would be avoided	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP78	Disagree	I have read the above proposal with disbelief! Apart from the fact this proposal would be on green belt land, have any of you driven through the Canford Bottom roundabout on a normal day with a normal flow of traffic? It's tricky, and in rush hours and summer time when it's a main tourist route it's practically impossible so to add 100,000 cars plus associated lorries to that mix is madness. I understand there is an additional bulky waste transfer and treatment facility also planned for the site so that would mean even more lorries coming from Bournemouth, Poole and East Dorset. And does this term mean an incinerator will be involved? That would cause pollution and thus a damage to health in a built up area. I think whoever thought up this idea should have a serious re-think.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP87	Disagree	<p>It has been brought to our notice that there is a proposal to make Uddens forestry the main waste vehicle depot with facilities for recycling household waste. Bulky waste transfer and treatment facility and taking waste from Bournemouth, Poole as well as East Dorset with the possibility to build an incinerator with an estimated 40m chimney. I cannot understand how the environmental services could even consider the site of Uddens Forestry for this purpose. As a friend of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodland and using the site of great recreational importance, for all members of the public, seems inconceivable that you could even consider this site of great beauty and ecological importance. A lot of work has been invested by a troop of volunteers to make this site a place of tranquillity to enjoy all the diverse flora and fauna the site has to offer. Looking at the petitions signed when a proposal to build a gypsy and traveller site, you will be aware of how many people feel very passionately that we need a space for resident and visitors to the area to enjoy. This site is not only used by the families and people of Staplehill, but also Cannon Hill, Ferndown, Longham, Cannon Hill and north of the bypass. It is also used by the people working in the industrial estates in the area to get a much needed break. If such a motion is passed, it will be taking away a much loved and used site leaving no substitute. This proposal will also have a massive impact on the health of the residents if a chimney is built to burn industrial waste. The fallout fumes from the proposed 40m high incinerator chimney could jeopardise fresh air for miles, encompassing schools, housing and industrial units, potentially leading to health issues for all. I will be proposing that this should be taken up with the Court of Human Rights if this proposal gets the go ahead. With a proposal to build 6000 new homes in the area, we need more recreational land, not less. The sustainable alternative natural green spaces are all very well but they are not mature natural areas. We have used Uddens Forestry for the last 40 years and hope that our children and grandchildren will also enjoy these wonderful spaces. This proposal will also impact on the Castleman Trailway used frequently by cyclists, walkers, and horse riders. This route is also used by workers on the industrial estate as a safe alternative way of getting to work. The road infrastructure which would serve this waste unit would be swamped by an estimated 100 lorries per day, every day of the year, 24 hours a day. This in addition to the 100,000 cars using Brook Road currently, and would transfer to Uddens drive. I urge all concerned in considering this proposal to please think very seriously on the consequences passing such a plan would be. As mentioned, since we moved to Staplehill some 40 years ago, we have been plagued with so many proposals to ruin this lovely community with its Forestry. From a proposal by pass along what is now the Castleman Trailway to the traveller's campsite. This is not a suitable area for any of these proposals. Please consider the lives you will be impacting with this proposal and the recreation area we have worked so hard to protect for generations to come.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP89		<p>This area is totally unsuitable for waste disposal. It is Green Belt land which is widely used by residents for recreation. It also allows pedestrian access to Cannon Hill plantation on the north side of the A31 via the footbridge. Canford Bottom Roundabout is already a bottleneck and the increased traffic will exacerbate this.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP90	Comment	<p>Whilst I appreciate that you may have to find a new site for the above I have to express my concern at your proposed choice of site. The access and egress off Uddens Drive to the A.31 has caused problems in the past and with the estimated extra movements of cars and lorries this will only get worse. No doubt, you have taken this into account but I felt I had to make the point,</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP97	Disagree	I am not happy with the proposal for the huge waste plant at Cannon Hill South as I live close to it! We have enough traffic from the canford bottom roundabout and any more would result in further disruption to Stapehill and Ferndown. I also do not wish for my child to inhale anything from the proposed 40m chimney. Please rethink your actions and construct it elsewhere	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP99			Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP102	Disagree	I am strongly objecting to the proposal to put bulky and residual waste treatment facility, HRC and a waste vehicle depot in the areas of Blunts Farm, land adjacent to Blunts Farm or Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates on these grounds; The close proximity of residential areas and schools could prove hazardous. There is a question mark over where and there could be potential harm caused to people from the long term effects of any waste burning facility. Despite regulations it is questionable as to whether the companies who run these installations are as rigorous as they should be in applying the safety measures. They may be tall chimneys but what goes up must come down again. The prevailing winds mostly come from the west bringing smells and fumes over the whole of Ferndown. Up to 100 HGVs on Ferndowns roads particularly Canford Bottom roundabout per day, it's a ridiculous proposition, the area would be in total gridlock. Apart from the noise and odour on surrounding areas. Why should Ferndown take the whole of Dorset's waste. Its noticeable it would be far away from Dorchester. The land adjacent to Blunts Farm is picturesque woodlands. I have seen lizards, snakes and many varied species of birds there. It is frequently used by local people for recreational purposes with access to the Castleman trail way	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP105	Disagree	I am devastated that you could even consider Cannon Hill South for a Waste Disposal Unit. These woods are in constant use by the local community for dog walking, cycling, schools use it regularly for nature walks with children and it is always busy. We are told to exercise more and you are thinking of taking away this amenity. Why do you keep trying to take this special site away from us? We had talk of a Gypsy Camp and now you are talking about a Waste Plant. Please reconsider, this is not a suitable area for such intrusive use. I look forward to you making a more caring and sensible decision.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP108		This beautiful area of woodland that is a pleasure for all locals and visitors alike and should be left as it is and NOT changed in any way especially the proposal to put a waste plant here. NO THANK YOU.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP110	Comment	This type of project should not be undertaken anywhere near residential settlements, Ferndown has a population of some 23000 people. I live on Wimborne Road and many days the road is near grid lock especially at rush hours. The Industrial estates are set to expand which will create even more cars and lorries. There are many areas of land areas of land north and west of Wimborne where population is small. Placing this facility at Uddens Wood would mean the loss of a beautiful public open space. Wimborne Road would be unable to cope with the increased traffic. More noise and pollution for those living nearby. I have lived here for nearly 50 years and seen the area expand massively. Why do we have to put up with this on our doorstep there is masses of land north of the Ferndown by pass. You could even use the now redundant Council Offices at Furzehill!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP114	Disagree	As a resident of the immediate vicinity and an active member of the Cannon hill Woodlands Group it is with great dismay that I read that our woodlands are being targeted again for development. There are numerous other sites in the consultation some of which the land owners are actively encouraging the waste facilities because they dovetail into already existing businesses. The woodlands are a valuable leisure resource and form part of the GREEN BELT. The woodlands group have had many work parties over the past five years improving the woods much of which has been funded by Dorset County Council. It would be very disappointing if all of our hard work and council funding were to go to waste. The volume of traffic in the surrounding area is already at saturation point so come on planners do the right thing and drop this site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP117	Disagree	<p>I wish to express my views against the plan to build a waste plant (site reference WP01) in Uddens Woodland. This area is a valuable community resource that would be devastating to all to loose. Enjoyed by walkers, dog walkers, cyclists, riders and more, surely this site should not be the preferred site for a waste plant!?! I grew up, like many others did, exploring these woods and growing very fond of them. It would bring myself and many more people a great deal of sadness and anger to see this woodland turn into a waste plant, polluting the air, destroying habitat and bringing traffic and noise to the area. This woodland is used so much by all the people who live in the surrounding area. Ferndown, Longham, Stapehill, Canford Bottom and Colehill. For the people of Ferndown, Longham and Stapehill, it is a means of accessing the wider recreational area without having to cross Canford Bottom roundabout. For some of our residents they just walk in Cannon Hill South and never cross to the north of the bypass, but for many others it is the only way on foot that they can access a wider area. If this access to our woodlands is removed where else can the people south of the bypass walk? The walk by the Stour is for fine weather only. Otherwise there is Ferndown Common but this is very wet in bad weather and takes as long to dry out as by the river. Cannon Hill South is an all-weather walking area. Not only can people walk but they can ride bikes and horses too, wheel chair users are able to negotiate the paths and enjoy a little nature. With almost 6000 new homes planned in the Core Strategy we need more recreational land, not less. The Sustainable Alternate natural green Spaces (SANGS) are all very well but they are not mature natural areas. I hope you will listen to the views of the people of this area.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP120	Disagree	<p>Please can you confirm that there will be no refuse site built within Cannon Hill woods in Colehill.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP123	Disagree	<p>I am writing to you on behalf of my family and many of the residents local to Cannon Hill South (Uddens Woodland) and the proposed Waste Plant for this area. Myself and hundreds of the local residents fiercely oppose this plan to turn the woods from a beautiful countryside retreat to a development that will bring pollution, noise, flies, vermin and mass traffic. I will ensure that all my contacts in the national press and TV are aware of these plans, and if necessary to highlight what is proposed by the council in order to stop this shameful plan to turn a beautiful piece of land into a concrete monster. As you will have gathered from this email, myself and my fellow residents are 100% against this Waste Plant (or indeed anything else similar). And I will fight tooth and nail to ensure this land remains untouched and free of these disturbing proposed plans.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WHP126	Disagree	I wholly object to this planned development. Such a lovely wooded area with beautiful wildlife. I use it often for walking and photography, cycling and walking my dog, so do many others. Absolutely ludicrous!!!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WHP130	Disagree	Having read your report on the potential waste plant in Blunts Farm Ferndown , once again you do not appear to care about the Welfare of the Ferndown residents of EDDC . If this project was to go ahead it would probably effect the health of residents of Ferndown this type of Plant should be built in a rural area, not close to housing estates ,this is how they do it in Germany .We would also be overloaded with excessive traffic as .the roads in this area have not been upgraded for 30 years and Ferndown is continually log jammed by the amount of traffic passing through and around it I am also concerned about the , casegenics that will be put into the atmosphere from that huge chimney .This project appears to be the same as the appeal that you lost in 2006 Therefore I would be unable to support this project.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WHP138	Disagree	My son attends school adjacent to the land proposed for this rubbish facility and uses the woods regularly for walks, to play, look for insects and have picnics. He came home from nursery telling me about a sign that they had seen whilst out on a walk that day. The sign, according to him, said that "some people wanted to cut down the trees". He felt very passionately about telling them to stop. He has asked me to write a letter to the "naughty people who want to build the tower" Below is Harry"s letter in his own words; STOP! I don't want you to knock the trees down. Don't build it because we won't be able to go in the woods anymore or have our teddy bears picnics When the smoke comes out of the chimney all the insects will die. The smoke will make me cough and the rubbish will be stinky and smelly. We play in the woods and find insects. There won't be anywhere for the animals to live because it will be full of rubbish.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WHP139	Disagree	I strongly oppose the use of this outstanding natural area to burn waste and create a rubbish 'dump'. Not only are the environmental impacts evident with the destruction of beautiful woodland, extra chaos of additional lorries and vehicles on the already over laded A31, fumes, smoke and stench of a tip and furnace, but this site is sandwiched between densely populated areas of Ferndown, Uddens and Colehill. My children attend the Barn Nursery School which backs onto your proposed/preferred site, the health impact greatly concerns us and you should reconsider your site location. We also live within a mile of this site and if you do live locally you will know that there are strong winds in the area due to the topography, we (or our close neighbours in Wimborne, Ferndown & Uddens) will suffer the stench and toxic smoke from the site. By choosing this location for such a huge site, you would be taking away the right of a healthy life for thousands of local residents, not to mention at least 6 schools within a 2 mile radius.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WVP142	Disagree	We would like to object to using uddens / blunts farm for waste. We are concerned regarding air pollution. Traffic pollution with the additional lorries. Loss of woodland green space wildlife. We object to this near our homes and schools. The page has flooded in the past so unsafe for more lorries.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WVP176	Disagree	My family have walked and played in these woods for the past 30+ years and continue to do so on a daily basis. The idea that such a beautiful place could be decimated by the plan to turn it into a rubbish and recycling centre is absolutely appalling. If it wasn't bad enough that East Dorset waste would be deposited there I understand Bournemouth and Poole will also be using the site. There appear to be plenty of brown field sites that could be used with much better transport links including areas around Hurn Airport and the Bournemouth Hospital site but instead it is proposed to decimate this outstanding and beautiful woodland which I feel is criminal and I am totally opposed to	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WVP268	Disagree	This proposed site is going to be located in an area of outstanding GREENBELT of woodland and heath. The area is in constant use by walkers, cyclist and horse riders as well as families using the picnic areas. The Friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands do an amazing job of maintaining the area and looking after the area and wildlife. To gain access to this site via the A31 will be impossible during the morning, evening and at weekends due to the traffic jam that the residents currently endure on a regular basis and which is worse throughout the summer, when we become prisoners in our own streets due to the grid lock on the road. At present, sitting in the traffic jam looking at the heath and woodland is preferable to looking at a recycling centre with incinerator with an approx. 40ft chimney, which is not the view to offer visitors to the area. Access via Wimborne Road East would be used to avoid the jam on the A31 and trying to cross the Canford Bottom roundabout which already backs up both ways without the additional traffic trying to drop off waste will become impassable. Any increase of people fly tipping around the area due to traffic jams is also of concern. As previously mentioned in the first consultation document having purchased our property with pylons in close proximity and throughout the area was our choice, but having our first mortgage application refused due to the pylons by Northern Rock (who lent to anyone), it will give problems for future mortgages with pylons and a recycling plant and incinerator all within 250m of a lot of properties. The dust of mineral extraction, heavy goods lorries, more traffic and a loss of green spaces and woodland would be disastrous for the area. Please leave this area alone as we already have an increase in traffic due to the expansion of the industrial estate.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP182	Disagree	<p>I am writing to express my concern and opinions as requested in the article I read in the Stour and Avon Magazine Woodland under treat “ people urged to give their views Having lived locally within this area for over fourteen and a half years I feel it is important to express my concerns and explain why I object to Cannon Hill South Woodlands being used as; Waste vehicle depot HRC Bulky waste transfer and treatment facility I believe that many local residents and individuals who use these woodlands on a daily basis will feel as passionately as I do in protecting a peaceful, unspoilt natural environment now and for future generations to enjoy. The thought of this area being spoilt and developed as proposed is unthinkable. A chimney 40m in height polluting the air will have a detrimental impact on the woodland and natural habitats will be destroyed. Local people, dog walkers, cyclists, holiday makers and businesses will no doubt be severely affected and this will in turn impact on the surrounding community. Others comments highlight the importance of recreational space and this is an extremely valid point. The government along with the NHS and many businesses has for an increasing number of years tried to encourage individuals to keep fit and healthy, promoting a lifestyle that combines regular exercise and a balanced diet. By going ahead with these proposals will mean that many people who regularly take pleasure in walking, jogging, exercising, cycling, playing, bird watching and enjoying the woodland will no longer be able to enjoy the tranquillity and breath the fresh woodland air. The friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill have worked as a team over the years to ensure that this area is maintained, equipping it with picnic benches, clearing pathways and keeping it litter free because it is an area that is loved and enjoyed by people of all ages. I hope that all their hard work has not been in vain. I realise that a site needs to be established but would urge you not to earmark Cannon Hill South because of the following; It is the only area similar to Moors Valley that people who live in Wimborne and Ferndown can access by foot and one that provides a relaxed environment “a natural, unspoilt area Increased traffic noise pollution, air pollution. Would impact hugely on an already busy area We need to maintain this beautiful woodland area. The forestry commission have cleared trees and new saplings have been planted It would be devastating to lose such a pleasant woodland area that is enjoyed and loved by a large local population. I do hope another suitable site can be found.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP198	Disagree	I am writing to express my concern about the proposed building of a major waste processing plant on woodland in Ferndown. Yet again it would appear that the issue that creates problems is not being addressed but how to solve the problem created. The council has created many examples of this, the most obvious is Canford Bottom Round-a- bout. Polio was attacked by a vaccine, government and councils would have created the best iron lung to solve the same issue. Building a bigger waste site and then having to truck waste from a greater area, is not going to solve the issue of increasing waste. Building it on greenbelt in an area already blighted by traffic congestion may resolve an issue in the short term but will create so many other issues that will take much longer to sort out. Since the introduction of charges to get rid of waste and the closing off of certain waste centres to residents living in the wrong area has created an increase in fly tipping. Making it harder still to get rid of waste and charging residents through local tax will not help. The disposal of waste needs to be close to the point of production to encourage its responsible disposal. Secondly reducing the amount of packaging through legislation and the allocation of the cost of disposal to the producer will have a greater affect long term on the issue than building bigger and better incinerators.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP202	Disagree	I am writing to strongly object to the proposal for a Waste Plant to be erected at the above site. This is the Castleman Trail which is used by many walkers and cyclists, myself included, on a regular basis. This is a lovely scenic woodland in the middle of a built up area, which you are thinking of destroying plus the increased traffic, e.g. heavy lorries, on our already congested Canford Bottom roundabout on the A31. Is the council mad! Are they intent on covering our natural woodlands with air and noise pollution plus vermin? We are being bombarded with houses being built on every spare piece of land in this lovely area. Our small woodland is a place where our community can get away from the constant traffic noise. I plead with the council to reconsider!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP204	Disagree	I would like to strongly object to the proposal to put bulky and residual waste treatment facility, HRC and a waste vehicle depot in the areas of Blunts Farm, land adjacent to Blunts Farm or Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates for many reasons, including: * My family and I use the area for family walks, our friends walk their dogs there and my children have a safe and clean place to ride their bikes. * I use the Castleman Trailway to cycle to Ringwood and Moors Valley due to the fact that it is safe but also because of the beautiful scenery and wildlife you see. If the proposal goes ahead at this site, the increase in traffic will not only pollute the air but will also remove the enjoyment out of this part of the cycle and drive away wildlife. * We moved to the area less than 5 years ago, attracted by the easy access to unspoilt woodland on our doorstep. Since moving, all we have heard is proposals to change this natural resource. * With ever increasing traffic on our roads, can our local infrastructure really support the extra burden this proposal would result in? More important than the infrastructure, will our health suffer as a direct result of increased fumes from both extra lorries and incinerators?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP211	Disagree	I write to strongly object to the proposed household recycling centres, bulky waste treatment and residual waste treatment plant at Uddens Woodland/Cannon Hill South/Blunts Farm. I regularly walk my dog through this beautiful area of woodland and often use as a safe access to Cannon Hill Plantation on the other side of the bypass. I frequently encounter walkers and bike riders using this woodland to traverse the Castleman Trailway, some of which have travelled some distance to enjoy the area. It is a well-used community asset and haven for wildlife. The Friends of Uddens & Cannon Hill Woodlands do a wonderful job of maintained the woodland for the whole community's enjoyment. The suggestion of an incinerator with a 40m chimney being constructed on this greenbelt site is abhorrent and totally unnecessary when there are vastly more suitable sites within already industrialised zones. Furthermore, the proposed access via Uddens Drive is not suitable for the volume and type of traffic this proposal would generate. Also, the extra vehicles that would have to use the Canford Bottom roundabout to access the site would make, what is already a continuous situation of congestion most of the time, intolerable. I sincerely hope that the views if the local residents are taken seriously and this proposals is refused.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP214	Disagree	If access is required using the by-pass A31 or old A31 via Canford Bottom the roundabout would need to be redeveloped to handle the enormous extra traffic at a very high cost. Uddens drive a country lane. A cul-de-sac abutted by the by-pass and old A31. Only entrance exits to trading estate and Chestnut grove and the farm. Time money and great effort has been put into making this small triangle of woodland into a leisure facility for the surrounding Ferndown area Prevailing winds blow across towards Ferndown Schools and the population of Ferndown and Stapehill The enormous amount of extra traffic to access this small triangle area would cause stress to those who live and work in the area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP223	Disagree	This green belt land is an essential part of Ferndown, for recreation and natural beauty, and one of the many reasons people love living here. The council/government have already ruined our road infrastructure with the terrible mess they have made over the Canford Bottom Roundabout 'improvements' that have made the traffic congestion worse and has also increased the number of accidents on the road. Surely, it does not take a genius to work out that should this waste plant go ahead at Cannon hill Plantation then the road congestion would be 10 fold and utterly unbearable to the residents and those driving through our town? It is bad enough when all the caravans start coming through in the holiday season but to increase this with the massive lorries belching out disgusting fumes, on top of the pollution that the plant itself will create, will only reduce the value of everyone's properties on top of making driving around Ferndown completely unbearable. I appreciate that the waste plant needs to be built and will be used by all but surely it needs to be in a less populated position that will not impact crowded roads further???	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP226	Disagree	I strongly disagree with the proposed site allocation in Wimborne. The proposed site is wholly unsuitable for numerous reasons: 1) It its current state the site is a valuable local resources for residents and visitors, it would be a great loss to the local community 2) As a site for flora and fauna it is equally valuable and to lose this to a waste site would be insult to a considerable injury 3) The effect on the local environment, especially so close to homes, schools and places of work would be intolerable " noise pollution and the negative effect on air quality, both caused by activity at the proposed site and from a very high number of vehicles coming and going would be unacceptable 4) The area of Wimborne and Ferndown has a good reputation as a place to live and visit, to stick a monstrous waste site in the middle of this would be damaging to the areas reputation and desirability 5) Traffic congestion is already a significant problem at Canford Bottom round about and the roads radiating from it for some distance. It is common for there to be significant traffic congestion around this area, making commutes to work and journeys to use local businesses, facilitates and schools increasingly problematic with the current level of traffic. It is not uncommon for journeys to take 4 or 5 times longer than they should due to traffic congestion. This becomes significantly worse during the summer months. To add to this level of traffic, especially with large vehicles for waste, would render the area completely dysfunctional. This would be damaging for local businesses and leave residents unable to go about normal day to day life. That all this is proposed for a location that would have an effect on the A31 which is the main access route into the South West is inexplicable. The increased congestion would significantly increase local pollution to unacceptable levels and be damaging to the health of local residents.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP227	Disagree	I am writing to BEG you NOT to build the waste recycling/vehicle depot site in the Cannon Hill/Uddens area. This is a beautiful green belt woodland that has been used by my family & others for over 45 years for recreation & education. It is the home of grass snakes (one was seen a few days ago), slow worms, lizards, hedgehogs & any number of birds & bats. Apart from the eradication of wildlife that will take place, it will be a source of bio hazards for the local children (there is a nursery school less than a quarter of a mile away) - do you really want to take the risk of local children developing cancer because of this siting? PLEASE look at the long term effects this will have, apart from the short term gross overcrowding of the local roads which are already brought to a total standstill at peak times. On the web site it says that this is 'paddocks' - it is NOT! It is beautiful mature woodland.