

Councillor Clare Sutton, one of three Dorset Councillors representing Rodwell and Wyke, just over there.

There are many people here wishing to speak so I'll be concise. I do though need to pay tribute to the Section 6 parties for their extraordinary commitment and professionalism and hope you pay particular attention to what their representatives say.

My fellow councillor Brian Heatley and I have worked closely together on which points each of us will address. Whilst Brian has covered the inconsistency with Dorset's Waste Plan and harm to heritage assets, I will focus on 3 issues which are of particular concern to residents within my ward: damage to the landscape, the road transport implications, and the overall planning balance.

First, that the proposal will cause **"less than substantial but still significant harm to the landscape, geological and historical value of the Jurassic Coast"**.

Of course it is in the appellant's interest to downplay the damage to the setting of the Jurassic Coast, both as a collection of landscape designations and also its UNESCO significance for its geology and its substantial contribution to the development of earth sciences over 300 years. But those of us who live here know that, if the appeal is allowed, many views of the Coast would include this huge Plant and its stack, which will dwarf the port's current installations. The appellant's proposed modifications to its external appearance won't change its size.

Second, **all road traffic to and from the Plant would travel through Wyke**, and much of it via Boot Hill in Rodwell, where air pollution is amongst the worst in Dorset. We are told the Plant would generate up to 80 extra HGV movements a day, but the definition of an HGV is over 3.5 tonnes. Most of these would be the largest HGVs, around 40 tonnes. Dorset Highways suggest this wouldn't significantly affect journey times or road safety but that simply does not ring true within our ward and, significantly, completely fails to take into account the impact on those who walk or cycle to the four local schools or to the shops, doctor, dentist or library en route.

Finally, **on the planning balance, some 'positive' elements have been seriously exaggerated**. There has been significant emphasis on the benefits of providing shore power to cruise ships, and a suggestion that Portland Port will cease to be a destination without this. This seems, frankly, bizarre. Only a tiny number of ports worldwide have shore to ship power, but even if it really WERE necessary at Portland Port the better solution is a new line from the grid. I acknowledge the long wait times cited by the appellant but a significant acceleration in the coming years will surely happen, not least because new RENEWABLE power will be generated at new local locations. Fundamentally, the first requirement for a cruise ship destination is that it offers an attractive tourist stop, which we manifestly are! The real danger is that we undermine that by doing significant damage to our main attraction, our beautiful World Heritage Coast. If you were a cruise ship passenger greeted on arrival by a massive waste incinerator, what would you say on 'Trip Advisor'?

The argument about new jobs, just 36 of them permanent, is in my view even more spurious. Locating a giant industrial plant which incinerates waste here could do huge damage to our tourist industry, and therefore local businesses and jobs. Given that many people visit Weymouth and Portland, and the Jurassic Coast in general, for its unique natural beauty and landscapes, I would have thought the balance of 'jobs gained' to 'jobs lost' is pretty obvious.

So, consistent with Planning law in relation to Waste and heritage assets, as highlighted by Brian; and in the interests of protecting the invaluable landscape and geological asset that is our Jurassic Coast, our tourist industry, and local jobs; and keeping huge lorries off our local roads, I very much hope you will not recommend allowing this appeal.