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP231	Disagree	Noise and Odour Traffic congestion De-value Ferndown & Wimborne Desirability to live in and around	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP234	Disagree	<p>We would like to strongly object to the proposal of the above (along with the proposed sand and gravel extraction and also traveller's site). We think that the amount of expected lorries per day would be hugely detrimental to the area swamping the already heavily congested roads, especially Canford Bottom, along, of course, with the cars and vans going there with waste instead of Brook Rd. Can the road infrastructure actually accommodate all this extra traffic? We understand that there would be an incinerator chimney which could obviously pollute the air for miles. Areas where people live, work and go to school, risking breathing problems and health issues for all, making this lovely area not so wonderful any more. We must also not forget the woodland which is loved and used by so many. What a blight on the landscape to have chimney pollution, the heavy continual traffic and the noise when we need more recreational areas for all the proposed housing as planned in the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Individual</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre &amp; Depot</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WP237</p>	<p>In response to the Additional and Emerging Waste Site Allocations (WP01) i.e. forestry land to the south west and adjacent Blunts Farm, I want to express my objections to the proposal for a Waste Treatment Plant on or anywhere near this area of land. In the original plan I objected to such a plant being sited at Blunts Farm so as this proposed emerging site is adjacent to Blunts Farm much of my comment applies equally to both sites. My objections are based on a number of grounds as shown below:</p> <p><b>Health and Safety</b> This proposed site is virtually central to the main population areas of Ferndown, Wimborne, and Colehill, along with others further afield such as West Moors and Wimborne which include schools and leisure facilities. It is also directly situated in the woodland amenity areas of Cannon Hill and Uddens which are widely and continuously used for recreation in many forms by local people and visitors to the area. The Castleman Trailway, a major outdoor leisure feature of the county runs directly through this area. No-one can guarantee fume free operation and with the general prevailing wind from the south west (with north easterlies quite common) no-one can guarantee the flow of emissions or the absolute level of pollutants generated from a high chimney. The landfall of pollutants close by would subject residents to long term exposure to low level pollution and in the event of a serious leakage exposure to high level pollution perhaps toxic in nature. Both these scenarios could have a serious and unacceptable effect on the health of the local people.</p> <p><b>Noise Pollution</b> It is now well known that continuous noise generated by the operations and traffic which would be bound to result from such a facility can have a serious effect on the health of people, and could make life in the vicinity of such a site unbearable.</p> <p><b>Green Belt Land</b> The land in question is Green Belt and to establish a waste site this would need to be changed. I believe this can only be done as a last resort if all other alternatives have been proved to be unsuitable. I cannot see proof positive in the plan that this is the only possible site available.</p> <p><b>Recreational Use</b> This area of land has been used for recreational purposes for many years and forms part of the Cannon Hill Woodlands which is recognised by the Forestry Commission (FC) website as a valuable area for recreation. The woodlands are used by the people of Ferndown, Longham, Stapehill, Canford Bottom and Colehill. It is also quite common when walking there to meet people from far afield. The Castleman Trailway is an all-weather track enabling people to enjoy it all year round used by walkers, runners, horse riders, dog walkers, and cyclists. It is an off road alternative for many cyclists going to their work. It is used by a local nursery school as an outside activity area. Picnic tables and benches provided in more recent times persuade people to stop a while and they also encourage older people to use the woodlands. The sculptures created out of fallen/felled wood add to the enjoyment of both adults and children, and some of those working on the industrial estate use the woods in their lunch break. A great deal of work has been undertaken in Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands in conjunction with the Forestry Commission and many more people are using the area for recreation. As a result of this work a number of species of mammals and birds have been discovered - who can tell how many more undiscovered creatures there may be - the adjacent area of Whitesheet is a designated SSSI site. It should be noted also that this work has been encouraged not only by the Forestry Commission but by Dorset County Council and local authorities. In short it is an extremely valuable and well used recreational facility, and it is also a scarce one. With thousands more houses planned in the current local plan, and a further development of Blunts Farm for industrial use, this green space needs to be preserved. There is mounting evidence that experiencing the outdoors and engaging with the natural environment is good for physical and mental health and the area is shown as part of the Open Space provision for Ferndown.</p> <p><b>Drainage Land</b> drainage is complex in this area and seepage of pollutants is a major concern. Stapehill is also notorious for flooding, another major hazard if waste recovery operations were to take place here. There are concerns that if such a large area of land is stripped of trees and other vegetation flooding could be worse and may lead to other areas of the woodlands being too wet to use in bad weather.</p> <p><b>Access Denied</b> The road network in the Ferndown area is heavily used on all fronts such as the very busy A31, and the local roads such as Wimborne Road East and West. Traffic is always a problem now and the addition of much more heavy haulage and cars would simply completely overload the roads. It would be highly likely that Uddens Drive would be used to access any Waste Site which would virtually make this road unusable for pedestrians, cyclists, elderly people and children, and wheelchair users who can currently use the woodland pathways. This would result in it being almost impossible to access the remaining woodlands except from perhaps Colehill which is already very busy and no facilities for car parking for visitors to the woods.</p> <p><b>Inappropriate Impact</b> Buildings and processing plant will have an adverse impact on the area in which it is sited and as such by default will breach most of the considerations in Proposed Policy 12 - Amenity and Quality of Life. Whilst mitigations can be put in place for some of the adverse impacts, some such as air pollution, natural leakage and water drainage are much more unpredictable and uncontrollable. A chimney of the proportions suggested (30 - 40 metres high) would be a blight on the area for miles around and could not be screened by</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
---	--	--	--	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
				<p>landscaping or other screening techniques. Ferndown Industrial Estate in which the Blunts Farm site and this extended area will fall is designated an area of light industrial use in the Core Strategy. Many people work here in small industrial units; I think waste recovery could not be considered as light industrial use. At the moment the industrial, residential, and recreational open spaces sit relatively comfortably with each other. This equilibrium would be totally destroyed by the building of a waste site in this area. Conclusion A waste plant such as this should be sited as far as possible from populated or recreational areas where people obviously live, work, and gather together. Cannon Hill Woodlands and the Uddens are becoming more and more recognised as the only viable open land facility available to large numbers of people with diverse healthy recreational interests. Over the years this area of land has been 'targeted' for a number of inappropriate developments but it is quite clear that it needs to be preserved and protected for future generations.</p>	

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WHP240	Disagree	I have just received details of the proposed development at Cannon Hill South to establish a Waste Vehicle Depot, Household Recycling Centre and a Bulky Waste Transfer and Treatment Facility. There is no way I could support this development at this location. This is a valuable area of woodland and heathland which is used by many people each week and supports many examples of rare birds and animals including Nightjars and Woodcocks. The Household Recycling Centre that would replace the Brook Road site in Wimborne would bring 100.000 cars a year to this site. How would these vehicles get there? The idea of all these vehicles using Wimborne Road and travelling via Canford Bottom or Ferndown is untenable, The Canford Bottom roundabout has to be one of the worst in the country and certainly the worst in Dorset. The lack of money invested in that roundabout, leading to the lack of an underpass results in massive queues every morning and evening along Wimborne road which would get much worse, leading to those queues being present most of the day. How many hundreds and probably thousands of man hours a week are totally lost to drivers locked in these queues? We cannot afford to lose this area of important countryside, and while I have no doubt that the development suggested would benefit the county this is certainly not the place to put it.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WHP243	Disagree	We Object strongly to your future plans of the ruination of these special woods, which are an amazing facility for our local community, also the threat to the varied wild life, flora and fauna. DO NOT GO AHEAD WITH THESE PLANS.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WHP246	Disagree	I would like to express my concern over the proposed waste plant at Cannon Hill South. My family and I regularly visit this area of woodland and it is of real value to us. The health, amenity and social benefits of trees and woodland are well documented. This resource needs to be maintained for the benefit of local people. We are also concerned about the impact on traffic as the a31 is already arguably at maximum capacity. My daughter has asthma and the negative impact on air quality is also a real worry for us.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WHP250	Disagree	I would like to object to the siting of the Ferndown waste processing plant. The reasons for my objections are that I use the open space to cycle and walk my dog. I also understand there is the possibility of an incineration plant. I live within walking distance of this plant and am concerned about the health effects and potential smell and fumes arising from this. The traffic is already heavy in this area and the extra traffic from users of the site and the lorries that will be accessing this plant will only add to the congestion.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP251	Disagree	<p>I cannot understand how the Council could even consider this as a suitable site for a Household Recycling Centre and Depot. The proposed site is designated greenbelt, it is an area of lovely woodland used regularly by families, walkers etc. And has been beautifully looked after by a local group, The Friends Of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands. If a Waste facility were to be sited here, it would mean the end of a beautiful area of woodland, loss of wildlife, pollution from the waste collected and processed, and also fumes from the vehicles used to transport the waste to the proposed facility; all affecting local residents and also workers on Ferndown Industrial Estate. The number of additional HGV's and associated traffic to and from the proposed site would add significantly to the already congested roads in the Wimborne/ Colehill, Ferndown areas. The Canford Bottom roundabout is always a problem to traffic flow and there are daily delays on the A31 approaches to that roundabout and also congestion to the local roads approaching the Canford Bottom roundabout. Presumably waste from Corfe Mullen would be transported via the A31. The traffic is only going to increase substantially when the proposed new housing is built in the Wimborne area without taking into account the additional traffic movements should this proposed new Waste facility be built here. Also there are proposed new housing development sites identified for Poole and a number of those are around Merley. If those sites are developed then even more traffic will be using the A31 and accessing Canford Bottom roundabout.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Friends of Uddens &amp; Cannon Hill Woodlands</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre &amp; Depot</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WP254</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Disagree</p> <p>Thank you for giving us this opportunity to respond. We do hope you look favourably on our hopes of keeping our woodland open for everyone to enjoy. We are only going to respond quite narrowly, concentrating on the small triangle of Forestry Commission woodland to the South West of Blunts Farm which was a new site proposed in the Additional and Emerging Waste Site Allocations (WP01). We will refer to it as Cannon Hill South as it is the part of Cannon Hill but to the south of the A31. OBJECTION: THIS IS GREEN BELT So much land has been removed from the Green Belt by the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan. Most of it green fields or allotments, but this site is not only Green Belt it is also an area of woodland heavily used for recreation. There appears to be no very special circumstances to warrant the release of this Green belt land. There seems to have been no comprehensive search for alternative sites in the urban area or alternate brown field sites in the Green Belt. OBJECTION: THIS IS WIDELY USED AS RECREATIONAL LAND The people of Ferndown, Longham, Stapehill, Canford Bottom and Colehill use this patch of woodland. It is very pretty with not too much of it as a conifer plantation. It has been adopted by the local people for decades. It is used by walkers, cyclists, horse riders, wheel chair users and families. Some paths are wet in bad weather but the Castleman Trailway remains an all-weather track enabling people to enjoy it all year round. It is the only patch of woodland accessible to the South of the A31 so people do not have to drive to find space to walk. The only other space to the south of the A31 is Ferndown Common (an International Designated heath) which is not only a protected site but is so eroded and impossible to walk in wet weather unless forced to. It is the same for the Stour Valley. It does not have to be flooded to be impassable due to deep mud. The Forestry Commission (FC) website recognises the value of Cannon Hill as a whole for recreation and also mentions our patch; The southern part of Cannon Hill, south of the Ferndown Bypass, is heavily used by residents of Stapehill for dog walking. They are not quite right as people come from much further afield to use it and not just dog walkers, especially since a local community volunteer group have improved access by removing so much rhododendron growth and looking after the paths (with the approval of the FC). It is used by a local nursery school as an outside activity area. Picnic tables and benches persuade people to stop a while. There are also some sculptures created out of fallen/felled wood for the enjoyment of both adults and children. Some of those working on the industrial estate use the woods in their lunch break, vans park up for lunch time. It is very widely used, all this activity has not been recognised. With thousands of houses planned in the current local plan, and a further development of 30 hectares of the Blunts Farm site as industrial use, we need our Green Space. The Draft Sustainability Appraisal fails to mention this loss of amenity to the wider community and how important this woodland is to all of us. The Local Authorities are already looking to revise Local Plans or progress new ones. An additional 700 houses a year has been mentioned. We need to protect Open Spaces for the children. This area could serve as an informal SANG as it is. Please take this into account and protect our woodlands from development of any kind. OBJECTION: FAILS TO RECOGNISE OPEN SPACE PROVISION AND THE VALUE OF GREEN SPACES TO BOTH PHYSICAL AND MENTAL WELLBEING. This is an emerging area of study. Evaluating Health and Wellbeing Outcomes for Community Growing Programmes. We are obviously not trained experts and we do not run community farms, but we do hold monthly community volunteer parties for people to enhance the woodlands, both north and south of the A31. To quote from the introduction, Experiencing the outdoors and engaging with the natural environment is good for physical and mental health. The Community Open Spaces Newsletter 2016, Christchurch and East Dorset Councils, shows all the different areas funded and run by the joint council. We run our Cannon Hill Friends with some funding from both EDDC and DCC, but otherwise just volunteers; that makes us good value for money. The area is shown as part of the Open Space provision for Ferndown, though if I could find it on line, I am sure it must be part of Wimborne's too. OBJECTION: POSSIBLE DISRUPTION TO THE CASTLEMAN TRAILWAY This is such a vital off-road track from Poole to Ringwood with options for cyclists/walkers to hop on or off without using cars/roads to get from A to B. A waste site of any kind would put people off using it which would put more cars on the road. OBJECTION: INCREASE OF TRAFFIC ON LOCAL ROADS. It is highly unlikely that the Highways Agency would allow access directly off the A31. If Uddens Drive is used to access a Waste Site this would add to the appalling problems we already have with Wimborne Road East and West to say nothing of this charming Drive lost to development. Some of the more elderly dog walkers, or those travelling some distance, drive to the woodlands and park. It would be too difficult for them to access any woods remaining if there was too much traffic and the traffic fumes would discourage them anyhow. OBJECTION: TO TALL CHIMNEYS AND POSSIBLE POLLUTANTS The 30 to 40 meter chimney would be visible from miles around, this would introduce a look of heavy industry to a residential area. We have all grown up with Uddens and Ferndown Trading Estates but they have never had the appearance of heavy industry. The prevailing winds from the South West would have the potential to spread pollutants, both chemical and smells, over dense residential areas and local schools. This is</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
				<p>not acceptable to local people. OBJECTION TO SPOILT LOCAL LANDSCAPE It mentions a major landscape concern and then says the development would avoid development of more sensitive sites! Do people not matter? Is this the conclusion we should make? Has there been a landscape assessment? We are already losing 30 hectares of open land. Not all of it accessible as some of it was farmed. We have raised no objections during the Local Plan process as we accepted the need for more industrial land and were informally advised that there would be a wide natural area to form a barrier to protect our woodland, a wild life pond was mentioned (informally). OBJECTION TO POTENTIAL DRAINAGE PROBLEMS Cannon Hill woodlands to the South of the A31 can get very wet underfoot in periods of rain, especially over the western part of the site. There are concerns that if the vegetation/trees are removed over a large area and the area concreted over, then in wet weather any remaining woodlands would be too wet to use. OBJECTION TO THE CONCLUSION In the conclusion on this site it fails to mention the loss of amenity value for recreation and also fails to mention the Green Belt. This summarises our concerns over this emerging site. Although we have only objected to this preferred site to the South West of Blunts Farm, we do not feel that that Waste Sites are suitable in an area of dense housing.</p>	
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP257	Disagree	<p>I was astounded to hear about the plan to put a Waste Plant at Uddens Woods. We walk and use the woods every day, these woods are beautiful and have an amazing diversity of plants, trees and wildlife. Away from the ecological issues, most days, traffic on the A31 and Wimborne Road approaching Canford Bottom roundabout is at a standstill most mornings and afternoons/early evenings. Adding lorries to this is just a crazy, ridiculous idea. I cannot believe these beautiful woods are even being considered. Shame on you!!!</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP260	Disagree	<p>I am writing to you to express my disgust and outrage that these beautiful Woods are even being considered for a Waste Site. I worked for several years for East Dorset District Council and have knowledge of planners. In my mind, if they actually removed their backsides from their chairs in their comfy offices from whichever Council they are at and actually walked and strolled around these Woods, they would actually realise what a beautiful Woods these are. Sitting in offices and maybe carrying out a site meeting in their Mini Bus will not give them any idea at all of the beauty and wildlife which live in these Woods. Besides the pollution, and mess which is involved in this so called Waste Plan, there is also the traffic to consider, which again, probably hasn't even been considered along this road approaching the Canford Bottom Roundabout at different times. Using these Woods every day, we do know about these things, unlike some of these Council Planners who really have no idea of these issues. Please, consider other areas around without having to wreck these beautiful woods. We have children and no doubt will have grandchildren within the next few years, I would love to take them for walks up there and show them the wonderful birds and wildlife which exist up there and if only these 'people' who choose these sites would take the time to do this, they may realise what damage they are doing to the environment and our beautiful area we live in. Although, they probably do not even live around here, so this would make no difference to them!!!!</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP264	Disagree	<p>I write to register my objection to the proposed household recycling centre, bulky waste treatment and residual waste treatment plant at Uddens Woodlands/Cannon Hill/Land SW of Blunts Farm. The area of woodland at Uddens and SW of Blunts Farm is a vital community resource. It is a green space for the local community, used by those working on the Industrial Estate, users of the very popular Castleman Trailway, dog walkers, horse riders and bike riders. It paths are also pushchair also wheelchair friendly. The potential for hazardous fumes discharging from the proposed incinerator and 40m chimney in such close proximity from residential areas and schools is also a major concern to public health. Wimborne Road West could not accommodate the proposed quantity of lorries and vehicles accessing the site on top of local traffic without causing gridlock to already heavily congested roads. The proposed access off Uddens Drive is simply not suitable or safe for such volumes of vehicles. Approx. 6000 new homes are planned within the Core Strategy for the local area and we need more recreation land, not less. I cannot see how this proposal can be given the go ahead and can only hope that, for once, the Council listens to public opinion and issues a categorical refusal.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP267	Disagree	<p>I write to register my objection to the proposed household recycling centre, bulky waste treatment and residual waste treatment plant at Uddens Woodlands/Blunts Farm. The proposed use of the land to the SW of Blunts Farm for a waste plant is wholly inappropriate and would be detrimental to the local community. I am a regular visitor to the woodland and a lot of work has gone into making it user friendly and accessible for all. The Friends of Uddens &amp; Cannon Hill Woodlands do an admirable job of maintaining the woodland and all the work is undertaken by local and loyal volunteers. The mature woodland is a positive haven for all types of wildlife. It is also intersected by the Castleman Trailway and this is an important and very popular long distance trail way form Ringwood to Poole, Passing through Cannon Hill South with a safe pedestrian crossing over the bypass. It is used by walkers, horse riders, cyclists and commuters. The proposals for this site also appear contrary to National Planning Policy Framework guidance and East Dorset Districts own Core Strategy regarding protection of the Green Belt. Para 81 "Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land EDDC Core Strategy 8.8 "Wimborne and Colehill are set within the South East Dorset Green Belt. The Green Belt between the settlements is very narrow and maintains their separate identity. One of the main purposes of the Green Belt is to prevent coalescence of settlements, so this open area is particularly important to protect. The proposed plan to construct a waste incinerator and 40m high chimney billowing hazardous fumes towards nearby residential areas and local schools also appear to flout NPPF policies such as; NPPF para 110 " In preparing plans to meet development needs, the aim should be to minimise pollution and other adverse effects on the local and natural environment. Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework Furthermore, the extra vehicles that would have to pass through the Canford Bottom roundabout to access the site would only exacerbate the horrendous congestion problems already suffered by motorists at this bottleneck. The proposed access via Uddens Drive is also not a suitable or safe junction for the volume and type of vehicles this proposal would create. In summary, I object to the proposal on the following grounds; It would result in the loss of an area of woodland which is a well-used local amenity, together with a loss of habitat for wildlife It conflicts with NPPF Protecting Green Belt Land and Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment polices The proposal for an incinerator has serious potential to cause a detrimental effect on the health of nearby residents and children attending local schools The local road infrastructure is not capable of withstanding the volume and type of vehicle traffic this proposal would create I hope that the views of the local people are listed to and this proposal is flatly refused.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP281	Disagree	<p>I object to the proposal on the following grounds: (1) As other consultees have already commented, the proposals for this site are contrary to both the National Planning Policy Framework guidance (Para 81) and East Dorset Districts own Core Strategy regarding protection of the Green Belt (EDDC Core Strategy 8.8). This site is located in an area of Green Belt of woodland and heath. The area is in use by walkers, dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders, all of whom currently benefit from using this area for healthy outdoor exercise. (2) As a daily commuter on the A31 and the surrounding area, drivers already suffer from regular gridlock due to the inadequate current design of the Canford Bottom roundabout and Ferndown Industrial Estate roundabout. The local road infrastructure is simply not capable of withstanding the current volume of traffic using it and is definitely not capable of supporting the additional volume and type of vehicle traffic this proposal would create. This point is already acknowledged in the report (p. 65). Encouraging extra traffic to turn on and off of the A31 from/to Udders Drive at speed is not a sensible idea as this is neither a suitable nor safe junction for the volume and type of vehicles this proposal would create. (3) A proposed recycling centre with incinerator with a 40ft chimney will adversely affect local resident's quality of life (housing in this area 87,700 properties) and the pollution and dust will represent a health risk/danger to residents, users of the woodland and the natural environment around it. Having an incinerator this close to large tracts of woodland also constitutes a major fire risk. These points are again in contravention of the NPPF (para 110).</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP285	Disagree	<p>This small triangle of woodland, which is a designated Greenbelt, is These woods are precious to the local people of this area through which runs the Castleman Trailway and the 256 Cycle Route which run from Poole to Ringwood. These woods are used on a daily basis by horse riders, dog walkers, cyclists, (some of which are family groups especially during week- ends and school holidays) walking groups and elderly people enjoying the fresh air and exercise. Many workers from Uddens and Ferndown Industrial Estates cycle or walk through as a safer route from Colehill than using the Canford Bottom Roundabout. 'Friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands' have over the years arranged regular work parties to enhance the trailways and have created 'natural' play areas for children. With donations from members of this group and various grants kindly donated by District and County Councillors they have, in conjunction with the Forestry Commission, constructed and placed many picnic tables and perch benches over the area, which are greatly appreciated by us all. The work by this group is ongoing. A Waste Site so close to the local community would pose a health hazard and encourage vermin. The Wimborne ByPass borders the proposed site and any loose waste could be blown onto oncoming traffic. The volume and frequency of the traffic along Uddens Drive that this development would generate would be a danger to the local community, some of who can only access their property via Uddens Drive. Before you even consider this Woodland as an option please visit the area, come and talk to us and then you will see the reasons for our concerns.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP288	Disagree	I would like to lodge my opposition to the proposal to remove green belt land in Cannon Hill Woods to supply a waste treatment and household recycling plant. Surely there are other sites that are already spoilt that would be more appropriate. Not only are the woods constantly used and enjoyed by ramblers, dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders, they are teeming with wild life including deer, voles, snakes, slow worms, foxes, owls and many other species of bird life . The green belt appears to be constantly under threat and to use woodland that provides a splendid recreational facility for such a destructive purpose as waste treatment seems to be short sighted, especially given the large increase in homes planned for the Wimborne and Colehill area	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP291	Disagree	I am alarmed to discover that once again Cannon Hill South (Uddens Woodlands) is the subject of consultation for: Waste vehicle Depot Household recycling Centre Bulky waste transfer & treatment facility. I accept that the facilities are probably needed and I am not a nimby. However, a lot has been done over the past few years to make good recreational space in the Wimborne/Ferndown area. I know that whenever a new space is developed it is fully used, especially the Castleman Trailway. It also safe guards our rapidly disappearing wildlife. I really do not understand why after creating such a space you now wish to destroy it and scar the area now and for future generations. There must be plenty of suitable sites away from recreational/residential areas that you could use. I am also concerned about the health issues. I suffer from allergies brought on by pollution. That is why I relocated here from the South East many years ago. Whenever neighbours light bonfires I have to stay indoors until the air has cleared. Hence I am concerned about the emissions from a 40m chimney not only for myself but for all the children who attend the local schools within that vicinity.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP300	Disagree	I strongly disagree with this proposal My daughter attends the nursery school that backs on to this woodland. She and her school friends were devastated to understand that anyone would wish to knock down trees and leave nowhere for the wildlife they explore to live. This woodland is used regularly by the nursery school and I would not feel satisfied by a waste disposal site to be backing on to a children's nursery. The road infrastructure is not sufficient to withstand additional traffic. The Canford bottom roundabout causes traffic back to the turning to this proposed site on a regular basis, and only worsens on Fridays or in the holidays. I have already complained to Dorset about the volume of traffic in Ferndown because of poor lighting systems which again will only worsen. I do not agree with this proposal at all and believe you have selected an inappropriate location which should be reconsidered	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP301	Disagree	I strongly object to the proposed development. Please acknowledge my objection in writing.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP302	Disagree	My objections to the proposals for the site are twofold: - I enjoy the fresh air in my garden. The prevailing winds are from the south-west. The thought of toxic fumes from an incinerator arriving on the wind is appalling. We in Bracken Road are in direct line and on the leading edge of a substantial built up area (I see that assurances are being given that an incinerator will not in fact be built on the equivalent Mannings Heath site - increasing the likelihood of one being built on other sites). - Traffic will be a major snag. I have seen it suggested that 100 lorries will visit the site every day plus more than 250 cars per day from the Brook Road site. A substantial part of these will approach and return via the Canford Bottom system exacerbating its inadequacies - a little extra holiday traffic can already gum up the works. Whether the actual access is via Uddens Road, Ferndown Industrial Estate on A31 (more lights?) it is going to add significantly to the already heavy local traffic.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP318			Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP322	Disagree	I object to the proposed inclusion of the triangular piece of Green Belt SW of the A 31 as part of the Blunts Farm area currently in the frame. This precious piece of peaceful woodland/Green Belt is an essential counterbalance to the current Ferndown and Uddens developments and is widely used for recreation including Mountain-biking, Running, Walking and horse riding. It's loss to this possible end use cannot be cost-effective if the external costs associated with its loss are properly evaluated. Please remove this plot from you list.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP336	Disagree	<p>I live in Leeson Drive and in our area we already suffer the noise nuisance from the slip road onto the Ferndown Industrial estate and the traffic noise from the A31. The inadequate traffic management system at Canford Bottom causes traffic tailbacks to the proposed entrance of this site at The Old Thatch, Uddens Drive and sometimes as far back as the entrance to the Ferndown Ind Estate, especially on Fridays and during holiday periods. The resulting substantial increase in lorries and cars would cause even more traffic congestion and pollution which the infrastructure of Ferndown cannot support along Wimborne Road East and the A31. More importantly a chimney would severely affect the quality of the air and cause pollution and possible ill health to residents, especially children and the elderly. Surely you can find a site that is not near to residential streets and schools, nurseries etc as it is totally unacceptable to inflict such an industrial type of waste facility on greenbelt land that is enjoyed by many and that in a way counteracts the effects of the 2 industrial estates we already accommodate in the area, namely Ferndown and Uddens estates which although provide employment, also cause a great deal of environmental pollution. I feel strongly that there should be a public meeting for the residents of Ferndown that should be fully advertised, in order that all residents have the chance to voice their opinions on this controversial and unacceptable proposal. I would also urge you to consider considerable compensation for existing residents if you insist upon this site being used which will devastate the quality of our lives.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP337	Disagree	<p>Objections to the development in or around Ferndown for Incinerator waste units or waste handling Grounds for objection Pollution fall out for chimneys Short term health concerns Long term health concerns Noise Pollution (DCC have still not built the planned and promised noise barrier running between Ferndown Industrial Estate and Bracken Road / Lesson Drive) Waste litter from deliver lorries and the site itself as seen within other local waste site areas Loss and use of Green belt area Inability of the current road infrastructure to support current traffic let alone the large traffic movements proposed for this development. Significant impact of backed up congestion in the area It is on a critical and well know traffic blackspot with traffic system which does not work Cole Hill roundabout inability to take more large traffic, one lorry blocks each traffic light section which stacks up congestion Residential infrastructure expansion planned over the next 10 years will have a significant impact on existing road capabilities. This will seriously increase current traffic problems. Incinerator plants have already been historically rejected in Ferndown</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Forestry Commission	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP346	Disagree	<p>The position of the Forestry Commission has not changed since our letter of 12th February 2016 and the points outlined in that letter still stand and are re-iterated below. We object to the inclusion of Blunts Farm as a site for a household recycling facility and even more to it as a site for a waste vehicle depot, a bulky waste transfer/treatment and/or residual waste treatment facility. As indicated previously, we would be keen to consider a local biomass CHP energy scheme to help support the on-going management of the significant areas of heathland and the lack of any market from the products of this management as part of a scheme to provide energy to the businesses within the area to be developed. There will be a need to make the difference between a biomass energy scheme and a municipal waste energy from waste plant clear in the plan as both will be considered a waste treatment or residual waste treatment facilities. The prime reason the site was taken out of the Green Belt was to allow a supply of much needed land for employment purposes hence it being identified for the provision of B1 (Office and Light Industrial), B2 (light industrial) and B8 (Warehousing and Distribution) as a natural extension to the Ferndown and Uddens Industrial estates. There has never been any intention for the land to be used for waste purposes along the lines you have identified. The Forestry Commission, East Dorset District Council and Ferndown and Uddens Improvement District have all worked together on a common goal to enable Blunts Farm to be used in the future for employment purposes as a natural extension to the existing industrial estates. There is an opportunity to provide modern, well designed industrial space which is currently not available at Ferndown or Uddens Industrial estates. This would in turn help some of the older properties to be re-developed and improved. The proposal to use up to 5.5 hectares of the developable area of the site would greatly undermine the remainder as an attractive location for industrial users and is likely to 'blight' the development. This is compounded by the triangular nature of the site making large areas undevelopable. There is also the presence of a SNCI on the property together with the need for an adequate ecological buffer on the western and northern boundaries. As the land is allocated for employment purposes, we would expect that arguments would need to be submitted with any proposed development stating how the waste disposal site will create jobs in the areas, as it is not a labour intensive use for the land and not compatible with the modern, well designed industrial space that is proposed on the site. In addition, there is a requirement in policy FWP8 (Blunt's Farm Employment Allocation, Ferndown) that the site be subject to a detailed development brief subject to public consultation. As the public appear to be against the development of a waste site in the area, it would be difficult to develop a strategy that would be acceptable to the public. Although there is the possibility of extending Nimrod Way to access the site in the future, this has still not been confirmed or agreed and there is uncertainty with respect not only to the access but also to the layout of any site. Uddens Drive is the current access but is unlikely to be adequate for the development of the entire site for employment use. The uses you propose would result in the whole of the development being less attractive for the intended use as employment land. The deleterious impact on the neighbouring businesses and residential properties remains the same. It's noted that the Draft Plan now includes the extension of the area of search to include the rest of the Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates, where they may be opportunity to redevelop an appropriate site or extend the existing facility operated by The Dorset Waste Partnership within the timeframe covered by the Waste Plan. This is more in line with the National Planning Policy for Waste (October 2014) giving priority to the re-use of previously developed land. Consultation responses have been consistent to those received during the Gypsy Site process undertaken by the County in respect of the area of land to the west of Blunts Farm which is part of the severed Cannon's Hill Plantation and still currently within the Green Belt. This remains a valuable local asset and therefore not suitable for the scale and extent of potential uses outlined in the Dorset Waste Plan consultation. Despite the inclusion of the site in Background Paper 2 published in June 2015, the Forestry Commission has always objected to the inclusion of Blunts Farm for use as a site for waste management or disposal facility. Previously the objection of the landowner to the inclusion of the site has been used as a reason for discounting sites. As we object to the proposed use of the site for waste management or disposal, with the exception of a biomass energy scheme, the proposed allocation will not be deliverable in the short to medium term and therefore casts doubt on the soundness of the plan.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing a preferred site to meet the needs identified. A separate report has been prepared to respond to the issues raised. However, the WPA authority has been unable to find a suitable alternative site to Blunts Farm and the adjoining Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estate to develop a HRC to serve the local community.</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP349	Disagree	We are writing to place on record our many concerns at the thought of a Waste Plant complete with incinerator and possible 40m chimney being built on land south of the A31, known locally as Uddens Woodlands. To build such a plant in that very sensitive area is completely in the wrong place, as not only would it deprive local people from using the woodlands as a place of enjoyment and for walking ones' dogs (thus exercising), it would also destroy the Castleman Trailway that runs from Poole to Ringwood, which again is a source of enjoyment for many people. Another huge point which should be taken into account is all the extra traffic (100+ lorries daily has been mentioned, plus all the extra cars should Brook Road Centre be closed), which would add to the already congested roads in the area and especially at Canford Bottom roundabout, which at times is gridlocked. Our final concern is from fallout fumes from the proposed siting of a 40m high incinerator chimney, which could jeopardise fresh air for miles. Also, in hot weather the smell from all the waste would be awful and would certainly increase the risk of vermin and flies contamination. Surely, it is possible to find a more suitable site that would not cause so much distress to the many people who live in the surrounding area of Uddens Woodlands. An acknowledgement of this letter would be appreciated.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP353	Disagree	I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the possibility of using the Canon Hill South site as a huge waste plant. I live opposite the woods and frequently use the lovely woods for walks and taking my grandchildren cycling. There are far too few places to go walking through woodland, therefore, the current ones must be protected at all costs. The traffic problem due to the new large roundabout is dreadful, can you imagine what would happen if another 100 lorries a day were to take place. The Castleman Track is used daily by numerous walkers and cyclists. I urge you to find a more suitable site as a matter of urgency.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP357	Disagree	I object strongly to the proposal for a waste plant at Uddens Farm on several grounds. Access via the A31 - an already congested area is going to cause more issues as traffic increases significantly - particularly lorries delivering waste products. The proposed facilities will be taking away a much valued amenity area used by countless people. It is a key community resource, a green space, it's used by people on the Castleman Trailway, dog walkers, horse riders, bike riding, children's play, wildlife and general walking. Around 675 properties lie within 250m of the Blunts Farm, with a further 101,000 homes within a five mile radius. Pollutants from smoke generated by an incinerator will blow across the residential area as the wind blows predominately from that direction towards the housing estates. Is there going to be an open discussion where people are invited to view the proposals being put forward and ask questions?	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP364	Disagree	<p>Although I agree the conurbation of Eastern Dorset is in dire need of an improved Household Recycling Centre to serve the area of Eastern Dorset I am totally opposed to the use of the Forestry Commission Woodlands to the South West of The Ferndown Industrial Estate known as Cannons Hill South or Uddens Forrest as submitted by the Forestry Commission. Along with Ferndown Common this site is now the only area of public open space for the residents of the Eastern area of Dorset and directly links (via a pedestrian bridge over the A31) into the 'Cannons Hill' Forestry Commissions land to the north of the Ferndown By-Pass. The site also includes the 'Castleman Trailway'. The previous Consultation Document suggested the area of 'Blunts Farm' for the Household Recycling Centre and other associated activities and I would support this provision as it has access from the Wimborne Road West/East and most importantly is linked to the Ferndown By-Pass via Cobham Road through the Industrial Estate. Although I am fully aware of the East Dorset District Councils opposition to the use of 'Blunts Farm' as they wish to market the site for additional high Value Industrial use the existing residents of the district need a suitable facility to dispose of their waste but not at the expense of the only Green Belt provision in the area. The option mentioned in the consultation document of an access via Uddens Drive South is totally unacceptable as the junction of Uddens Drive and Wimborne Road West is already a dangerous and busy junction as it is the sole access to the Uddens Industrial Estate. Wimborne Road West is a very busy road between 7.00am and 7.00pm and is not able to handle much more traffic without major improvements to the road structure throughout Ferndown and the surrounding area. I am totally opposed to the inclusion of an Incinerator on either of the sites in what is the largest conurbation in the County of Dorset which includes Corfe Mullen, Wimborne, Colehill, Ferndown. West Parley, West Moors and St Leonards and St Ives and I despair that any Local Authority would consider such a proposal in view of the known serious dangers to the local communities and the environment of this type of disposal process. I ask how this suggestion fits into the County Council's 'Corporate Plan' (assuming you have one) regarding the Health and Well Being of the residents of this area of Dorset? As the local District Councillor for the area I would ask to be included in any of the discussions on the above proposals and also be able to take part in the Public Enquiry so as to be best able to protect the residents of Hampreston and Longham (including Stapehill and Canford Bottom) and Ferndown in general,</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP369		<p>I object to any and all waste plans for uddens woods ferndown it is a well-used and well-loved woodland in the green belt .apart from the traffic problems this will cause ,you will also cause pollution for up to five miles around the area . there are 16 home's within 100 meters,675 home's within 250 meters and 101,000 home's within the five Miles these are not my figures they are the councils. So strange the council does not include this information in the consultation info!!!. Also a children's nursery school within 80 meters of the site and a farm with horses that would be a few feet away the other side of the fence. Incineration will harm not just the animals but all of us too. Incinerators do not burn off all the waste around 20% will be fly ash which would have to be removed and buried in landfill the fly ash is very toxic and would transported past our homes. The consultation info leaves out much info that is relevant to the area the councils way of hiding it and getting it through quickly shame on them !!!..Please don't destroy this woodlands for your profit!</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP373	Disagree	We have lived in Ferndown for nearly 40 years and regularly walk our dogs across Cannon Hill Plantation. We cannot believe that consideration has been given to this green belt area of natural beauty being utilised for a Waste Deposal Plant and associated facilities. The impact of additional traffic would be a nightmare as the Ferndown bypass is inadequate and the Canford Bottom roundabout is an absolute nightmare. In the spring there are several species of birds nesting and the area is also used by cyclists and horse riders. We appreciate that no one wants this facility near them but we would hope a better alternative can be found that has less disruption to the lives of local residents.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP377	Disagree	I am writing to object to the planning permission for the new recycling and incinerator site being built - great concern as to the effect it will have on health with the pollution from the incinerator burning plastic etc causing cancer, as so close to homes and schools. Please don't let this go ahead!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP382	Disagree	I wish to object to the proposed siting of an incinerator and waste disposal site at Uddens. Wimborne Road East is already congested and despite the modifications to the Canford Bottom round about traffic in the area is a major issue. This proposal will bring many heavy commercial lorries into the area with significant and unacceptable consequences. Traffic volumes will increase, the nature of the vehicles will change with consequent detrimental increase in emissions and congestion will ensue. The site is close to a significant residential area and the effect will be felt by those residing in the whole of Ferndown. The effect on the environment from such a plant will harm our surrounding area. This plan should be shelved at the earliest opportunity as it is not in the best interests of the residents of Ferndown.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP385	Disagree	Reference WP01. Proposed subject matter. My wife and I would like to add our names to the many hundreds of protesters you will have already received with regard to the proposed misuse of a public amenity. We have lived in the Colehill area for nearly 50 years and apart from inevitable housing development, it has always been a wonderful experience to enjoy the surrounding areas of natural beauty such as Cannon Hill and Uddens woods. It would be a non-returnable countryside rape of this area which would not only eliminate the facilities available to walkers, horse riders and others who just want to relax between shifts at Ferndown Industrial Estate, but the prospect of the whole of the Bournemouth/Poole and East Dorset conurbation bringing its waste for incineration or transfer is a deplorable concept. We have already had to put up with the total waste of money in the form of the "Hamburger Roundabout" designed to allow traffic to get to the Olympic Games at Weymouth more quickly which has resulted in huge traffic problems. Now you are suggesting allowing even more lorries and cars onto the surrounding roads, particularly from Wimborne if Brook Road is closed. We are not aware as to how Christchurch/Bournemouth/Poole get rid of their waste at the moment but we have not heard of any problems so would this proposal be a forerunner to the giant Unitary Authority we hear rumours about which would be enable every local council to dump their rubbish in someone else's back yard. In this instance on an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. "Fly Tipping" is illegal.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
The Barn Nursery	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP388	Disagree	I definitely disagree. I am horrified at the very thought of this proposal of a waste plant being developed in Uddens Woodlands -Canon Hill south. I am the owner of The Barn Nursery School which has been in existence for 42 years. There are 45 children on the register ages 2 -5 years. The Nursery is located at Stapehill Farm which has a common field boundary to the proposed waste site. The children delight in a Forest School Club experience in Uddens Woodlands which provides a natural education, by using the woodland's resources it meets the development matters of national curriculum - the Early Years Foundation Stage. It has been commented in our recent successful Ofsted inspection as how beneficial it is to be able to use these rural and natural resources. Therefore my main concerns and reasons are:- 1. The 40 metre chimney omitting fumes which could have an adverse effect on the young children's health. 2. Odour and pests from the rubbish piles waiting for clearance/disposal. 3. Immediate danger of heavy vehicles directly passing the nursery entrance - there is approximately 80 car movements daily transporting young children to and from the Nursery. Consequently would parents feel they could send their young and vulnerable children to a Nursery School with such possible health hazards and danger on the doorstep. This could be closure of a very popular, thriving and unique to the local community - farm based Nursery School. I do you will consider my comments and look forward to hearing your reply,	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP391		<p>Thank you for informing me of the proposal of the waste management site in Uddens Woodlands - South Cannon hill Plantation. I would like you to take my points into account from this consultation. I strongly disagree. I have been farming at Stapehill Farm and my father before me. Over many years I have seen the increasing residential development which has left my farm and the woods as a rural oasis in this area of search - a well valued recreational resource for the ever increasing local community. During this time I lost land and many acres of woodland were lost due to the Ferndown Bypass. My reasons are of disagreement: - 1. Stapehill farm has a common field boundary with the proposed waste plant site - it is so close to the site what will the detrimental effect on my farm land be? 2. Fumes, noise and light 24/7. 3. Farm animals could be effected grazing on contaminated grass from the neighbouring proposed waste development. Would the waste plant also cause me a rat problem? 4. Traffic on Uddens Drive will be intolerable - will it be a hazard as I take Farm Vehicles in and out of my entrance. 5. I am very concerned of the health hazards to my family. 6. Considerable devaluation of my property. I do hope you take my points into serious consideration,</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP394	Disagree	<p>I am writing to disagree with the above proposal to put a waste plant and incinerator on the woodlands south of Canon hill Plantation "Uddens Woods. The reasons for the disagreement which I hope the planning officers consider are: - The Uddens/ferndown site is Green Belt Land. It is a popular recreational amenity for local residents using the Castle Main Trailway for cycling, horse riding and dog walking. It is the entrance to the Canon hill Plantation. The footpaths have been used for over 50 years. The woods are a haven to wildlife "nesting birds, deer, badgers, foxes and the protected species of smooth snakes. With the ever increasing surrounding suburbs it is really important the wildlife have an area of safety. What other towns have this on the doorstep. I work at The Barn Nursery which is based at Stapehill Farm and is adjacent to the site. The Barn Nursery is a rural nursery with a strong outdoor ethos. The Nursery school children are aged 2 " 5 years we use the potential site as part of the children's learning " in a forest school club. Uddens woods is just the right distance for the children to walk. These visits to the woods provide such a range of learning and discovery "a wonderful outdoor classroom. Not only do we use the woods but the meadows on the farm adjacent to the site. We would welcome any planners and councillors to come and visit our nursery and see for themselves first-hand the learning our nursery children achieve. I also use the woods for recreation walking my dog and baby in a pushchair daily. It is a short walk from where I live in Coppice Avenue, in Ferndown "the woods have good pushchair access and natural shade unlike Ferndown Common and St. Georges Park. The further congestion this would bring, as a resident of Ferndown working in Uddens. I already spend much time in traffic jams along Wimborne Road West. Secondly, at the moment beyond Uddens Trading Estate, Uddens is a quiet cul-de-sac. The Nursery School entrance is up a quiet lane next to Uddens woods, will the amount of lorries to the waste site cause a hazard to the parents bringing their children to Nursery. The incinerator " this is perhaps the biggest concern and why this site would be unsuitable " how safe is the incinerator to be placed next to a children's Nursery school, grazing farm animals and many residential homes in Uddens, Stapehill, Colehill and Ferndown. I hope this brings some important issues why this site should not be used for a waste plant and incinerator. It is a beautiful place which is green belt for a reason to protect it from the already built up surrounding area. We have already lost woods for the Ferndown Bypass. Please do not take any more for this proposed site. Thank you for taking the time to read my letter in this consultation,</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP399	Disagree	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed incinerator. This was previously debated at great expense to the tax payers some years ago, and then a traveller's site was proposed for this area. I would like to ask why can any attractive green area not just exist, for the enjoyment and pleasure of the local community and the benefit of nature - why does it have to be on some plan, often brought up again after years have passed? Yes, waste is a big issue and we do need to plan, but we do already have 3 waste areas, Hurn, Longham and Brook Road in Wimborne. Surely it is possible to extend one of these to increase capacity, rather than build one on green belt land. Previously we were advised that the site would have lorries accessing it, approximately 200 per day, which would be 400 extra trips in or out of the area. The capacity would be such that the waste from Dorset alone would not meet its capacity, and it would be possible to generate revenue by also processing waste from outside the county. Do we have the road infrastructure to do this? I would strongly suggest we do not, as any Friday after midday the roads in Ferndown can be a solid mass of traffic, adding significantly more housing (at the Staplehill Abbey site and other sites) and the increase in the number of large lorries can only add to this existing problem. Given that it is so close to natural areas, residential areas and Hampreston First School I think this proposal is highly unsuitable from an environmental perspective, it's unknown what the long term health implications of such an incinerator could be. Previously it was mentioned that this technology is new, and not enough data has been gathered about it to know if this is the best option for this site. I recall a party of councillors travelled to Germany to visit similar installations and there was a court case involving residents and the council. Surely enough public money has been spent on those past proceedings, it seems farcical to be embarking on the same road again. The woodland has recently been enhanced as a community resource with picnic benches and a lot of clearing has been done, there is the Castleman Trail Way, a cycle trail, lots of people walk dogs and ride horses or simply walk and enjoy the wildlife. Such green oases are few and far between in our ever more developed environment. We should look to protect these areas and enhance them. I urge you to look again at this plan and to check the suitability of other sites or different options within Dorset. Ferndown, Wimborne, Staplehill and Hampreston deserve better.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP403	Disagree	<p>I am writing concerning the proposed waste plant at Uddens Woodlands. I walk in Cannon Hill plantation every day and it is beautiful you see the changing of the seasons, there is a lot of wildlife and research has shown that walking in woods has mental health benefits. All these things will change if a waste plant is on our doorstep. It could bring animal pests and spread disease to the wildlife. The air will be polluted from the 40m proposed chimney and increase congestion on already busy roads. The Canford Bottom roundabout at busy times is a nightmare and you want to put more Lorraine's into the mix. Why does Brook Road need to be closed and why are we taking waste from Poole and Bournemouth? I don't want a waste plant on my doorstep!</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WHP406	Disagree	As a member of the friends of uddens woods, I was recently helping out on a work party event. This was a number of days before we received news of the waste plant proposals. Throughout the whole day we all commented on the number and range of people using the beautiful space that we were all working on. Walkers bike riders picnickers with children running around and helping us, searching for the bat boxes that we installed years ago .children a few years older searching out for the one that has their name on it. horse riders marvelling at the improvement we have made to their bridle ways. A true community space .Since we heard the news every evening we take our walk we look around and cannot imagine the space being taken from our community and being replaced by business and traffic. Working together on these woods has been an absolute joy and brought people together. The woods provide both physical and mental health for swathes of the Cole hill and Ferndown communities and this should not be compromised. The damage to the wildlife of the area doesn't bear thinking about and the increased traffic which is already at breaking point makes this option really untenable. Any backlog of traffic will immediately impact canford bottom causing more frustration for locals and holidaymakers alike. I would like to state clearly that I object to this proposal because it will utterly spoil the fragile environment ant mental wellbeing of all who use the area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WHP409		I would like to object to the proposed site at Cannon hill ref WP01. As a resident I am extremely concerned with regard to this wholesale industrialisation of my neighbourhood. As far as I can tell if this goes ahead there will be a huge increase in traffic and what is currently an outstanding and historical greenspace enjoyed by a whole community will become a concrete hell. It has taken me so long to object because I cannot really believe that anyone would honestly consider doing this to a recreational area that is so well used and needed by the wider community. But it seems this is the case and yet again I need to take the time to protect our precious woodland. An area that the whole community has invested time energy and passion in preserving, through our membership of the friends of uddens woods. I object on the grounds of traffic pollution. Noise pollution. Contamination of a former green belt site and on behalf of the wildlife and humans that need this space.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WHP412	Disagree	Destruction of woodland and recreational facilities. Eyesore Traffic already heavy on A31 Unsuitable exit Uddens Drive and Wimborne Rd west for increased vehicles "heavy and cars Impact on residential properties	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP415	Disagree	We were very sorry and alarmed to hear of the proposal of closing Brook Rd and concerned about the now proposed site from Blunts Farm to Cannon Hill South to establish several ideas. Cannon Hill South us an all-weather walking area, ride likes, walk dogs and horses etc I understand there are almost 6000 new homes planned and so more recreational places are needed not less.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP418	Disagree	Uddens Woodlands " Cannon Hill South Please register my objection to plans at the above site for Waste vehicle depot HRC Bulky waste transfer & treatment facility Probably to include commercial waste Probably to include an incinerator Probably to include import of waste from all over Dorset and beyond My main objections are Destruction of green belt woodland Destruction of amazing biodiversity Destruction of wildlife Environmental pollution Emissions, smells and contamination Health and safety hazard Traffic and congestion " on al already overloaded A31 " especially the Canford Bottom Roundabout I objected to the earlier plans at almost adjacent Blunts Farm the latest proposal is even closer to my property. The Blunts Farm site was turned down "I quote from Community Magazine 5 May 2006 Controversial new waste treatment facilities are not to be built in Ferndown. A government inspector has rejected a proposal at Blunts Farm on the edge of town because of its possible impact on green belt land It is not 2016 " nothing has changed This site is too close to people's homes in Ferndown, Stapehill and Colehill	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP422	Disagree	Until recently I lived in Cannon Hill Gardens. While I was living there, there were various planning proposals put forward -mobile phone masts, a camp for travellers and gravel extraction. And now it is suggested that it would be a suitable site for waste handling. This is green belt woodland used by an awful lot of people, walkers, dog walkers, horse riders, mountain bikers, on a daily basis. It is also home to a wide variety of flora and fauna. On what planet can this area be considered suitable for this kind of development? It is so unfair on local residents who have had years of worry over previous plans. This proposal would be life changing for so many people. There must be a better place. Also, this plan completely ignores the disaster that is the relevant stretch of the A31. I have driven from St. Ives to Wimborne this morning. It took very nearly 40 minutes!! Thanks to the sheer weight of traffic and the very slow clearing roundabout at Canford Bottom. To deliberately force more traffic on to this road would be madness and of course a lot of traffic would start using the lanes through Uddens. It seems to me that local planners will not be happy until a pretty town like Wimborne is completely spoiled. Congratulations. It won't be long!!	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP435	Disagree	I wish to make comments regarding a waste disposal plant being installed so close to a built up area which contains a large population of elderly people in bungalows which lie west of the proposed site. We will suffer air pollution affecting our health. Also unable to have windows open during warm weather. Being a driver of a vehicle the congestion on our local roads from lorries in both directions bringing in waste and extra cars from Brook rd. site being closed. The value of our property will drop and finding buyers will become difficult when they find out about the proposals. I moved from Winchester in 2006 and at that time an incinerator in Chandlers Ford near Southampton was closed down because of air pollution so to build another one to cause air problems to people's health.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP460	Disagree	I strongly disagree with the proposal to build a Household Recycling Centre and Incinerator or Bulky Waste Treatment Facility at Ferndown & Uddens Industrial Estate. Primary concern is the health and wellbeing of the local residents, particularly given the unknown carcinogens that would be released into the air around some 100,000 residential properties, nurseries and schools. There are no assurances that the air quality will be constantly maintained. Should the filters become blocked for example, what will the impact on the health and comfort of local residents? Further loss of woodland area used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Impact on the already horrendous Wimborne Road and A31, which will have a knock on effect on traffic all over Ferndown, which is already struggling to cope with the volume of traffic it has to deal with. An incinerator was proposed for the Ferndown area some years ago and was refused permission. Why, just a few years on is it now considered appropriate? There has been a lack of consultation with local residents, with many finding out about the proposals through luck rather than any efforts by the council to communicate its intentions. Impact on local property values, particularly as the proposals did not appear on property searches earlier this year. There must be a more suitable alternative.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP463	Disagree	Green belt land should not be used when there are other options. This area has significant recreational use as well as adding to our wildlife and biodiversity.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WHP464	Comment	I strongly disagree with the proposal to build a Household Recycling Centre and Incinerator or Bulky Waste Treatment Facility at Ferndown & Uddens Industrial Estate. Primary concern is the health and wellbeing of the local residents, particularly given the unknown carcinogens that would be released into the air around some 100,000 residential properties, nurseries and schools. There are no assurances that the air quality will be constantly maintained. Should the filters become blocked for example, what will the impact on the health and comfort of local residents? Further loss of woodland area used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Impact on the already horrendous Wimborne Road and A31, which will have a knock on effect on traffic all over Ferndown, which is already struggling to cope with the volume of traffic it has to deal with. An incinerator was proposed for the Ferndown area some years ago and was refused permission. Why, just a few years on is it now considered appropriate? There has been a lack of consultation with local residents, with many finding out about the proposals through luck rather than any efforts by the council to communicate its intentions. Impact on local property values, particularly as the proposals did not appear on property searches earlier this year. There must be a more suitable alternative.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WHP467		I strongly object to the new waste and recycling plant being sited at land near Blunts farm Ref WP01. It would impact on important woodland and be a loss for future generations, I use the trails through this area regularly.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WHP475	Disagree	The waste disposal proposal is yet another unwarranted imposition on the Wimborne/Ferndown/Colehill area targeted once again at Green Belt. The infrastructure already cannot cope with the traffic at Canford Bottom and when the new houses are built in Wimborne and Colehill there will be gridlock. The added burden of so many lorries will make travelling untenable. Wimborne, Colehill and Ferndown seem to be being used as a dumping ground for Bournemouth and Poole. This should not be allowed. East Dorset will become a polluted concrete jungle unless our representatives on our local councils stand up to the larger councils.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP476	Disagree	<p>Strongly object to the inclusion of this area as a waste site. This area is in the green belt and no exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for its use. It provides an essential buffer between the A31 corridor and Ferndown. The removal of this buffer would urbanise the area and totally change its character. It would also further erode the demarcation between Ferndown and Wimborne. The proposed development is totally inappropriate, close to businesses and residential properties. It will be an eyesore. The area is currently an important recreational area, regularly used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The removal of this facility would potentially push these users onto more sensitive heathlands. With the additional housing set out in the Core Strategy robust recreational areas are essential. More green space for the health of residents is needed not less. The roads already become heavily congested. Additional traffic would cause gridlock. The infrastructure is not suitable for the proposed development. The assessment of potential sites need to be considered in conjunction with all the other plans for the area i.e. employment land, house building, transport, recreation etc. The quality of life of the residents must be prioritised. The buffer between the A31 and Ferndown must be maintained.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP485	Disagree	<p>I disagree with the proposal to site a recycling centre on green belt land which is well used for numerous outdoor pursuits and personally for cycling. Any proposal to site an incinerator in or at WP01 Ferndown search area should not be proceeded with now or any time in the future, the resultant pollution and carcinogens would be spread far and wide with attending health problems to the local population.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Chestnut Grove Residents Association	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WVP489	Comment	<p>The residents of Chestnut Grove are unanimously against the use of the Area of Forestry Commission Land South West of Blunts Farm (within the Green Belt) for any part of the Waste Plan. To say that we viewed the proposal with disbelief is an understatement, particularly following findings of the government inspector some years ago on a similar proposal, who agreed with local residents that this was not a suitable site for such an operation. In more recent times we had the plans for a Gypsy &amp; Traveller Transit Site in the same location. This resulted in a 6,000 name petition being submitted. When will the council accept that this woodland is a community asset of great importance? It is regularly used by dog walkers, ramblers, cyclists, horse riders who would otherwise be forced towards the sensitive Lowland Heathland sites of Holt Heath, Ferndown Common and Slop Bog. It is a key mitigation site. Our residents have close links to the Friends of Uddens &amp; Cannon Hill Woodlands who have spent many voluntary hours working in conjunction with the Forestry Commission and Dorset Countryside Ranger Service to improve this woodland for the benefit of the local community, users of the Castleman Trailway and woodland wildlife. Picnic benches, perch benches, all weather paths, noticeboards, area maps and interpretation boards, bird &amp; bat boxes are part of efforts that have gone in to making the woods the welcoming and accessible area they are for children, the elderly and infirm alike. We are not a NIMBY group and accept that the Blunts Farm site will eventually be developed, ideally though as an extension of the Industrial Estate creating much needed growth and employment opportunities. We understand access would be from the more appropriate Nimrod Way. The destruction of the triangle of woodland (South West of Blunts Farm) known as Uddens Woodland or Cannon Hill South, for any form of development would be totally unacceptable to us.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WVP510	Disagree	<p>Disagree most emphatically - traffic, pollution, loss of amenities. Very much a "thin end of the wedge" for later addition of heavier-duty (and far more intrusive) facilities.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP519	Disagree	<p>I object to the suitability of the proposed site SW of Blunts Farm (WP01) for several reasons; This is a long-standing recreational area of green-belt land. With the huge number of new houses planned for the area we need to make sure that the areas of recreational land are maintained or increased, not reduced. This is particularly the case as this is an area classed as green-belt. The 'classification' as green belt should be taken in the spirit it was intended and not used for the development of a waste plant. Destruction or 're-purposing' of green-belt will ruin the area; at the moment it is a lovely patch of greenery amid the creeping asphalt. The proposed plan would ruin the area visually as well as environmentally. The loss of such pieces of green-belt might look small on the map, but the impact they have on the emotional wellbeing of residents once they are gone cannot be measured. The infrastructure around the area struggles with normal traffic. The huge increase in public traffic attempting to access any waste facility, particularly from the west, together with the required waste vehicle movement will likely cause major traffic problems in the area. The destruction of wildlife and reduced biodiversity at a time when we should all be looking at protecting such pieces of land. The environmental pollution and health risk; as someone living on the Bridle Way estate, I can see that there are a huge number of houses and a couple of schools that will be 'in the line of fire' from fumes and deposits from any chimney positioned on this area of land. I understand that the Forestry Commission intend to make money from the use of the land they own adjacent to the Industrial Estate. It is worth remembering that the Forestry Commission seem not to be concerned about conserving our countryside and therefore their suggestion to use green belt land SW of Blunts Farm should be looked at in this light. Previous objections to use of this land by the Government in 2006 still stand. I would also like to note that 'public consultation' has been woeful... so many of my neighbours knew nothing about this until informed by other concerned locals. Please do not take away another of the small parts that make Dorset a lovely place to live.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP525	Disagree	<p>I strongly disagree with the proposed development on the woodland site due to the fact that there should be no need to cut down woodland when there are plenty of brown field sites that could be used. Also the extra traffic on a narrow road with a dangerous junction also the smell from the waste and the proposed incinerator.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP526	Disagree	<p>As a local resident, I feel having a waste centre in this area will be a burden to local wildlife, road infrastructure and a high number of residential &amp; commercial buildings. The current road infrastructure will not support the proposed plan leading to a high volume of traffic on a restricted width road. A loss of woodland with varying wildlife will be affected, local support groups have spent hours of their time building/supporting the area with the support of local council. This also gives concern to attracting further fly tipping during out of hours, which this area is currently suffering with no consideration of woodland users or local residence.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP528	Disagree	As a resident of Colehill and a mother of three children, I am strongly opposed to the building of such a large recycling depot in the location proposed. My family are keen cyclists and we often enjoy long cycle rides through canon hill woods and along the castlemaine track towards Moores Valley. This area is largely unspoilt and one of the reasons we decided to raise our family here. The green belt area is very previous to us. In addition, the canford bottom roundabout and A31 struggle with the volume of traffic using it already. This proposed recycling centre will only add to the problems we already have.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP535	Disagree	When I bought our house nearly 9 years ago I did so knowing of the existence of the Castleman Trailway and the access that this would give me from Stapehill to the New Forest by cycleway. I joined the Friends of Uddens Wood and Cannon Hill so as to protest at the proposed Gipsy Transfer Site on Uddens Wood and since then have learnt more of the biodiversity of this area. I am a Triathlete and regularly run through Uddens Wood onto the Castleman Trailway at least twice a week. The use of Uddens Wood for development as a Waste Vehicle Depot, Household Recycling Centre or Bulky Waste Transfer Site would destroy an area of countryside that I know is well loved and used by many local residents. I must see between half a dozen and a dozen walkers, dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders every time that I use this route from the Old Thatch to the footbridge over the A31. This is a most valuable local amenity and must be preserved as a green lung for all of those residents upon the Ferndown side of the Canford Bottom roundabout so that we may exercise from home without having to use motorised transport to get to an area where we can do so. The valuable work that has been done and the many volunteers of the Friends of Uddens is testament to the importance that is placed by local people upon preserving Uddens Wood in particular both for itself and as an access way to the Castleman Trailway. In that respect all of the objections that were raised to the development of the Gipsy Transfer site equally apply to the proposed development of this site for waste transfer and recycling. If local democracy and local elections, local planning committees formed of the locally elected councillors, localism and consultation count for anything then the strength of feeling to preserve Uddens Wood must prevail. Blunts Farm may have a case for redevelopment as part of the Industrial Estate which it adjoins but should not be accessed via Uddens Lane that leads to Uddens Wood as the road is narrow and access to Wimborne Road West is not good and the traffic would conflict with recreational use of Uddens Wood and the Castleman Trailway beyond.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP540	Disagree	I strongly disagree with this proposal that will seriously affect the healthy enjoyment of the local environment. When will the County Council finally realise the importance of this site to the residents of Wimborne and Ferndown? This is an essential green lung that must be maintained particularly with the large scale housing construction that is about to commence. The roads feeding into Canford Bottom are already unable to cope with the current traffic problem and the additional movement of waste lorries from across Bournemouth and Poole on a daily basis will only compound this. However, my main concern is that the positioning of the waste plant and the incinerator will result in a loss of valuable open space and render a larger area of the woodlands unsuitable for recreation due to pollution from fumes, dust, flies and vermin. I use the Uddens Forest and the Cannon Hill Plantation which are a wonderful resource and should be left intact for future generations to enjoy too.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP543	Disagree	These are my objections to this proposal: NO on transport re: A31 + Canford Bottom Roundabout + Old Thatch junction NO on transport re: adding to delays + extra traffic volume + too many large lorries on Canford Bottom Roundabout + private cars with trailers at Canford Bottom Roundabout NO on pollution re: emissions + smell + vermin NO on amenity re: loss of green belt + impact on leisure facilities NO on location re: site is not central for a strategic facility NO on environmental impact re: too much housing too close + schools + businesses + other workplaces nearby This site is totally unsuitable and should be withdrawn.	Your comments are noted. However, the strategy for the future management of waste in Dorset relies upon the development of new facilities for the generation of waste and a move away from landfill in the early part of the Plan period.

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP549	Disagree	<p>Re. - WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre &amp; Depot Specifically - Traffic congestion "i.e. in an area that is already heavily congested with private, commercial and holiday traffic the proposals will significantly increase traffic volumes. Apart from the general congestion there will be impacts on air pollution, noise, accident levels and the general resultant deterioration of the quality of life and quiet enjoyment of the area by its residents. It should also be considered that there are already several residential developments in progress in the area (and more are planned!) and consequently there will be a significant increase in the local population with associated vehicles which will compound the current congestion issues. Impact on Roads " the roads in this area are far from well-maintained with potholes and crumbling verges etc " the increase in traffic volume and notably heavy commercial lorries carry waste to and from the site will result in ever faster breakdown of the road surface and its general integrity. Impact on the environment and proximity to housing and schools " the effects of the proposals which incorporate Bulk Waste Management and Residual Waste Treatment will be smell, discharges into the atmosphere (via chimney), seepage into ground and water table, litter pollution, vermin (rodents and foxes), seagulls and other scavenger birds (i.e. noise and guano) plus dust and noise. Do you know what carcinogens and toxins will be produced and which groups will be put at risk? Loss of green belt "enjoyed by ramblers, walkers, dog walkers, wildlife including rare species e.g. Sand Lizard, Adders, bats and an abundance of native flora! Line of Sight "the proposed chimney at between 70 and 100 mts will be visible for many miles and will be a blight on the horizon for many people. Impact on Property Values "clearly those properties close to and on route to these proposed sites will be devalued because of the mess, smell, noise, congestion etc. Quiet enjoyment of the surrounding areas - Residents in the immediate and surrounding areas will suffer diminution in the overall quality of their environment and loss of the quiet enjoyment that is currently being experienced. Additionally, vulnerable groups such as infants, pregnant women, aged residents, those with respiratory conditions etc will be at increased risk because of the general pollution that will result from these proposals General objections - I have several objections and concerns about the Waste Plan in general " Impact on Ferndown, Stapehill and Tricketts Cross communities i.e. deterioration of quality of environment and threat to health and safety; Pincer movement on Ferndown i.e. the WP01 Ferndown site proposals is to the North West of Ferndown and WP05 Parley proposals is to the South East of Ferndown " this will effectively double the environmental impact of the Ferndown, Tricketts Cross and Stapehill communities plus their surrounding areas; and I suspect that these proposals will lead to an increase in fly-tipping " e.g. the closure of the Wimborne Household Waste facility will mean that some people will have to travel further with their rubbish to get to the WP05 site and I confidently expect that some people will just not bother and start fly-tipping rather than travel that bit further!</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Natural England	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP621	Comment	<p>WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Residual Waste Treatment/ Bulky Waste Treatment/ Household Recycling Centre &amp; Depot The identified area of search raises a number of concerns, there are existing high levels of public access in parts of the site which would be displaced by any proposal, potentially onto nearby protected heathlands. An assessment under the Habitats Regulations may be required. In addition there are known to be records for both species of rare reptiles and likely also to be bats in the woodland as well as SPA birds such as nightjar. An assessment would need to be carried out unless a narrower AOS was defined with much reduced impacts. To the north is a county wildlife site and adjacent SSSI and specially protected site, these should be excluded from the AOS.</p>	Your helpful comments are noted and will be considered further when developing the preferred site. As suggested the SSSI will be removed from the Area of Search if this site is to be retained in the final Plan.

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Campaign to Protect Rural England	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP728	Disagree	There is great unhappiness in East Dorset at the proposal for a Household Recycling Centre with bulky waste and treatment facility on the Uddens and Cannon Hill woodlands. There appear to be no special circumstances to warrant the release of this Green Belt site just off the A31 and several of our Members have asked me to draw your attention to their strongly held feelings about this matter. The site has been used for many, many years by walkers, cyclists, horse riders, dog walkers and others all the year round. It is also used by a local nursery school as an outside activity area. Access to the proposed HRC either from the A31 or from Uddens Drive would be difficult and add to the already severe traffic congestion in this area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP717	Disagree	I read with disbelief about the proposal to locate a household recycling centre, a bulky waste transfer and waste treatment facility with a 40metre chimney blowing carcinogenic material over the area, on land comprising Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands, Dorset. This unspoilt area of green belt Woodland and open area is enjoyed for quiet recreation by many people of all ages. In addition, it provides home and shelter to many species of wildlife. Access could only be off the A31 Ferndown bypass or the Wimborne Road West both busy routes. The volume and type of traffic this proposal would generate would make these roads even more difficult for residents and through traffic. Bearing in mind the proximity of this proposed site to residents, Ferndown and Uddens Industrial estates and the Canford bottom roundabout, I believe this proposal must not become a reality.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP698	Disagree	The north-east part of this proposed site includes the whole of SU00/060 Ferndown Bypass Site of Nature Conservation Interest. This site comprises dry and wet heathland/acid grassland mosaic habitat running between the bypass and the dismantled railway line. This habitat is fragile and vulnerable, and the site forms an important link to the nearby Slop Bog and Uddens Heath SSSI. Dorset Wildlife Trust wants to see the whole of the SNCI removed from the proposed site, and with a buffer to ensure no adverse effects on the SNCI from future waste transfer/treatment facilities on the site. It would be preferable if the whole of the triangle of land between the old railway line and the bypass from the southern boundary of the SNCI north-eastwards were removed from the proposed site. If opportunities arise during the term of the plan for a waste facility within the existing Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estate, DWT would welcome this, and regard it as much preferable to development of the land to the south-west within the area of search, at Cannon Hill Plantation, which is Green Belt land containing mixed plantation woodland, and therefore clearly of considerably higher wildlife value. Additionally the displacement of the considerable amount of informal recreation which is practiced on the land to the SW of Blunts Farm would have the potential to impact upon the nearby internationally designated heathlands sites.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised Further thought will be given to removing the SNCI from the Area of Search and the provision of an appropriate buffer.

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP682	Disagree	<p>I have a number of concerns regarding the plan and the effect it will have on the areas adjacent to the proposed site. Road congestion, with regular; traffic jams' is already a serious problem in Wimborne Road East/West and Ferndown bypass both leading up to the Canford Bottom roundabout. The access requirements to the new site by many thousands of extra vehicle journeys each year can only exacerbate the congestion problem. This could reach unmanageable levels if the Brook Road site is closed. I understand this could mean an extra 100,000 car trips from Wimborne across the roundabout the new proposed sites. National road networking authorities spent millions of pounds on the Canford Bottom roundabout. This project was paid for to improve the flow of the heavy traffic load through Ferndown to the west country especially at holiday times. This national project was to benefit the local area as well as the national as a whole. It seems perverse that a localised plan to massively increase traffic volumes at this roundabout should frustrate this national planning. To avoid the roundabout, a large proportion of the traffic from Bournemouth, Poole and Christchurch could use Stapehill Road as a short cut through to Uddens Drive. This road is very narrow and currently has a vehicle weight restriction imposed on it. However, a substantial increase in car traffic on this road would be dangerous. This would not only apply to the residents but the many visitors to national tourist attraction at Knoll Gardens. Traffic trying to cross Wimborne Road West to Uddens Drive would cause much congestion as well as increasing the possibility of car accidents considerably. A new set of traffic lights could of course make it safer. However this would increase traffic congestion considerably in Wimborne Road West. There would now be two sets of traffic lights within 100metres of each other. The East Dorset area has the largest population of people aged over 65 in the country. The higher health problems and service requirements of this elderly population already places a great burden on local services and the NHS. Extra traffic can only worsen the level of bad air pollution in the area. This must adversely affect the fragile health of this older population many of whom have respiratory problems Not only will this cause distress to local residents but put an intolerable extra burden on the already overstretched local services. In Wimborne Road East, we have one of the larger school sites in Ferndown. During the 40+ week academic year, both early morning and mid afternoon there is a steady flow of young people walking beside and crossing the road. Whether the road crossing is controlled or made recklessly, the danger of accidents offered by extra traffic movement is apparent and well documented. I understand a number of young people suffer from asthma and related health problems which will be detrimentally affected by increased air pollution. Within the proposal are plans to build an incinerator with accompanying 40 metre chimney. The prevailing wind in the area is west, right across the heavily populated areas of Ferndown. Smell and pollution are a known feature of these incinerator sites. The operation can only be viable if it operates 24 hours/7 days a week. Apart from the smell and pollution created by such an operation, the noise pollution across a heavy populated area like Ferndown for 24 hrs a day would be totally unacceptable for community living. The prevailing wind would further accentuate these problems to the Ferndown population further increasing health and social problems in the area. The population will not be able to negate these negative problems by recreational activity. One of the major recreational areas south of the A31 will be swallowed up to accommodate the proposed plan. Residents will thus not only lose access to the Cannon Hill and Uddens site but the safe access to wider recreational areas reached by use of this site. No absolute guarantee can be given with regard to the control of vermin. It is stated that the waste will be kept within buildings and the walls would act as a barrier and deterrent to vermin movement. Householders for many centuries have tried to stop vermin entering and leaving their homes at will. It is highly unlikely that the proprietors of the waste site will be any more successful. Surrounding the industrial estate is green belt land and this could act as a breeding site for the vermin. How far the vermin will travel after they mature is very much a matter for conjecture. I trust the points raised by myself and others will make the waste planning team consider that the environmental and health impact of their waste plans in the proposed WP01 area are too great to consider as a viable option.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP726	Disagree	<p>We live within the proposed affected area of the new treatment plant at Uddens Wood. We live on an unmade road with no speed limit that links Wimborne Road West and Stapehill Road as we are close to the junction to the industrial estate our road is regularly used as a cut through. All the residents in the road object to this situation and are very concerned that the added pressure on the roads adjacent to the industrial estate will just increase the pressure on the roads in the area and therefor adding to the pressure on the residents in Award Road. As things stand at the moment, the pressure on the road system between 7.30am and 9.15am and 4.30 and 6.30pm means all the road system is completely blocked. By adding this recycle plant to the area it will mean that there will be no break from the traffic jams for the whole day and increased pressure at busy times. The residents maintain this road and we cannot control the amount of traffic and the speed they drive, there are families with children and elderly residents that live in the road which will make it increasingly unsafe to walk and drive in the road.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP611	Disagree	<p>The road infrastructure is not capable of carrying this development. The proposal is unacceptable.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Individual</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre &amp; Depot</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2016WP593</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Disagree</p> <p>The proposed use of this site is entirely without merit. 1. Inadequate transport links The A31 is notorious throughout Hampshire and East Dorset for congestion and accidents. Especially at commuter time and during the holiday season, the A31 barely copes with the weight of traffic on it and long queues can build up, especially between the David Phipps roundabout and the Canford Bottom Roundabout (CBR) “exactly where this sites extra traffic would be concentrated. I notice, looking at Dorset County Councils twitter feed today (for the first time), that there are constant tweets about accidents and delays on the A31. So DCC should be aware that the A31 makes this proposal unworkable. The CBR has long been a bottleneck. Improvements were made in 2012 with the installation of some 70 sets of traffic lights to support the redevelopment of the CBR into a hamburger junction with the A31 through the middle and local roads circulating the outside. In spite of this, long queues still build up particularly on the A31, on the carriageway of Ham Lane from Longham to the CBR and on the carriageway of Wimborne Road West from Ferndown towards the CBR where I have observed long queues stretching back past Uddens Drive even in times of otherwise light traffic, when the opposite carriageway moves freely “and this happens at unpredictable times, not just during the rush hour. This situation will not improve. In 2012 I asked the Highways Agency if they would return after completion of the CBR junction; test queue lengths against the shorter projected ones they had modelled and published; and tweak the junction to make sure queue lengths actually matched the projections. The answer was, No. Residents from Wimborne and Colehill (including the planned, large housing developments) would be driving round the CBR in huge numbers to get to a HRC and then trying to get out of Uddens Drive, turning right towards the CBR to get home. This would be an almost impossible task, whether traffic is moving or stationary on Wimborne Road West. An added problem is Stapehill Road, which joins Wimborne Road West virtually opposite Uddens Drive: the combination of the three roads is already recognised as a danger point, and adding in so many extra vehicles would be unwise. Anyone who lives and travels in this area knows that the road network here is at breaking point. Nobody who understood this would propose the development at Uddens. It must go elsewhere. 2. Proximity to housing, workplaces, nurseries, etc It cannot be right to put tips and incinerators so close to settlements. The associated unpleasantness and health risks (smells, noise, vermin, airborne pollution, possible toxins, etc, as well as spoiling the landscape) mean that any such facilities should be sited where the fewest people will be affected by them. The site at Uddens is surrounded by Colehill, Wimborne, Ferndown and Longham, as well as smaller settlements such as Stapehill and Hampreston. As well as a lot of housing, there is an industrial estate, schools, pubs, farms, garden centres, etc near the site. In a rural county like Dorset, there must be places where few if any people will be affected by the health risks associated with waste disposal: waste facilities should be sited there. 3. Destruction of a community amenity The site at Uddens Woods (referred to in this document as land SW of Blunts Farm) is not some random, disused area ripe for development. It’s a mature forest, part of the Cannon Hill and Uddens Plantation, the two parts of which are linked by a bridge over the A31. It’s been a recognised community resource for more than 30 years, used by thousands of people for activities as diverse as dog walking, rambling, cycling, horse riding, photography, painting, birdwatching and simply for the enjoyment of being in the countryside. The local community support the forest by joining regular work parties organised by the Friends of Uddens and Cannon Hill Woodlands, in conjunction with the Forestry Commission, to improve the plantation for residents use. There’s a trailway through it. For many people, the forest is the reason we chose to live here. It’s the only amenity we have; we need this amenity, and there is no reason to put waste facilities here when they could just as easily go elsewhere. In planning terms, if this is taken away, people will have to get in their cars to find other open spaces to use, which will also increase pressure on those spaces. 4. Use of green belt land The forest at Uddens forms part of the Green Belt and therefore should not be touched. The argument for using Uddens Woods is very peculiar. It seems to go: We wanted to put the waste facility on Blunts Farm, but that was green belt, so it was disallowed; now Blunts Farm is no longer green belt, so we want to put it there, but the owner said no, so we want to put it in Uddens Woods. BUT UDDENS WOODS ARE GREEN BELT, TOO! This makes no sense whatsoever. It’s my understanding that if green belt land like this is taken away from a community, the community must be given similar land of equal or greater value as an amenity. Where are you going to find the same area of mature forest rich in biodiversity, right on our doorstep, to give to our community? You can’t. This proposal must be disallowed. 5. Destruction of a forest rich in biodiversity The plantation supports an amazing array of wildlife, including protected species such as bats. The fauna in this area include deer, squirrel, bat, mouse, vole, shrew, grass snake, slow worm, frog, toad and many different types of birds, dragonflies, butterflies, moths and beetles. Walking in the woods, one sees an amazing number of different fungi. It would be criminal to destroy this habitat and kill off all of this wildlife. Let’s not have any box-ticking nonsense about reptile surveys and the like. It would simply be wholesale destruction,</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
---	--	--	--	---

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
				<p>and it must not go ahead. 6. Local residents not informed of these proposals I only learned of the proposals and the consultation from an article in a local community magazine. There was no personal notification from Dorset County Council, even though I live next to Cannon Hill plantation and a couple of minutes away from the CBR. On seeing the article, I looked at the News page of the council’s website and only found articles about Weymouth and two items exhorting people to cycle and to walk in the woods with their children “both activities which many people here love to do in Uddens and Cannon Hill Woods. To me this was the height of hypocrisy. I’ve seen no posters, leaflets, notices on lampposts, meetings or roadshows about this. DCCs news-sheet Your Dorset arrived last week and I can’t find anything in that. The only publicity I’ve found is multiple tweets about commenting on the Waste Plan- and that’s because today I was trying to find anything DCC had said about it, for the purposes of this comment. I feel the council has failed in its duty and acted unfairly towards residents. 7. Previous proposal disallowed A similar proposal was disallowed in 2006. This document makes no mention of the history of this proposal, and there is no acknowledgement of the strong local opposition to the previous proposal. 8. Proposal is contrary to government guidelines Considering Uddens Woods, this proposal is contrary to many sections of the governments National Planning Policy Framework, including #69 Planning policies and decisions; should aim to achieve places which promote opportunities for meetings between members of the community who might not otherwise come into contact with each other; safe and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas. #70 To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should; guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community’s ability to meet its day-to-day needs #73 Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. #74 Existing open space; should not be built on; #75 Planning policies should protect and enhance public rights of way and access. #80 Green Belt serves five purposes: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; — to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; — to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; — to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and — to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. #81 Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. #83 Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. Please summarise as: Transport links in this area already at breaking point and will not be improved. Residents and workers health and enjoyment of homes/workplaces would be adversely affected by smell, noise, pollution “facilities should be sited away from centres of population. Proposal would mean the destruction of a green belt forest rich in biodiversity which has been a much-used, well-loved community amenity for 30+ years. Local residents not adequately informed of these proposals. Previous proposal disallowed amid strong local opposition. Proposal is contrary to government guidelines on community resources and the green belt.</p>	
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP601	Disagree	<p>I strongly disagree with this proposal. This area is widely used by families and a beautiful location for walking the dog, horse riders &amp; cyclists. Plus it will introduce even more traffic onto the already incredibly busy Wimborne rd. west &amp; A31, causing more trouble &amp; delays for local residents!!! The pollution is another major factor, this is a green belt site &amp; as so should be left as the natural beauty site it is</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP575	Disagree	This is green belt land and should be protected. The roads around this area are already at capacity and to add a recycling depot would be unacceptable because of health and safety for everyone involved including all road users on that bit of A31	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP579	Disagree		Noted
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP739		As a Ferndown Town councillor, I'd like to strongly object to the proposed site at Blunt's Farm. Many local residents have expressed concerns about noise, pollution, smells and traffic. Local roads will not be able to support the increased traffic levels. There are also concerns about the implications for public health on building an incinerator in a populated area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP598	Disagree	There is already too much traffic in this area, the tailbacks from the Canford Bottom roundabout are ridiculous. The A31 is also overcrowded with gridlock on both the A31 and Wimborne Road happening regularly. There were similar plans for a Waste Plant back in 2005 (?) and the traffic has increased dramatically since then with the expansion of the Ferndown Industrial Estate - which is still growing. The area around the site is green belt used by many people for leisure and should be left as such.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP599	Disagree	The traffic situation in this area is already ridiculous and the Ferndown Industrial Estate is still expanding. The last thing needed is to encourage more traffic into the area. Gridlock on the A31 and Wimborne Road are too regular as it is.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP606	Disagree	<p>I completely disagree with your proposals for a waste plan for this area. In Section 5 WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' you have said that "The Ferndown area is well located for a strategic site to serve the needs of Bournemouth Dorset and Poole ..." Following on you have said "Key Development Considerations - TBC" why is nothing further written here?? - Further information is therefore required. Ferndown is not "well located". It is not in central Dorset, but is within East of the County, so how can it be acceptable to bring in traffic from North/West Dorset? The extra time lost in transporting waste to Ferndown from North Dorset is so short sited and the additional traffic costs/fumes surely should be considered. From your map in point 4.4 I note all the Strategic Waste Facilities (Blue) are all to the East of the County - why??? I disagree with all aspects of the WPO1 proposals - Bulky Waste transfer/treatment, Residual Waste Treatment, HRC and Waste Vehicle Depot. There are several reasons I disagree with the waste proposals: - a) Traffic/Roads With an already choked road network, more so in the summer months, which has exasperated by the Canford Bottom "roundabout" which has caused such problems instead of easing/helping the local traffic as many HGV's and lorries avoid using the bypass and come through Ferndown, which cannot cope much longer with this. The access proposed through Uddens would not ease this situation and why would you not propose the access via the A31 - because it is ill planned. b) Forest/Heathland and many habitats and recreation area Local development is not permitted within specific distances of SSI's so how can a waste plant be acceptable?? Why would you even consider green belt when other areas could be looked at. It is so important to keep these areas safe from industrial development, when so many people use Cannon Hill Woodlands. There are many nesting birds and reptiles that have habitats in this area. c) Employment within Ferndown Industrial Estate. You say "the WPA has been made aware that as Blunts Farm is developed business currently located at Ferndown and Uddens Industrial Estates may choose to re-locate to Blunts Farm, opening up opportunities for the development of a waste facility." The key point is "may choose". Many companies will not relocate and some have other sites in other areas of the Country so will simply close their Ferndown site. The local employment will fall for local residents. How can this be acceptable in such uncertain times?? EDDC and DCC must take into consideration all the views and comments made during this consultation. There should also be a well-advertised public meeting to address some questions not answered.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Ferndown Town Council	WPO1 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP602	Disagree	<p>Ferndown Town Council strongly object to the proposal of a Waste Transfer station at Blunts Farm and Uddens Industrial Estate, Ferndown. Transport Waste management facilities are significant generators of traffic and impact on the road infrastructure. Ferndown Town Council has been trying to reduce HGVs along Ringwood Road. The traffic will impact on the already horrendous Wimborne Road and A31, which will have a knock on effect on traffic all over Ferndown, which is already struggling to cope with the volume of traffic. Environmental Issues An incinerator was proposed for the Ferndown area some years ago and was refused permission. What has changed? Primary concern is the health and wellbeing of the local residents. Around 675 properties lie within 250m of Blunts Farm, with a further 101,000 homes within a five mile radius. Pollutants from smoke generated by a 30 foot incinerator will blow across the residential area as the wind blows predominately from that direction towards the housing estates. If the filters become blocked, what impact will this have on local residents? The proposed waste transfer station will smell in hot weather, attract vermin, cause noise pollution and have a harmful effect on the carbon footprint.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP614	Disagree	The proposed location of a household recycling centre is not appropriate for Blunts Farm and certainly not for the green belt land to the SW of Blunts Farm for the following reasons: Risk to health from air and noise pollution affecting numerous residential areas in the immediate locality due to prevailing winds. Loss of green belt forest which is continuously visited, enjoyed and maintained by a large number of local residents and visitors. The area is habitat for a variety of wildlife including protected species of bats. There is no reasonable access for the large number of household vehicles plus waste vehicle traffic. The local roads are already overwhelmed with traffic from the industrial estates and passing traffic on the A31, with large queues forming for Canford Bottom roundabout during all peak times. This will be exacerbated by any additional traffic and increase the risk to health of local residents from increased exhaust emissions.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP617	Disagree	I strongly object to the new waste and recycling plant being situated near Blunts farm ref WP01. Not only do I find the proposal a blatant contradiction of government restrictions on the use of green belt land, it would clearly be damaging to local residents use and enjoyment of said land as well as financially limiting the development and prosperity of the local area. Any such plans privately would constitute a public nuisance.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP631	Disagree	We are very disappointed that this proposal is being reconsidered. The site is due west of Ferndown in the direction of the usual prevailing winds. This would bring airborne smells and pollution directly to our homes. This is before we consider the impact on the already hopeless road system. Try to go either down ferndown bypass or Wimborne road west. Or try the Wimborne bypass in either direction! On 90% of occasions you need to allow at least an extra 30 minutes for your trip. Add a waste recycling site to this and it will just be gridlock. Do not proceed with this site as it will overload an already saturated road system.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP656	Disagree	<p>Re: development proposal to build a Dorset wide transfer station and waste incineration facility at Cannon Hill south (preferred site) or south west of Blunts Farm &amp; Uddens plantation. We found out about this proposal only a few days ago, not by being respectfully informed but from reading the letters to the editor page in the Blackmore Vale Magazine. We strongly object to the proposals for the following reasons: 1. Noting that these facilities are intended to serve Dorset as a whole and that income from small traders and leisure facilities are important for local jobs and local taxes, anything that obstructs what is already an inadequate road network cannot be good for Dorset. 2. To consider placing such a large waste incinerator facility so close to such a highly and expanding populated area, with all the risks of combustion effluents, given the regularity of the westerly winds descending on the population, including schools, nurseries and old people's homes, etc, we consider irresponsible, particularly at a time it is nationally recognised we need to support and enhance the health of the younger and older generations. 3. The loss of rare species such as wild orchids and beautiful special woodland which is vital for walkers, dog users, cyclists and horse riders etc to keep healthy, plus the mobility of wild species moving between wooded areas to east and west. 4. When the wind is in a westerly direction, especially in the autumn, we note that the area of special scientific interest called Slop Bog is liable to be contaminated from combustion effluents, without the apparent consideration for the inevitable drop in property values in the area, can local people expect to be compensated financially should this dreadful proposal go ahead. Thank you for taking our comments on board.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP660	Disagree	<p>Regarding the recent proposal to establish a Waste Vehicle Depot, Household Recycling Centre and a bulky waste transfer and treatment facility on the green belt Uddens Woodland area would add serious problems to an area that is mainly residential. Wimborne and its surrounding area are already fast disappearing under bricks and mortar with a huge amount of building in the pipeline. A smelly noisy waste dump of this scale will be one more horror in what was a lovely area to live in. Any woodland is hugely valuable to people and wildlife alike, and therefore should be preserved. The volume of traffic crossing the Canford Bottom roundabout is already causing huge problems with vehicle noise and exhaust fumes. If a waste dump is sited in the same area the infrastructure would be totally overwhelmed by many extra lorries and cars visiting the site daily and gridlock would ensue. As for the fallout fumes from the huge chimney blanketing the area, it does not bear thinking about. Ask yourselves, please, would you honestly want to live in such an area? Please please preserve this woodland and find another site for such a large facility. It is so important to us who live here and absolutely vital to our precious and fast declining wildlife.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP663	Disagree	<p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Draft Waste Plan Update which I have recently viewed on the internet but prefer to make my comments by letter. I appreciate the need for a more substantial waste/recycling plant as we producing more products and packaging which require, where at all possible, to be disposed of in a more environmentally friendly manner. I would however ask the question as to why the Uddens Industrial Estate has been 'earmarked' as an alternative to the previously suggested Blunts Farm site. It is my concern that the Uddens site would result in a huge increase in traffic on an already busy road - Wimborne Road West - which I understand the bypass was built to relieve. It does so, to a certain extent, but I am assured that many satellite navigational systems do not consider the bypass as an alternative to driving through Ferndown on either of its two roads. I feel that large vehicles would increase the traffic on Wimborne Road West detrimentally to Ferndown and feel that the previously suggested site, Blunts Farm, some 8 yrs ago, would be far better served by the Ferndown bypass to divert traffic from populated areas. I, in the most strong terms, also object to the proposal's inclusion of an incinerator. It is acknowledged that waste incinerator systems produce a wide variety of pollutants which are detrimental to human health. Incinerators release TOXIC METALS, DIOXINS, AND ACID GASES. Burning plastic is recognisably carcinogenic and it would be highly irresponsible for DCC to proceed with this proposal. Our children and our grandchildren will suffer from the ill effects of an incinerator on or near the environment in which they live and which the council is bound to protect for generations to come.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP666	Disagree	<p>As a resident of Stapehill, I wish to strongly object to your proposal for an industrial incinerator and waste treatment at Uddens Drive. The woodlands are used for recreation for the people of the local area and should be developed for this use not waste disposal. The traffic on Wimborne Road West is often jammed from Canford Bottom roundabout (whoever thought this up?) all the way back to the Old Thatch. There are numerous accidents at this crossroads, a waste lorry nearly killed me last week! So I'm certain increased traffic and lorries are inappropriate. Green Belt building at Stapehill Abbey will impact this traffic flow and strain local resources. I cannot see any benefit in employment for the area. I therefore object.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP669	Disagree	I have viewed the information contained on the website re the above waste plan but prefer to send a written response. I understand and accept the need for a new waste/recycling plant although I would ask why this site has been chosen in place of the Blunts Farm site. The Uddens site would result in a huge increase in traffic on an already busy road, Wimborne Road West, which the bypass was built to relieve. It does so admirably and I do not understand why it is deemed appropriate to increase the traffic on Wimborne Road West when an appropriate site is already identified and which would be served by Ferndown bypass. However, my main objection to this proposal is the inclusion of an incinerator. It is acknowledged that waste incinerator systems produced a wide variety of pollutants which are detrimental to human health. Incinerators release TOXIC METAL, DIOXCINS, AND ACID GASES. Burning plastics is recognisably carcinogenic and it would be highly irresponsible for DCC to proceed with this proposal. Our children and our grandchildren will suffer from the ill effects of an incinerator on or near the environment in which they live and which the council is bound to protect for generations to come.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP673	Disagree	As a retired consultant physician, I read with great concern that the woodland area at Uddens Drive south of the A31 near the old Thatch and accessed by Wimborne Road West, is the present County Council's preferred site for the development of an industrial waste treatment centre. This includes a 70-100m high chimney for the incinerator. I cannot believe the County Council expects to execute this. I oppose most strongly for the following reasons: 1. This land is part of the green belt woodland south of the A31 forming part of the Cannon Hill/Uddens Plantation. Loss of land which currently promotes better health through cycling and walking activities. 2. Biodiversity and plants and animals. 3. The site is very close and adjacent to residential and workplace areas. 4. The prevailing south/south west winds will distribute particulate matter and fumes to these area in (3) and beyond. 5. The passage of additional heavy lorries through residential areas, increasing traffic flow on an already very congested A31, Canford Bottom roundabout, Uddens Drive, and Wimborne Road West. To avoid heavy traffic flow and A31 congestion, lorries would take alternative routes through residential areas with associated increases in noise and pollution. 6. As a physician, I strongly object because of the potential adverse effects on health caused by diesel fumes; particulate emissions from the incinerator, fumes from same and increased traffic noise. All these are known to affect health and are detrimental. This site is completely unsuitable. The Council needs to rethink.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP679	Disagree	<p>Proposed Waste Plan for Ferndown (Blunts Farm and associated area) Site Ref. WP01 I am writing to register my objections to the proposed plans for waste at the above site. I have looked at the overall plan for Dorset and noticed as usual that nothing on the scale proposed for Ferndown is listed anywhere else in the county. Do you think that because it is mainly an elderly population that we do not care or you can slip this under the mat as your attempts at notification are laughable. I have been informed that Facebook and Twitter will carry the latest news. They are not the tool of information for most people and even the younger generation would not think to check the plans via this method. You state that after exhaustive searches these sites have been selected for suitability. How can anyone think it suitable to impose a site of this scale on the edge of a growing town and pollute the air quality for the population. The traffic around Ferndown is already gridlocked on many occasions and the addition of 100,000 plus vehicles for a Household Recycling Centre plus the waste vehicles returning frequently to offload their collections will create more congestion. Air pollution from these vehicles will also affect the health of local residents who often walk along the routes taken. The HRC along with the recycling, sorting, building, will create an environment for vermin and the smell from so much rubbish will make life very unpleasant for residents nearby. It is also proposed for an incinerator again to deal with the waste for the whole of Dorset. This was stated to be totally unacceptable in the last plan in 2005/6 by the Government Inspector and nothing has changed. This would not be conducive for anyone planning to open a business on the Trading Estate. It beggars belief that anyone could possibly think this is a good idea. The only place for a super waste site is far away in open countryside away from any residential population. We have more than enough open space in Dorset or will it be too near Dorchester. It appears that when any undesirable site is required be it a gypsy site or waste disposal, then Ferndown is first choice. Until the plans are more explicit then our objections are of a general nature but these will be firmed up at the next stage.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP713	Disagree	<p>There is already Hilliards Waste Disposal unit near the A31 end of the estate Whittle Road, causing an enormous amount of disruption, rubbish and traffic behind caterpillar business. The area is filthy and very unhygienic without any extra lorry delivery. The queues of traffic reach the full length from the Ringwood Road roundabout to Canford Bottom roundabout NOW, and trying to get out of Cobham Road Industrial Estate is ridiculous at present. Without even considering holiday traffic.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WPP720	Disagree	<p>More heavy lorries. Exhaust fumes. Smoke from chimney plus smells. Schools in the area. House prices will drop. I do not think an incinerator should be built in an urban area. What about the health of the public.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP723	Disagree	This is our green belt area and again near residential properties. Increased heavy traffic to and from the area would cause more pollution in a small area already having traffic congestion problems. And will not improve your (Council) green footprint. The areas are used by all ages as recreational areas as well as wildlife disturbance. You cannot pollute our lovely area with wholesale pollution from 40-70 metre chimney belching out carcinogenic material. This must be away from thickly populated areas, Central Dorset, Dorchester in fact. See what Prince Charles likes on 'his' town doorstep. Regarding Map 5, blue sites are all concentrated local to this area.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP01 Ferndown 'Area of Search' - Household Recycling Centre & Depot	2016WP735	Disagree	Since your last try about a waste dump and high chimney 70-100m high, so much has happened in Ferndown and Wimborne. Many homes have been built, more people and cars on the road, care homes have been built - one near the site. So many planes going over Ferndown large and small. The roads around here won't stand for big lorries, they are in a bad state. We have school in Ferndown and so many children. They are our future, and so is their health is our priority.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP07 Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	2016WP22	Agree	As stated, the existing Shaftesbury HRC is small and not coping with the demand from the increasing populations of Shaftesbury, Gillingham and surrounds. The proposed site on the Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham makes perfect sense - a sustainable site, good access site, in an area where there will be both residential and employment expansion to the south of the town. The move to this location will enable a much needed modern, possibly split level facility. Having seen the new facility at Swanage, with its ease of access and landscaping, I have no hesitation in favouring the same proposal at Brickfields, Gillingham.	Your support is welcomed
Individual	WP07 Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	2016WP34	Agree	Brickfields BP is the perfect site for the new Waste Station provided that the new access road is opened fully before the site goes live.	Your support is welcomed - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised.
Highways England	WP07 Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	2016WP863	Comment	This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. Comments remain the same.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Environment Agency	WP07 Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	2016WP846	Disagree	<p>No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided below. Flood Risk Small part of site in FZ2/FZ3. Some flooding shown on our surface water maps. If there is an Ordinary watercourse on site "Land Drainage Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) may be required. LLFA should be consulted on the proposed waste site. Water quality Surface water drains to tributary of the River Stour upstream of Longham (public water supply). Site very close to River Stour and Lodden. Groundwater This site is on a minor aquifer of Secondary or Unproductive designation. GWCL would have no objection subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. Any existing contaminated land will require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options appraisal in accordance with CLR11. Flood Risk FZ2&amp;3 so Sequential Test may be required by the LPA. Sequential Approach required. Detailed FRA required to assess fluvial flood risk, and other sources of flood risk. FRA also to include surface water management. There may be restrictions on use of soakaways, depending on the nature of the site (e.g. contaminated/ high groundwater levels). Groundwater and Contaminated land May require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options Appraisal at planning application stage. Waste/ Environmental permitting Impacts upon amenity should be considered bearing in mind the locations of residents and nearby business and control measures put in place to reduce effects from odour, dust etc. The waste hierarchy should be considered for outputs and processes. Contingency should be in place to reduce impact from flooding in terms of loss of infrastructure Biodiversity Ecological survey may be required at planning application stage.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
North Dorset District Council	WP07 Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	2016WP558	Agree	<p>WP07 Brickfields Business Park. This site scores highly in the Sustainability Appraisal. The area of land identified is on an allocated employment site and is currently vacant, allowing scope for the development of a modern facility generally well located to serve both towns, but with Gillingham set to grow substantially to approximately twice the population size of Shaftesbury, would be appropriately located in the largest town. This option is compliant with the adopted Local Plan Part 1 (2011-2031). However, we suggest some minor text changes within the table: Existing land use - Agriculture. There is planning permission for an office complex on the northern part of the site. (Planning permission for this development has now lapsed.) Access - The Gillingham Southern Extension includes a new link road from the B3081 to the eastern boundary of the site B3092. Access would be via this route. (The exact location of the link road has not yet been determined, but the consultation draft of the Master Plan Framework shows the road as potentially being located further south than the site identified for employment and HRC/WVD.)</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Dorset Wildlife Trust	WP07 Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	2016WP704	Comment	The proposed site partially overlaps a Flood Zone, and lies very close to the River Stour and the River Lodden. Dorset Wildlife Trust would suggest that the boundary of the proposed site is amended to remove any area which falls within the Flood Zone. Provided that the Environment Agency consent is agreed then Dorset Wildlife Trust has no particular biodiversity concerns about this site. It is not possible to assess the potential impact of the access route mentioned on the flood zone or river. It would be helpful if this was also marked on the map. If the public footpath is affected by the proposals and needs to be diverted or replaced, there may be the opportunity to create a new native hedgerow with standards which would enhance the biodiversity of the site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised. Further though will be given to removal of the Flood Zone from the site boundary.
Individual	WP07 Brickfields Business Park, Gillingham	2016WP657	Comment	We are very much in favour of a new recycling centre - essential for the size of Gillingham. However, has any other site been considered? Could another possibility be in the Business Park behind Orchard Park? Surely this would have less impact on the town and the traffic - roundabout already in situ to ease congestion. Extra traffic on the B3092 could create problems if the Brickfields site is chosen, considering the possibility of more housing development in that area. We sincerely hope that the proposed new site has easier access than the present Shaftesbury facility and No stairs to empty bags! Surely, if the Shaftesbury facility is to be closed, it would seem better to have the new Gillingham recycling centre at the Shaftesbury end of the town, rather than bring all that extra traffic into the town.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP08 Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works	2016WP135	Comment	The chosen site is too close to existing properties in Stour Meadows and Stour Gardens (using the DEFRA guidelines of 400 metres exclusion). A recent application to erect houses on adjacent fields was rejected by North Dorset District Council and an appeal dismissed by the planning Inspectorate based on the effect of odours from the existing sewage works. Any expansion of the works should take this in to account and create the maximum separation from existing properties. An extension which followed the line of the railway track i.e. South West of the existing site would reduce the impact of annoyance and unpleasant odours from the works.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Highways England	WP08 Gillingham Sewage Treatment	2016WP864	Comment	This site is proposed to be shortlisted for allocation in the Waste Plan. Comments remain the same.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Environment Agency	WP08 Gillingham Sewage Treatment Works	2016WP847	Comment	<p>No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided below. Overall EA position: No objection. This development is required because of improvements required under the Asset Management Plan (AMP) process. Flood Risk Given the size of the site (major development) a full Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will need to be submitted in support of any future application in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) will be the planning consultee in respect of surface water drainage. Fisheries and biodiversity The proposed site appears to be on improved pasture or arable therefore the impacts on biodiversity are likely to be minimal. There is a substantial tree lined buffer between the site and the watercourse, as well a railway line, which also provides an artificial buffer between the river and the proposed development. Gillingham is a water vole core area and otters are also known to be present on the River Stour, but these species are unlikely to be affected unless the detailed proposals include impacts on the river and river corridor. Groundwater and contaminated land This site is on a minor aquifer of Secondary or Unproductive designation. We would have no objection subject to standard conditions for the protection of land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. Any existing contaminated land will require Site Investigation, Risk Assessment and Remedial Options appraisal in accordance with CLR11. Waste If any wastes are brought on to site as part of the development phase, they should be done so under the relevant permit or exemption. Pollution prevention Appropriate pollution prevention measures will need to be put in place at this site. Water Quality There are no water quality objections to this proposal. These are improvements required under AMP. Any further studies required? Not at this stage.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
North Dorset District Council	WP08 Gillingham Sewage Treatment	2016WP557	Agree	Accept the principle that a safeguarded area to the Sewage Treatment Works as illustrated on the map accompanying WP08 may be necessary to meet identified needs. However, this should not lead to unacceptable levels of odour to existing nearby residential properties.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	WP08 Gillingham Sewage Treatment	2016WP705	Comment	If the public footpath is affected by the proposals and needs to be diverted or replaced, there may be the opportunity to create a new native hedgerow with standards which would enhance the biodiversity of the site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP08 Gillingham Sewage Treatment	2016WP683	Disagree	The extension to the Sewage Works seems like creeping development getting nearer to existing houses - less than 400 metres. How long can you keep expanding an old facility originally intended for a small village? It is an antiquated system and odours are a problem at present so getting nearer to housing should be avoided. It is a very large expansion to the existing facility and would encroach on green space which we value and is ever shrinking.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
West Dorset & Weymouth & Portland Councils	WP09 Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works	2016WP132	Agree	WP09 Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works extension “ proposed extension to the sewerage treatment works incorporating landscape mitigation The preferred approach to the expansion of the Sewage Treatment Works incorporating landscape mitigation is considered appropriate. The inclusion of an area for landscape mitigation is supported.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Highways England	WP09 Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works	2016WP872	Comment	Proposals have changed due to concerns relating to landscape and visual impacts. Land to the east of the existing site (Option B) has been discounted and land to the north has been expanded in a westerly direction, abutting the north of the site, in order to enable mitigation to be built into any future development. Providing the amendment does not affect trips, Highways England comments remain the same.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	WP09 Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works	2016WP848		No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided below. Overall EA position: No objection. This development is required because of improvements required under the Asset Management Plan (AMP) process. Flood Risk No flood risk concerns from our point of view. Our Flood Risk Standing Advice (FRSA) applies in respect of surface water drainage. Fisheries and biodiversity There are records of the Marsh Fritillary butterfly in the lowland calcareous grassland, where the extension is proposed and further investigation may be needed. Waste Any wastes brought on to site for the expansion works should be done so under the relevant permit or waste exemption. Water quality There are no water quality objections to this proposal. These are improvements required under AMP. Pollution prevention Appropriate pollution prevention measures will need to be put in place at this site. Any further studies required? Ecology study	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Historic England	WP09 Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works	2016WP803	Comment	We acknowledge the comments and recommendations of the county archaeologist in relation to this site.	Noted
Dorset Wildlife Trust	WP09 Maiden Newton Sewage Treatment Works	2016WP706	Comment	Although this site lies close to the Langcombe Bottom Site of Nature Conservation Interest the proposed site for the expansion of the existing sewage treatment works is downhill from the species-rich grassland and sufficiently small and separated from it, that it is unlikely to have a significant adverse impact upon the SNCI. The amendment of the boundary of the proposed site to remove Option B and extend Option A to the west moves the site further from the SNCI boundary and is therefore supported by DWT.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised. Your support for the amended site boundary is welcomed.

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
West Dorset & Weymouth & Portland Councils	WP14 Bourne Park, Piddlehinton	2016WP131	Comment	WP14 Bourne Park, Piddlehinton “proposed green waste recycling facility The site at Bourne Park currently is not formally designated as an employment site even though employment related uses are currently operating on the site. It is noted that the existing anaerobic digester facility offers operational synergies with the proposed composting facility. The site is prominent in the landscape due to its elevated location and with the Dorset AONB being in close proximity to the north good design, appropriate landscaping and sensitive lighting design are critical to a successful application. In addition, the impact of increased traffic on nearby rural roads and villages needs to be minimised. The Piddle Valley Neighbourhood Plan is at an advanced stage in its production having been submitted to the district council for consultation and on to examination. The draft plan has been produced by the local community through extensive consultation and therefore reflects the views of the local community. As a result, the draft plan carries some weight in planning decisions. It is expected to be formally made early in 2017 and will then form part of the development plan. The draft proposals in the Piddle Valley Neighbourhood Plan include a policy specific to Bourne Park and Enterprise Park. The draft plan states that Bourne Park should not be expanded further, but improvements to existing buildings would be acceptable. Access to Bourne Park must not be via London Row . The draft plan also highlights the intrusive impact of security lighting and seeks to minimise its impact.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Highways England	WP14 Bourne Park, Piddlehinton	2016WP873	Comment	The site is an existing anaerobic digestion plant and is being considered for allocation for a green waste composting facility. Access, will be from the B3143 to the south via Piddlehinton Enterprise Park. The site is located just to the north of the A35 so could potentially be adversely affected by development here. We would need further information to understand the likely trip generation before commenting on likely impact.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Environment Agency	WP14 Bourne Park, Piddlehinton	2016WP849	Comment	No objection to proposals and no further comments over and above those previously made in earlier consultations, which are provided below. No objection in principle provided that the following points are addressed. Groundwater Site is in SPZ1 so adequate pollution prevention measures will need to be put in place. A risk assessment may be required. Environmental permit An environmental permit will be required and will need to adequately address issues around amenity as these type of operations may cause odour and noise. Adequate infrastructure and pollution prevention measures will be required. Flood Risk The Lead Local Flood Authority (Dorset County Council) should be consulted on the proposals as they may have information on flooding relevant to this site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Wessex Water	WP14 Bourne Park, Piddlehinton	2016WP764	Comment	The site is within SPZ1. It is acknowledged that there is an existing AD Plant on site with a green Waste Composting site proposed.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Historic England	WP14 Bourne Park, Piddlehinton	2016WP804	Comment	The heritage assessments, associated commentary and recommendations are noted. No further comment.	Noted
Alliance Planning	WP14 Bourne Park, Piddlehinton	2016WP901	Comment	Eco Sustainable Solutions Site at Bourne Park, Piddlehinton The Eco Sustainable Solutions Site at Bourne Park, Piddlehinton is referred to as Site WP14 in the Draft Waste Plan Update. The document outlines that this site could address the identified need for capacity for the management of green waste in West Dorset. Eco obtained planning permission for an Anaerobic Digestion (AD) Facility at Bourne Park Estate in June 2010 (Planning Ref: 1/D/2008/0989). The AD Facility was designed to process 25,000 tonnes per year of organic domestic and commercial waste and 12,000 tonnes of agricultural slurry arising from local pig farms. The facility would generate up to 1,000KW of power, via a CHP engine driven generator, for supply to the Local Distribution Network, whilst the final digestate would be used on farms as a soil improver or conditioner. The AD Facility commenced operation in late-2012 and is operating efficiently. Eco considers that the wider site has scope for further waste management uses. The site can address the identified need for capacity for the management of green waste in West Dorset. Open windrow composting of green waste collected from the West Dorset area can be accommodated at this site. Locating composting alongside the existing AD facility provides benefits. There is the option to take softer green waste into the AD process and both operations could share facilities such as the weighbridge. Leachate from the composting operations could also be used in the AD process if required. Any proposal for a green waste composting facility would need to be subject to a planning application and would therefore need to consider a number of planning and environmental factors, including traffic and proximity to the Dorset AONB. Notwithstanding these considerations, it is our contention that the proposed site at Bourne Park provides a suitable location for green waste composting that can be integrated with the existing AD process to maximise efficiency. Hence, we wish to reiterate our support for the identification of this site within the new Waste Plan. Concluding Comments It is submitted that Ecos site at Bourne Park, Piddlehinton also offers scope for the location of further recycling activities, namely green waste composting. In this regard, the Bourne Park site would help to address an identified need for the management of green waste in West Dorset and would help maximise the operational efficiency of the site in tandem with the existing AD process	Noted
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	WP14 Bourne Park, Piddlehinton	2016WP894	Comment	WP14 Bourne Park, Piddlehinton (no designation in original draft): East Dorset FoE supports this site.	Support is welcomed

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	14	2016WP277	Disagree	<p>As a local resident of Purbeck, I wish to strongly disagree with this proposal. Ć An extension to the quarry of 17 acres was applied for in 2014; this increased to 35 acres in 2015. Ć The amended plan from 2015 remains at 35 acres but has moved the quarry further towards the village of Kingston, making it more visible from the B3069 (top road) opposite Greystone Court. Ć As the site is more elevated, the noise and dust pollution will be much greater due to the prevailing winds. The quarry currently nestles in a valley therefore this pollution is contained. Ć Proposals to camouflage the site are not realistic. These are exposed uplands and any attempt to screen with hedging or trees will take decades to grow. Has anyone seen any trees on this ridge? Ć The possible tunnel location over the Purbeck Way is misleading. How can anyone decide whether this can or cannot be done when we have no idea what this means? Ć LANDFILL: The proposed extension of landfill will create additional lorry movements in addition to the quarry’s current 60 movement allowance which they already achieve. This is all additional traffic manoeuvring through the narrow streets of Corfe. Ć The bronze settlement is still in close proximity. Kingstons private water supply could still be compromised (only recently did Kingston village have to refrain from drinking the water as the supply had been disturbed). The village still obtains some of its water from the springs in the Coombe. Ć Once again NOTHING HAS CHANGED. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 “it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction proposed would be highly intrusive and damaging. There is ample supply of aggregate elsewhere in Dorset with none of the AONB and environmental restrictions in place. I strongly object to this proposal.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WVP273	Disagree	<p>I would like to express my complete objection to the extension of Swanworth Quarry I understand that the proposed quarry extension will destroy 14 hectares within an area designated as of Outstanding Natural Beauty and will have a devastating impact on Purbecks unique landscape. The noise of an open caste quarry will impact the surrounding villages in particular Worth Matravers and Kingston. I understand that this is NOT traditional Purbeck stone quarrying but commercial mining for aggregate on a large scale that will create a scar on the landscape for many many years to come. In addition: *The site remains the same size but now includes a "possible tunnel" over The Purbeck Way? What does this mean? *It now extends further North into the field adjacent to the B3069, where it will be fully visible to the local community. * Now includes increased Waste Landfill of the present site up to 400,000 tonnes: this will be transported through Corfe Castle and up Kingston Hill. These areas are already heavily over burdened with transport during the summer months and large lorries will be extremely detrimental to the road system and the ambience of Corfe in particular. * If approved, the new site would give rise to additional traffic through the Parish for an extended period. * This AONB site (one of only 33 in the country) will be compromised for a finite aggregate resource. There is also some concern that it could cause issues with Kingston water supply. I understand that this was a major issue in permission not being granted around 25 years ago. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 and i believe that Purbeck District Council refused the planning application on the following grounds to safeguard and enhance the special character of this area. They considered the nature and scale of stone extraction proposed would be highly intrusive and damaging Nothing has changed if anything tourism is even more important than ever to Purbeck.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WVP283	Comment	<p>Re. your notice in the advertiser of 6th June, about the Swanworth Quarry in Worth Matravers, I see no objection to quarry and building material being put into the quarry. The paper writes of 'black bag waste' which to me is household rubbish. 30 years ago we were categorically told by Tarmac who owned Swanworth at the time that Purbeck Stone is porous and the gas from household rubbish would seep up into our houses so the quarry could not be used for this purpose. Being an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, it would be horrendous to see a pit at the entrance to the village and environmentally unhealthy to those who live and visit the area.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WVP293	Comment	<p>This site is in an area of outstanding natural beauty. Whilst the site needs filling, this should not be undertaken at the detriment of the area. Waste should only be rubble or soil with no other waste allowed due to subsoil. Also the size of lorries should be restricted as the lanes are very narrow. The size of lorries appears to have increased over the last 6 mths and this should definitely be restricted to reduce the impact of the site on local people.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP294	Comment	<p>I wish to object strongly to the proposed, and extended, changes to the Swanworth Quarry. This is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which will be severely disrupted and forever changed, for a finite resource. The proposed waste landfill will cause huge amounts of disruptive and noisy traffic through along twisty, rural roads and through ancient villages which are already under pressure from traffic. Local businesses which rely on tourism would be disadvantaged. The area is much appreciated by local people and by tourists for its beautiful views and the excellent walking. The Purbeck Way, in particular, would be badly affected by these proposals. There are not many AONBs in the country - this is one of 33 - and we need to respect and protect these precious areas for future generations. These are places of retreat and peace, and where wildlife has a chance to flourish. Noise and disruption have a disproportionate effect on birds and mammals, in ways we don't yet know and appreciate. We are relying on you to consider the long-term - not just cave in to short-term commercial interests - and to honour the reasons for this area being designated an AONB.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP311	Disagree	<p>As a local resident of Purbeck, I wish to strongly disagree with this proposal. Please see below for the list of reasons why this amended plan should not take place: An extension to the quarry of 17 acres was applied for in 2014; this has actually now increased to 35 acres in 2015. The amended plan from 2015 remains at 35 acres, not taking to account the public objections) and has now moved the quarry further towards the village of Kingston, in fact making it more visible from the B3069 (Kingston Road) opposite Greystone Court. As the site is more elevated, the noise and dust pollution will be much greater due to the prevailing winds. The quarry currently nestles in a valley therefore this pollution is contained. Proposals to camouflage the site are not realistic. These are exposed uplands and any attempt to screen with hedging or trees will take decades to grow. This will therefore have a negative effect on the aesthetics of the area, which in turn could have an impact on tourism, one of the major employers of Purbeck The possible tunnel location over the Purbeck Way is misleading. Surely yet again this is going to lead to a lot of short-term disruption; visually and noise. Also, how can anyone decide whether this can or cannot be done when we have no idea what this means? The issue of Landfill - The proposed extension of landfill will create additional lorry movements in addition to the quarry's current 60 movement allowance which they already achieve. This is all additional traffic manoeuvring through the narrow streets of Corfe Castle, as well as down Kingston Hill, along B roads. The roads already are not in the best of conditions and congestion is becoming an increasing problem through Corfe. This is going to further impact on already busy roads, in particular in the summer months The bronze settlement is still in close proximity, this appears to be the only area that has been attempted to address Kingstons private water supply could still be compromised (only recently did Kingston village have to refrain from drinking the water as the supply had been disturbed). The village still obtains some of its water from the springs in the Coombe. This form of quarrying is not traditional stone Purbeck quarrying as other quarries are along Kingston Road and in Worth Matravers - it is not in keeping with the traditional industry Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 as it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction proposed would be highly intrusive and damaging. This has not changed. Also, since this time period the role and importance of tourism, including the Jurassic World Heritage Coastline indeed means that it is even less applicable now. There is large supplies aggregate elsewhere in Dorset with none of the AONB and environmental restrictions in place. I strongly object to this proposal.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP332	Disagree	I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the changes to the above proposal. I am concerned that the site now extends further north into the adjacent field to the B3069, where it will be fully visible to the local community. The plan now includes increased Waste Landfill of the present site up to 400,000 tonnes which will be transported through the conservation village of Corfe Castle and up Kingston Hill. If approved there would be increased traffic through the area. This AONB site (one of only 33 in the country) will be compromised for a finite aggregate resource.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP343	Disagree	I COMPLETELY OBJECT TO THE EXTENSION OF SWANWORTH QUARRY I understand that the proposed quarry extension will destroy 14 hectares within an area designated as of Outstanding Natural Beauty and will have a devastating impact on Purbeck's unique landscape. The noise of an open cast quarry will impact the surrounding villages in particular Worth Matravers and Kingston. I understand that this is NOT traditional Purbeck stone quarrying but commercial mining for aggregate on a large scale that will create a scar on the landscape for many many years to come. In addition: *The site remains the same size but now includes a "possible tunnel" over The Purbeck Way? What does this mean? *It now extends further North into the field adjacent to the B3069, where it will be fully visible to the local community. * Now includes increased Waste Landfill of the present site up to 400,000 tonnes: this will be transported through Corfe Castle and up Kingston Hill. These areas are already heavily over burdened with transport during the summer months and large lorries will be extremely detrimental to the road system and the ambience of Corfe in particular. * If approved, the new site would give rise to additional traffic through the Parish for an extended period. * This AONB site (one of only 33 in the country) will be compromised for a finite aggregate resource. There is also some concern that it could cause issues with Kingston water supply. I understand that this was a major issue in permission not being granted around 25 years ago. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 and I believe that Purbeck District Council refused the planning application on the following grounds to safeguard and enhance the special character of this area. They considered the nature and scale of stone extraction proposed would be highly intrusive and damaging. Nothing has changed if anything tourism is even more important than ever to Purbeck.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP365	Disagree	Purbeck's infrastructure does not support such development. Corfe Castle and Kingston Hill are especially unsuitable for lorries. Time and time again the traffic through Corfe Castle is grinding to a halt whilst lorries attempt to navigate the 2 particularly narrow sections. The bends of Kingston Hill are too narrow for lorries to safely pass. Our children's school bus driver has commented that he is concerned when he meets the lorries on the Hill. The pavement which leads from the Corfe bound bus stop is particularly narrow and it can be quite a scary experience to be between a lorry on one side and a stone wall on the other. Tourism has to be the Council's priority in an area of outstanding natural beauty and a visible waste site together with more and more heavy vehicles on the road would not be progress.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP468	Comment	I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Campaign to Protect Rural England	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP474	Disagree	The proposal appears to be that when the current void spaces become full then some further void spaces will be filled with inert waste filling. This is acceptable provided 1. There is no increase in heavy traffic on the narrow and twisting roads in the Isle of Purbeck especially in Corfe Castle village and on Kingston Hill. 2. This important site is in the AONB and adjacent to an SSSI and the special character of the area must be properly maintained.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP503	Disagree	<p>As a local resident of Purbeck, I wish to disagree strongly with this proposal for the following reasons: ¢ The original quarry was started many years ago, before the area in which it stands was designated as an AONB. Designation is designed to conserve and ensure natural beauty and there is a presumption against developments of this nature in an AONB location. This so called extension is not an extension at all but a completely NEW quarry which can only be reached by building an industrial sized steel bridge over the Purbeck Way and then building a tunnel between two Bronze Age burial mounds. The local archaeologists and Celtic curator of The British Museum have said this would have a detrimental effect and would also destroy future archaeological evidence of this Celtic Settlement. ¢ The DCC has conflicting issues here, with its statutory obligations (e.g. under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act) and the policies set out in the AONB Management Plan and all that it stands for. Furthermore the Purbeck Local Plan supports only small scale extraction to meet local demand “not industrial scale open-cast mining. ¢ There are no exceptional reasons for ignoring the AONB. The 35 acre quarry would not be traditional in any sense: it is limestone industrial mining for crushed stone. There are ample supplies which can be obtained locally in Dorset, on Portland, and in Somerset where there is a rail link to Hamworthy. ¢ An extension to the quarry of 17 acres was applied for in 2014; this increased to 35 acres in 2015. The amended plan from 2015 remains at 35 acres but has moved the quarry further towards the village of Kingston, making it more visible from the B3069 (top road) opposite Kingston Courtyard. Kingston village is on a private water supply. This supply is already vulnerable to contamination and only recently the villagers had to refrain from drinking the water. The water originates from the springs in the Coombe in Hill Bottom, in close proximity to the quarry. The landfill plans of 440,000 tonnes of inert waste and the industrial mining excavation could significantly affect the water supplies. This does not seem to have registered yet and could be a huge problem. The proposed site is more elevated and therefore the noise and dust pollution will be much greater due to the prevailing winds. The quarry currently nestles in a valley and this pollution is contained. ¢ Proposals to camouflage the site are not realistic. These are exposed uplands and any attempt to screen with hedging or trees will take decades to materialise. Has anyone seen any trees on this ridge? ¢ LANDFILL: The proposed extension of landfill volumes will create additional lorry movements in addition to the quarry’s current 60 day movement allowance which they already achieve. This is all additional traffic manoeuvring through the narrow streets of Corfe and up Kingston Hill, whose residents are already long-term sufferers of shaking houses and gear-changing engine noise. NOTHING HAS CHANGED. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 “it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction proposed would be highly intrusive and damaging. There is ample supply of crushed stone elsewhere in southern England both in Dorset and elsewhere which could be utilised without the serious adverse impacts of this project. I strongly object to this proposal.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Settle Stone Quarries	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP505	Agree	<p>Swanworth Quarry has a current planning permission from DCC and relevant permits from the Environment Agency which allows for upto 100,000t per yeay of inert materials to be imported into Swanworth Quarry for the recovery of the site, e.g. restoration, and for recycling inert demolition materials into recycled aggregate. Due to a number of ever changing factors e.g. , rate of extraction, availability of inert materials, density and compaction rates of imported materials, demand for inert void space in Dorset, the restoration profile of Swanworth needs to be altered slightly. This will result in 400,000t of material being required to fill the void space that is currently being created by the extraction of stone. This material will be bought in as part of our ongoing operations and our current vehicle movements. It is not in any way related to the proposed extension and is part of normal, day to day operations.</p>	Noted

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP507	Disagree	I wish to strongly disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic which is already considerable. c) This is not only an AONB area, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP512	Comment	Additional proposed use as Inert Landfill Provided that the proposed additional infill does not cause a delay in the timing of restoration of this site, we do not believe there would be any problems with this. Restoration of this site in due course has the potential for considerable habitat gain through the creation of calcareous grassland.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP515	Disagree	I wish to strongly disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. I gather, the plan is for large quarry machines to access the extended quarry by crossing the Coombe and The Purbeck Way by way of a large steel bridge. This seems totally out of keeping with this rural area. This country walk, we take from Corfe Castle to Chapmans Poole and the south west coastal path, will be spoilt. And I cannot see how the whole project can be camouflaged on these exposed hills. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic which is already considerable. c) This is not only an AONB area, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP516	Comment	<p>I wish to strongly disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. I gather, the plan is for large quarry machines to access the extended quarry by crossing the Coombe and The Purbeck Way by way of a large steel bridge. This seems totally out of keeping with this rural area. This country walk, we take from Corfe Castle to Chapmans Poole; the south west coastal path and the World Heritage site will be spoilt. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for heavier vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic which is already considerable. c) This is not only an AONB area, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP518	Comment	<p>I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic which is already considerable. c) This is not only an AONB area, but it lies along side the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP545	Disagree	This is an area of outstanding natural beauty and it was originally stated that it could be turned into a nature conservation area. Using it for waste will totally destroy any other potential use such as for housing. The carriage of waste cannot be supported on the roads from Corfe Castle onwards. Traffic is already a major burden in quantity and size of vehicles. This has noticeably increased in recent months. Roads and traffic and pollution will damage the environment and damage tourism on which this area relies. The smell, noise and dust are already a problem and will get worse. I have almost been knocked off the road a few times by these huge trucks travelling at dangerous speeds. The natural environment which is meant to be protected in this area because it is so unique is again being damaged for the greed of the few. I object to this site being used for waste disposal.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Natural England	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP627	Comment	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry The consultation proposes additional filling of 2-3 m across undefined areas of the site. The site lies within the Dorset AONB and as such should be restored to the original landform as a matter of principle, in the absence of any more detailed information it is difficult to comment on the acceptability or otherwise of the proposals as these clearly need to be understood from various viewpoints. The policy position with regards the AONB is set out in the NPPF. Natural England advice that the authority should liaise closely with the AONB Team to establish where on the site such proposals may come forward in an acceptable form or be suitably moderated if this is a possible option.	Your comments are noted. The Waste Planning Authority will liaise closely with the AONB Team regarding this site.
Highways England	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP874	Comment	This is an existing stone quarry with a mobile aggregates recycling plant and permission for inert waste filling to aid restoration. Additional capacity for the filling of approximately 40,000 tonnes of inert waste at Swanworth Quarry is being proposed by the site operator. The site is located to the south of the A35 and any effects on the SRN are likely to be experienced A35/A351 junction. The development of this site has the potential to impact the SRN and may generated significant movements of HGVs on and across the SRN. Development here would need to be supported by a robust transport evidence base to understand the extent of any impacts. Before we respond on this we would need to some information on potential trip generation.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Environment Agency	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP850	Comment	No objection in principle to the proposals for inert filling of Swanworth Quarry, provided an Environmental Permit is obtained, if required, and the following comments taken into account for this site. Environmental Permitting This development may require an Environmental Permit under the Environmental Permitting Regulations from the Environment Agency, unless a waste exemption applies. This should be applied for at the earliest possible stage. Flood Risk Site is in Flood Zone 1. If there is an Ordinary watercourse on site "Land Drainage Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) may be required. LLFA should be consulted on the proposed waste site. Other flood risks may be present and should be assessed. Detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) required at planning application stage. This should also include surface water management. Groundwater projection A hydrogeological risk assessment may be required for these proposals at the planning application stage. Biodiversity Ecological surveys and assessment are likely to be required at the planning application stage particularly due to the proximity of the adjacent SAC and SSSI. Pollution prevention Appropriate pollution prevention measures will need to be put in place at this site.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Swanage town council	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP650	Comment	Further to Minute No. 7) a) of the Planning and Consultation Committee Meeting held on 9 th May 2016, the Mineral and Waste Sites Planning Policy Consultation documents had now been received and reviewed by Committee Members. A short discussion ensued and comments were made that extensive work had been undertaken on the plans to limit visual and environmental impacts, and that they were lengthy and comprehensive. Members agreed that extended waste facilities were required, and it was confirmed that, in respect of the Additional Waste Site Allocation proposals for the existing Swanworth Quarry site, the proposals related to inert waste only, not household waste, and that some of the inert waste was, in fact, re-processed and re-used. A query was raised as to why the Town Council had been consulted as all sites identified in the plans were outside the parish boundary, and had no direct impact on the parish. It was confirmed that the Council had been consulted as it was a neighbouring authority. Members concurred that they had no further observations to make, and it was therefore AGREED: That a response be submitted to Dorset County Council confirming that the Committee had reviewed and appropriately discussed the consultation documents, and had no further comments to make.	Noted
Langton Matravers Parish Council	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP902	Comment	At its meeting on 14 th July the Council discussed proposals for Swanworth quarry relating to extension of the quarry and further disposal of inert waste, and made the following resolution in relation to the DCC Minerals and Waste Site Consultation: - This Council supports continuing quarrying at Swanworth subject to their being: 1.No increase in traffic movements . 2. No negative impact on water supplies 3. No negative impact on AONB, and subject to approval from relevant bodies on environmental matters. Could you please take this message as Langton Matravers Parish Councils formal response to the consultation, and include it in your collected responses.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP647	Disagree	<p>I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP684	Disagree	<p>Swanworth Quarry extension plans have been on the Mineral Sites consultation plan since 2014 but the site has not been allocated. Why has no decision been made in two years? Is this a serious proposal? Why is it For Information Only? I wish to disagree strongly with this latest proposal for the following reasons: - The original quarry was started before the AONB safeguards were applied. This so called extension is not an extension at all, but a completely NEW quarry which can only be reached by building an industrial sized steel bridge over the Purbeck Way and then building a tunnel between two Bronze Age burial mounds. The local archaeologists and Celtic curator of the British Museum have said this would have a detrimental effect and would also destroy future archaeological evidence of this Celtic settlement. - There are no exceptional reasons for ignoring the AONB. The 35 acre quarry would not be traditional in any sense; it is limestone industrial mining for crushed stone. There are ample supplies which can be obtained locally in Dorset, on Portland, and Somerset where there is a rail link to Hamworthy. - An extension to the quarry of 17 acres was applied for in 2014; this increased to 35 acres in 2015. The amended plan from 2015 remains at 35 acres but has moved the quarry further towards the village of Kingston, making it more visible from the B3069 (top road) opposite Kingston Courtyard. - Kingston village is on a private water supply. This supply is already vulnerable to contamination and only recently the villagers had to refrain from drinking the water. The water originates from the springs in the Coombe in Hill Bottom, in close proximity to the quarry. The landfill plans of 440,000 tonnes of inert waste and the industrial mining excavation could significantly affect the water supplies. This does not seem to have registered yet and could be a huge problem. - The proposed site is more elevated and therefore the noise and dust pollution will be much greater due to the prevailing winds. The quarry currently nestles in a valley and this pollution is contained. - Proposals to camouflage the site are not realistic. These are exposed uplands and any attempt to screen with hedging or trees will take decades to materialise. Has anyone seen any trees on this ridge? - LANDFILL: The proposed extension of landfill volumes will create additional lorry movements in addition to the quarry's current 60 day movement allowance which they already achieve. This is all additional traffic manoeuvring through the narrow streets of Corfe and Kingston Hill, the residents are already long term sufferers of shaking houses and gear changing engine noise. NOTHING HAS CHANGED. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 "it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction proposed would be highly intrusive and damaging. There is ample supply of aggregate elsewhere in Dorset with none of the AONB and environmental restrictions in place.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP646	Disagree	<p>I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP690	Disagree	<p>Swanworth Quarry extension plans have been on the Mineral Sites consultation plan since 2014 but the site has not been allocated. Why has no decision been made in two years? Is this a serious proposal? Why is it For Information Only? I wish to disagree strongly with this latest proposal for the following reasons: - The original quarry was started before the AONB safeguards were applied. This so called extension is not an extension at all, but a completely NEW quarry which can only be reached by building an industrial sized steel bridge over the Purbeck Way and then building a tunnel between two Bronze Age burial mounds. The local archaeologists and Celtic curator of the British Museum have said this would have a detrimental effect and would also destroy future archaeological evidence of this Celtic settlement. - There are no exceptional reasons for ignoring the AONB. The 35 acre quarry would not be traditional in any sense; it is limestone industrial mining for crushed stone. There are ample supplies which can be obtained locally in Dorset, on Portland, and Somerset where there is a rail link to Hamworthy. - An extension to the quarry of 17 acres was applied for in 2014; this increased to 35 acres in 2015. The amended plan from 2015 remains at 35 acres but has moved the quarry further towards the village of Kingston, making it more visible from the B3069 (top road) opposite Kingston Courtyard. - Kingston village is on a private water supply. This supply is already vulnerable to contamination and only recently the villagers had to refrain from drinking the water. The water originates from the springs in the Coombe in Hill Bottom, in close proximity to the quarry. The landfill plans of 440,000 tonnes of inert waste and the industrial mining excavation could significantly affect the water supplies. This does not seem to have registered yet and could be a huge problem. - The proposed site is more elevated and therefore the noise and dust pollution will be much greater due to the prevailing winds. The quarry currently nestles in a valley and this pollution is contained. - Proposals to camouflage the site are not realistic. These are exposed uplands and any attempt to screen with hedging or trees will take decades to materialise. Has anyone seen any trees on this ridge? - LANDFILL: The proposed extension of landfill volumes will create additional lorry movements in addition to the quarry's current 60 day movement allowance which they already achieve. This is all additional traffic manoeuvring through the narrow streets of Corfe and Kingston Hill, the residents are already long term sufferers of shaking houses and gear changing engine noise. NOTHING HAS CHANGED. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 "it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction proposed would be highly intrusive and damaging. There is ample supply of aggregate elsewhere in Dorset with none of the AONB and environmental restrictions in place.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP817	Disagree	<p>This extension and increase in the importation of 'inert waste' should not go ahead for the following reasons: - 1. It doesn't make sense to be importing even more waste into the quarry as it is so close to the source of Kingston's water supply. We were told at the Parish Council meeting that the waste is mostly from building which can hardly be described as inert. Our household is having to spend up to £1,000 every year on drinking water because we can't be sure our tap water is safe. 2. The quarry is on the supposedly valued Jurassic Coast and part of an AONB which should be protected. Since the 80's, in spite of fierce local objections, additional quarrying time has been permitted partly on the basis that the quarry would be restored. This hasn't happened and it is now an even greater eyesore. Than it was then. The proposed extension would further degrade the value of the landscape. 3. Due to its heritage status this area is popular with visitors who come to enjoy the beauty of our countryside and coastline. Tourism is a major source of income for the local people which quarrying of this kind will never be. 4. The quarry traffic is via a steep winding road with no pavement and consequently poses a danger to cyclists, walkers and other motorists. Only last week my teenage granddaughter was very nearly run over by a quarry lorry on this hill. She was walking because the bus company won't stop near our house on the basis that it is too dangerous. Miraculously there have only been 2 deaths on this hill in the distant past but there have been many near misses and there is no exceptional need to justify extending the life of this quarry yet again when there are safer sources of crushed stone.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Dorset Wildlife Trust	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP710	Comment	<p>Provided that the proposed additional infill does not cause a delay in the timing of restoration of this site, we do not believe there would be any problems with this. Restoration of this site in due course has the potential for considerable habitat gain through the creation of calcareous grassland.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP632	Disagree	<p>I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP685	Disagree	<p>Swanworth Quarry extension plans have been on the Mineral Sites consultation plan since 2014 but the site has not been allocated. Why has no decision been made in two years? Is this a serious proposal? Why is it For Information Only? I wish to disagree strongly with this latest proposal for the following reasons: - The original quarry was started before the AONB safeguards were applied. This so called extension is not an extension at all, but a completely NEW quarry which can only be reached by building an industrial sized steel bridge over the Purbeck Way and then building a tunnel between two Bronze Age burial mounds. The local archaeologists and Celtic curator of the British Museum have said this would have a detrimental effect and would also destroy future archaeological evidence of this Celtic settlement. - There are no exceptional reasons for ignoring the AONB. The 35 acre quarry would not be traditional in any sense; it is limestone industrial mining for crushed stone. There are ample supplies which can be obtained locally in Dorset, on Portland, and Somerset where there is a rail link to Hamworthy. - An extension to the quarry of 17 acres was applied for in 2014; this increased to 35 acres in 2015. The amended plan from 2015 remains at 35 acres but has moved the quarry further towards the village of Kingston, making it more visible from the B3069 (top road) opposite Kingston Courtyard. - Kingston village is on a private water supply. This supply is already vulnerable to contamination and only recently the villagers had to refrain from drinking the water. The water originates from the springs in the Coombe in Hill Bottom, in close proximity to the quarry. The landfill plans of 440,000 tonnes of inert waste and the industrial mining excavation could significantly affect the water supplies. This does not seem to have registered yet and could be a huge problem. - The proposed site is more elevated and therefore the noise and dust pollution will be much greater due to the prevailing winds. The quarry currently nestles in a valley and this pollution is contained. - Proposals to camouflage the site are not realistic. These are exposed uplands and any attempt to screen with hedging or trees will take decades to materialise. Has anyone seen any trees on this ridge? - LANDFILL: The proposed extension of landfill volumes will create additional lorry movements in addition to the quarry's current 60 day movement allowance which they already achieve. This is all additional traffic manoeuvring through the narrow streets of Corfe and Kingston Hill, the residents are already long term sufferers of shaking houses and gear changing engine noise. NOTHING HAS CHANGED. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 "it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction proposed would be highly intrusive and damaging. There is ample supply of aggregate elsewhere in Dorset with none of the AONB and environmental restrictions in place.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP638	Disagree	<p>I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP645	Disagree	<p>I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP692	Disagree	<p>Swanworth Quarry extension plans have been on the Mineral Sites consultation plan since 2014 but the site has not been allocated. Why has no decision been made in two years? Is this a serious proposal? Why is it For Information Only? I wish to disagree strongly with this latest proposal for the following reasons: - The original quarry was started before the AONB safeguards were applied. This so called extension is not an extension at all, but a completely NEW quarry which can only be reached by building an industrial sized steel bridge over the Purbeck Way and then building a tunnel between two Bronze Age burial mounds. The local archaeologists and Celtic curator of the British Museum have said this would have a detrimental effect and would also destroy future archaeological evidence of this Celtic settlement. - There are no exceptional reasons for ignoring the AONB. The 35 acre quarry would not be traditional in any sense; it is limestone industrial mining for crushed stone. There are ample supplies which can be obtained locally in Dorset, on Portland, and Somerset where there is a rail link to Hamworthy. - An extension to the quarry of 17 acres was applied for in 2014; this increased to 35 acres in 2015. The amended plan from 2015 remains at 35 acres but has moved the quarry further towards the village of Kingston, making it more visible from the B3069 (top road) opposite Kingston Courtyard. - Kingston village is on a private water supply. This supply is already vulnerable to contamination and only recently the villagers had to refrain from drinking the water. The water originates from the springs in the Coombe in Hill Bottom, in close proximity to the quarry. The landfill plans of 440,000 tonnes of inert waste and the industrial mining excavation could significantly affect the water supplies. This does not seem to have registered yet and could be a huge problem. - The proposed site is more elevated and therefore the noise and dust pollution will be much greater due to the prevailing winds. The quarry currently nestles in a valley and this pollution is contained. - Proposals to camouflage the site are not realistic. These are exposed uplands and any attempt to screen with hedging or trees will take decades to materialise. Has anyone seen any trees on this ridge? - LANDFILL: The proposed extension of landfill volumes will create additional lorry movements in addition to the quarry's current 60 day movement allowance which they already achieve. This is all additional traffic manoeuvring through the narrow streets of Corfe and Kingston Hill, the residents are already long term sufferers of shaking houses and gear changing engine noise. NOTHING HAS CHANGED. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 "it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction proposed would be highly intrusive and damaging. There is ample supply of aggregate elsewhere in Dorset with none of the AONB and environmental restrictions in place.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP633	Disagree	I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP644	Disagree	I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
East Dorset Friends of the Earth	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP895	Comment	WP16 Swanworth Quarry, Worth Matravers (no designation in original draft): This is an excellent showcase example of how restoration should be carried out, first by Tarmac, then by Suttles, who are also excellent site managers. We in EDFoE have no problem with the proposed landfill as further remediation will take place while the neighbouring quarry is being excavated. As to the bridge and the cut-and-cover tunnel, well respond to these in the Mineral Sites Plan update. There is the possibility the site could be used for a small scale commercial venture. If this is so, it may possibly be an opportunity for innovative development of a cut-and-cover nature, on 2 levels, built into the stope. Anything that did not blend into the natural landscape would be opposed.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP670	Disagree	<p>As a local resident of Purbeck, I wish to strongly disagree with this proposal. - An extension to the quarry of 17 acres was applied for in 2014; this increased to 35 acres in 2015. - The amended plan from 2015 remains at 35 acres but has moved the quarry further towards the village of Kingston, making it more visible from the B3069 (top road) opposite Greystone Court. - As the site is more elevated, the noise and dust pollution will be much greater due to the prevailing winds. The quarry currently nestles in a valley therefore this pollution is contained. - Proposals to 'camouflage' the site are not realistic. These are exposed uplands and any attempt to screen with hedging or trees will take decades to grow. Has anyone seen any trees on this ridge? - The 'possible tunnel location over the Purbeck Way' is misleading. How can anyone decide whether this can or cannot be done when we have no idea what this means? - LANDFILL: the proposed extension of landfill will create additional lorry movements in addition to the quarry's current 60 movement allowance which they already achieve. This is all additional traffic manoeuvring through the narrow streets of Corfe. - The bronze settlement is still in close proximity. - Kingston's private water supply could still be compromised (only recently did Kingston village have to refrain from drinking the water as the supply had been disturbed). The village still obtains some of its water from the springs in the Coombe. - Once again NOTHING HAS CHANGED. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 - it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction proposed would be highly intrusive and damaging. There is ample supply of aggregate elsewhere in Dorset with none of the AONB and environmental restrictions in place. I strongly object to this proposal.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Purbeck District Council	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP695	Comment	<p>The Council is encouraged by the reference in the supporting documentation that no additional vehicular movements beyond the current consent for the site would result if this site were to be used for additional inert landfill. However, the Council does have concerns that there is currently insufficient reference to landscape sensitivity, given this AONB location, and heritage terms, given the proximity of Worth Matravers conservation area and the listed buildings within it. Impacts could potentially arise from the indication that land levels could rise by 2-3m on the eastern side, which faces towards Worth Matravers. There could also be impacts on public views from adjacent public rights of way. The Council acknowledges that the supporting document and the key development considerations are a work in progress, but it believes that early discussions between the Council, the Dorset AONB Team and Natural England (in its landscape capacity) are vital to ensure that the impacts on the AONB are fully considered at the earliest opportunity.</p>	Your comments are noted. The Waste Planning Authority will liaise closely with PDC, the AONB Team and other relevant consultees regarding this site.
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP587	Disagree	<p>I forgot to add. Why is this the ONLY site being proposed for inert waste disposal? Does this mean it's this or nothing at all across the whole of Dorset? I'm furious that you can only give 'one' option and call it a consultation, what a flippant abuse of your remits and roles, how so very lazy in your attention to detail and your consultation process with the public. I strongly disagree with this proposal.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP580	Disagree	<p>What is this nonsense? Who has come up with this idea? Incredible that you can place on the table the notion that Swanworth quarry can be used to dump everybody's crap! Road Infrastructure How you can take a place with such poor road access to then think it will be adequate enough support the volume of traffic on top of what is already creaking under the current usage. This site will be used for and behalf of the whole of Dorset? Blimey, you really do have no idea of what the local rural roads are like in the location. AONB This whole area is under the AONB, do we really need to discuss this? SSSI As above, do we need to discuss this. The Jurassic Coastline With World Heritage Status only a stone throw away would something like this be passed within the same distance to Stone Henge or the Pyramids? Numbers Cars parking at the local Worth Matravers car park number about 30,000 a year, with an average of 2 people per car that's a lot of people. It's also a voluntary pay parking facility, so you can only imagine the real figure! This is without the tens of thousands that walk the Priests Way and head in this direction also visiting this area. Why would you spoil such a special place and our greatest asset, our AONB. Local needs, local solutions. Are we being chosen for this, as we are right out on the edge of the county, nobody will see or hear, yet alone smell this. If large towns in the county have a rubbish issue that's their problem, NOT OUR'S! They can go dig their own hole and fill it. We are not a dumping ground for everyone's crap, we have our own issues in rural Dorset without having to cope with the larger town's mismanagement. Ecology Why have I not seen or read anything here relating to the possible ecological side effects of this proposal? Don't say there won't be either, stick 10's of thousands of tonnes of chemicals into the ground, there has to be a problem. Sustainability Really? I am sure it's everyone's favourite word currently. Fleets of trucks, big ones and even bigger ones driving to this place, which by the way if you were not aware is on one road in and out! Corfe Castle is a bottle neck, anything south of it is a nightmare to drive around with traffic levels. Road usage, petrol, equals very unsustainable. The Quarry It's already huge, it can be seen from a far distance in various positions around the local area. Here we talking about expanding it, and filling it with rubbish, why? It's far more of a going concern for myself that there seems to be NO OTHER sites up for discussion on this 'Inert filling' need? Consultation I find this consultation an insult. I only managed to find out about this process the day before it closes. I have seen NO media, leaflet, public discussion, not even a sign outside of the quarry entrance for this 'stupid' proposal. The owners of the quarry made no representations to the local parish councils, I wonder why? It's a terrible reflection on your level on contacting the people who pay for all this, the local tax payers, whom it seems are just not aware of what is being proposed on their doorstep. Shame on you for such a poorly run and promoted consultation process. In a nutshell, I DISAGREE with this proposal.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP603	Disagree	<p>I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the Swanworth Quarry Mineral Extension Proposal - Site PK16 Amended plan July 2016. I also wish to object to the proposal to use the site for waste. I have lived in Kingston for over 30 years and thought that when we successfully fought to prevent the proposed extension over 20 years ago that this would be the end of the matter. The present proposed quarry extension would result in a devastating scar on the landscape which would be visible from miles around. I feel this would be totally unacceptable in this beautiful area which should be protected by its status as 'An Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty' which in addition would affect the status of this part of Purbeck being a World Heritage Site. We run a holiday cottage agency with around 40 properties in the Isle of Purbeck and employ the equivalent of at least 6 full time people. There are at least two other holiday cottage agencies based in Corfe Castle and Wool with Purbeck Cottages employing people because of the beauty of area which attracts so many thousands of visitors each year. I am very concerned that full consideration is given to the effect on employment which could be caused dwindling visitor numbers which could be caused by this plan going ahead. Public houses, restaurants and local attractions would all be detrimentally effected. Tourism is without doubt the major industry of Purbeck. As a Kingston resident, reliant on the local water supply, I am also particularly worried about the effect, the quarry extension itself and also the plan to dump waste, could have in contaminating a supply which is essential for the village. I live on Kingston Hill and I am only too aware of the noise and danger caused by the large quarry lorries on our small country roads. I do not feel this should be allowed. I strongly object to this proposal.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP628	Disagree	<p>I am writing to object to the Swanworth Quarry Mineral Extension Proposal - Site PK16 Amended plan July 2016. I also wish to object the proposal to use the site for waste. The present proposed quarry extension would result in a devastating scar on the landscape which would be visible from miles around. I feel this would be totally unacceptable. This wonderful area should be protected by its status as 'An Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty' and by being part of a World Heritage Site. Tourism is without doubt the major industry of Purbeck and this quarry would destroy jobs created in tourism through holiday cottage agencies, public house, tea shops and attractions. As a Kingston resident, reliant on the local water supply, I am also particularly worried about the effect, the quarry extension itself and also the plan to dump waste, could have in contaminating a supply which is essential for the village. I live on Kingston Hill and I am only too aware of the noise and danger caused by the large quarry lorries on our small country roads. I do not feel this should be allowed. They drive fast, often in convoy. We know by experience that they damage the walls and it is not going to be long before there is a fatality as they drive without concern for pedestrians or other vehicles on the road. I strongly object to this proposal.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP634	Disagree	<p>I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise “the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP635	Disagree	<p>I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise “the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP636	Disagree	I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP637	Disagree	I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP639	Disagree	I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP640	Disagree	I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP641	Disagree	<p>I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise “the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP642	Disagree	<p>I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise “the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP643	Disagree	I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP648	Disagree	I wish to disagree with this latest proposal. As a frequent visitor to this area, I enjoy its beauty, tranquillity and amazing unspoilt panoramic views. Proposed 35 acre Extension a) The latest proposed extension would now be adjacent to the B3069 and even more visible on the exposed uplands. b) Local infrastructure is unsuitable for more heavy vehicle movements, coming up the country road of Kingston Hill and Corfe Castle. With extra landfill lorries, this would just exacerbate the flow of traffic. c) This is not only an AONB, but it lies alongside the Jurassic Coastline (World Heritage Site) and Corfe Castle so three exceptional reasons for it to be left intact. It should not be destroyed for limited commercial gain from poor quality aggregate. d) Noise "the peace of Kingston and Worth would be spoilt due to extensive industrial operations, blasting, crushing and grinding lorry traffic. e) Destroying the tranquillity and beauty of The Isle of Purbeck will curtail many of us from the towns and cities visiting and will then have a knock on effect for tourism and the income and jobs that it provides. This area is even more precious now in our overcrowded country. I ask that DCC reject the proposal to add Swanworth Quarry Extension to their Mineral Sites Plan.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP651	Disagree	I am writing to object to the extension of Swanworth Quarry, Worth Matravers and for the increase waste landfill. I am concerned about the visual impact in an area of AONB. I live locally and don't want a blight on the landscape. I am concerned about the increased traffic of lorries up and down the dangerous Kingston Hill (where I live) also extra noise from lorries. There have been many accidents on this road which is steep and has many bends. I'm often phoning the emergency services. Also, Corfe village road is narrow and can't cope with present traffic, increased landfill and extension of quarry would increase traffic to the detriment of the local community.	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP686	Disagree	<p>Swanworth Quarry extension plans have been on the Mineral Sites consultation plan since 2014 but the site has not been allocated. Why has no decision been made in two years? Is this a serious proposal? Why is it For Information Only? I wish to disagree strongly with this latest proposal for the following reasons: - The original quarry was started before the AONB safeguards were applied. This so called extension is not an extension at all, but a completely NEW quarry which can only be reached by building an industrial sized steel bridge over the Purbeck Way and then building a tunnel between two Bronze Age burial mounds. The local archaeologists and Celtic curator of the British Museum have said this would have a detrimental effect and would also destroy future archaeological evidence of this Celtic settlement. - There are no exceptional reasons for ignoring the AONB. The 35 acre quarry would not be traditional in any sense; it is limestone industrial mining for crushed stone. There are ample supplies which can be obtained locally in Dorset, on Portland, and Somerset where there is a rail link to Hamworthy. - An extension to the quarry of 17 acres was applied for in 2014; this increased to 35 acres in 2015. The amended plan from 2015 remains at 35 acres but has moved the quarry further towards the village of Kingston, making it more visible from the B3069 (top road) opposite Kingston Courtyard. - Kingston village is on a private water supply. This supply is already vulnerable to contamination and only recently the villagers had to refrain from drinking the water. The water originates from the springs in the Coombe in Hill Bottom, in close proximity to the quarry. The landfill plans of 440,000 tonnes of inert waste and the industrial mining excavation could significantly affect the water supplies. This does not seem to have registered yet and could be a huge problem. - The proposed site is more elevated and therefore the noise and dust pollution will be much greater due to the prevailing winds. The quarry currently nestles in a valley and this pollution is contained. - Proposals to camouflage the site are not realistic. These are exposed uplands and any attempt to screen with hedging or trees will take decades to materialise. Has anyone seen any trees on this ridge?</p> <p>- LANDFILL: The proposed extension of landfill volumes will create additional lorry movements in addition to the quarry's current 60 day movement allowance which they already achieve. This is all additional traffic manoeuvring through the narrow streets of Corfe and Kingston Hill, the residents are already long term sufferers of shaking houses and gear changing engine noise. NOTHING HAS CHANGED. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 "it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction proposed would be highly intrusive and damaging. There is ample supply of aggregate elsewhere in Dorset with none of the AONB and environmental restrictions in place.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP687	Disagree	<p>Swanworth Quarry extension plans have been on the Mineral Sites consultation plan since 2014 but the site has not been allocated. Why has no decision been made in two years? Is this a serious proposal? Why is it For Information Only? I wish to disagree strongly with this latest proposal for the following reasons: - The original quarry was started before the AONB safeguards were applied. This so called extension is not an extension at all, but a completely NEW quarry which can only be reached by building an industrial sized steel bridge over the Purbeck Way and then building a tunnel between two Bronze Age burial mounds. The local archaeologists and Celtic curator of the British Museum have said this would have a detrimental effect and would also destroy future archaeological evidence of this Celtic settlement. - There are no exceptional reasons for ignoring the AONB. The 35 acre quarry would not be traditional in any sense; it is limestone industrial mining for crushed stone. There are ample supplies which can be obtained locally in Dorset, on Portland, and Somerset where there is a rail link to Hamworthy. - An extension to the quarry of 17 acres was applied for in 2014; this increased to 35 acres in 2015. The amended plan from 2015 remains at 35 acres but has moved the quarry further towards the village of Kingston, making it more visible from the B3069 (top road) opposite Kingston Courtyard. - Kingston village is on a private water supply. This supply is already vulnerable to contamination and only recently the villagers had to refrain from drinking the water. The water originates from the springs in the Coombe in Hill Bottom, in close proximity to the quarry. The landfill plans of 440,000 tonnes of inert waste and the industrial mining excavation could significantly affect the water supplies. This does not seem to have registered yet and could be a huge problem. - The proposed site is more elevated and therefore the noise and dust pollution will be much greater due to the prevailing winds. The quarry currently nestles in a valley and this pollution is contained. - Proposals to camouflage the site are not realistic. These are exposed uplands and any attempt to screen with hedging or trees will take decades to materialise. Has anyone seen any trees on this ridge? - LANDFILL: The proposed extension of landfill volumes will create additional lorry movements in addition to the quarry's current 60 day movement allowance which they already achieve. This is all additional traffic manoeuvring through the narrow streets of Corfe and Kingston Hill, the residents are already long term sufferers of shaking houses and gear changing engine noise. NOTHING HAS CHANGED. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 "it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction proposed would be highly intrusive and damaging. There is ample supply of aggregate elsewhere in Dorset with none of the AONB and environmental restrictions in place.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP688	Disagree	<p>Swanworth Quarry extension plans have been on the Mineral Sites consultation plan since 2014 but the site has not been allocated. Why has no decision been made in two years? Is this a serious proposal? Why is it For Information Only? I wish to disagree strongly with this latest proposal for the following reasons: - The original quarry was started before the AONB safeguards were applied. This so called extension is not an extension at all, but a completely NEW quarry which can only be reached by building an industrial sized steel bridge over the Purbeck Way and then building a tunnel between two Bronze Age burial mounds. The local archaeologists and Celtic curator of the British Museum have said this would have a detrimental effect and would also destroy future archaeological evidence of this Celtic settlement. - There are no exceptional reasons for ignoring the AONB. The 35 acre quarry would not be traditional in any sense; it is limestone industrial mining for crushed stone. There are ample supplies which can be obtained locally in Dorset, on Portland, and Somerset where there is a rail link to Hamworthy. - An extension to the quarry of 17 acres was applied for in 2014; this increased to 35 acres in 2015. The amended plan from 2015 remains at 35 acres but has moved the quarry further towards the village of Kingston, making it more visible from the B3069 (top road) opposite Kingston Courtyard. - Kingston village is on a private water supply. This supply is already vulnerable to contamination and only recently the villagers had to refrain from drinking the water. The water originates from the springs in the Coombe in Hill Bottom, in close proximity to the quarry. The landfill plans of 440,000 tonnes of inert waste and the industrial mining excavation could significantly affect the water supplies. This does not seem to have registered yet and could be a huge problem. - The proposed site is more elevated and therefore the noise and dust pollution will be much greater due to the prevailing winds. The quarry currently nestles in a valley and this pollution is contained. - Proposals to camouflage the site are not realistic. These are exposed uplands and any attempt to screen with hedging or trees will take decades to materialise. Has anyone seen any trees on this ridge? - LANDFILL: The proposed extension of landfill volumes will create additional lorry movements in addition to the quarry's current 60 day movement allowance which they already achieve. This is all additional traffic manoeuvring through the narrow streets of Corfe and Kingston Hill, the residents are already long term sufferers of shaking houses and gear changing engine noise. NOTHING HAS CHANGED. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 "it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction proposed would be highly intrusive and damaging. There is ample supply of aggregate elsewhere in Dorset with none of the AONB and environmental restrictions in place.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP689	Disagree	<p>Swanworth Quarry extension plans have been on the Mineral Sites consultation plan since 2014 but the site has not been allocated. Why has no decision been made in two years? Is this a serious proposal? Why is it For Information Only? I wish to disagree strongly with this latest proposal for the following reasons: - The original quarry was started before the AONB safeguards were applied. This so called extension is not an extension at all, but a completely NEW quarry which can only be reached by building an industrial sized steel bridge over the Purbeck Way and then building a tunnel between two Bronze Age burial mounds. The local archaeologists and Celtic curator of the British Museum have said this would have a detrimental effect and would also destroy future archaeological evidence of this Celtic settlement. - There are no exceptional reasons for ignoring the AONB. The 35 acre quarry would not be traditional in any sense; it is limestone industrial mining for crushed stone. There are ample supplies which can be obtained locally in Dorset, on Portland, and Somerset where there is a rail link to Hamworthy. - An extension to the quarry of 17 acres was applied for in 2014; this increased to 35 acres in 2015. The amended plan from 2015 remains at 35 acres but has moved the quarry further towards the village of Kingston, making it more visible from the B3069 (top road) opposite Kingston Courtyard. - Kingston village is on a private water supply. This supply is already vulnerable to contamination and only recently the villagers had to refrain from drinking the water. The water originates from the springs in the Coombe in Hill Bottom, in close proximity to the quarry. The landfill plans of 440,000 tonnes of inert waste and the industrial mining excavation could significantly affect the water supplies. This does not seem to have registered yet and could be a huge problem. - The proposed site is more elevated and therefore the noise and dust pollution will be much greater due to the prevailing winds. The quarry currently nestles in a valley and this pollution is contained. - Proposals to camouflage the site are not realistic. These are exposed uplands and any attempt to screen with hedging or trees will take decades to materialise. Has anyone seen any trees on this ridge? - LANDFILL: The proposed extension of landfill volumes will create additional lorry movements in addition to the quarry's current 60 day movement allowance which they already achieve. This is all additional traffic manoeuvring through the narrow streets of Corfe and Kingston Hill, the residents are already long term sufferers of shaking houses and gear changing engine noise. NOTHING HAS CHANGED. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 "it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction proposed would be highly intrusive and damaging. There is ample supply of aggregate elsewhere in Dorset with none of the AONB and environmental restrictions in place.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP691	Disagree	<p>Swanworth Quarry extension plans have been on the Mineral Sites consultation plan since 2014 but the site has not been allocated. Why has no decision been made in two years? Is this a serious proposal? Why is it For Information Only? I wish to disagree strongly with this latest proposal for the following reasons: - The original quarry was started before the AONB safeguards were applied. This so called extension is not an extension at all, but a completely NEW quarry which can only be reached by building an industrial sized steel bridge over the Purbeck Way and then building a tunnel between two Bronze Age burial mounds. The local archaeologists and Celtic curator of the British Museum have said this would have a detrimental effect and would also destroy future archaeological evidence of this Celtic settlement. - There are no exceptional reasons for ignoring the AONB. The 35 acre quarry would not be traditional in any sense; it is limestone industrial mining for crushed stone. There are ample supplies which can be obtained locally in Dorset, on Portland, and Somerset where there is a rail link to Hamworthy. - An extension to the quarry of 17 acres was applied for in 2014; this increased to 35 acres in 2015. The amended plan from 2015 remains at 35 acres but has moved the quarry further towards the village of Kingston, making it more visible from the B3069 (top road) opposite Kingston Courtyard. - Kingston village is on a private water supply. This supply is already vulnerable to contamination and only recently the villagers had to refrain from drinking the water. The water originates from the springs in the Coombe in Hill Bottom, in close proximity to the quarry. The landfill plans of 440,000 tonnes of inert waste and the industrial mining excavation could significantly affect the water supplies. This does not seem to have registered yet and could be a huge problem. - The proposed site is more elevated and therefore the noise and dust pollution will be much greater due to the prevailing winds. The quarry currently nestles in a valley and this pollution is contained. - Proposals to camouflage the site are not realistic. These are exposed uplands and any attempt to screen with hedging or trees will take decades to materialise. Has anyone seen any trees on this ridge? - LANDFILL: The proposed extension of landfill volumes will create additional lorry movements in addition to the quarry's current 60 day movement allowance which they already achieve. This is all additional traffic manoeuvring through the narrow streets of Corfe and Kingston Hill, the residents are already long term sufferers of shaking houses and gear changing engine noise. NOTHING HAS CHANGED. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 "it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction proposed would be highly intrusive and damaging. There is ample supply of aggregate elsewhere in Dorset with none of the AONB and environmental restrictions in place.</p>	<p>Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised</p>

Respondent	Section	Comment ID	Agree/ disagree	Comment	Officer Response
Individual	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP693	Disagree	<p>Swanworth Quarry extension plans have been on the Mineral Sites consultation plan since 2014 but the site has not been allocated. Why has no decision been made in two years? Is this a serious proposal? Why is it For Information Only? I wish to disagree strongly with this latest proposal for the following reasons: - The original quarry was started before the AONB safeguards were applied. This so called extension is not an extension at all, but a completely NEW quarry which can only be reached by building an industrial sized steel bridge over the Purbeck Way and then building a tunnel between two Bronze Age burial mounds. The local archaeologists and Celtic curator of the British Museum have said this would have a detrimental effect and would also destroy future archaeological evidence of this Celtic settlement. - There are no exceptional reasons for ignoring the AONB. The 35 acre quarry would not be traditional in any sense; it is limestone industrial mining for crushed stone. There are ample supplies which can be obtained locally in Dorset, on Portland, and Somerset where there is a rail link to Hamworthy. - An extension to the quarry of 17 acres was applied for in 2014; this increased to 35 acres in 2015. The amended plan from 2015 remains at 35 acres but has moved the quarry further towards the village of Kingston, making it more visible from the B3069 (top road) opposite Kingston Courtyard. - Kingston village is on a private water supply. This supply is already vulnerable to contamination and only recently the villagers had to refrain from drinking the water. The water originates from the springs in the Coombe in Hill Bottom, in close proximity to the quarry. The landfill plans of 440,000 tonnes of inert waste and the industrial mining excavation could significantly affect the water supplies. This does not seem to have registered yet and could be a huge problem. - The proposed site is more elevated and therefore the noise and dust pollution will be much greater due to the prevailing winds. The quarry currently nestles in a valley and this pollution is contained. - Proposals to camouflage the site are not realistic. These are exposed uplands and any attempt to screen with hedging or trees will take decades to materialise. Has anyone seen any trees on this ridge? - LANDFILL: The proposed extension of landfill volumes will create additional lorry movements in addition to the quarry's current 60 day movement allowance which they already achieve. This is all additional traffic manoeuvring through the narrow streets of Corfe and Kingston Hill, the residents are already long term sufferers of shaking houses and gear changing engine noise. NOTHING HAS CHANGED. Planning for a quarry extension was declined in 1968 and 1988 "it was considered that the nature and scale of the stone extraction proposed would be highly intrusive and damaging. There is ample supply of aggregate elsewhere in Dorset with none of the AONB and environmental restrictions in place.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised
RSPB	WP16 - Swanworth Quarry	2016WP911	Comment	<p>WP16 - Swanworth Quarry (Inert Filling) The RSPB is in favour of the use of inert waste positively to restore and create valuable habitats in locations where this is feasible. The RSPB considers use of in-site material where possible a more sustainable approach than importing material. The design and implementation of restoration must be carefully planned and managed to avoid impacts on nearby protected sites or existing sensitive habitats.</p>	Your comments will be considered further when developing the preferred site - see separate report for detailed response to issues raised