

Town and Country Planning Act 1990  
Town and Country Planning Appeals (Determination by Inspectors) (Inquiry procedure) (England) Rules 2000



<b>Proposed development</b>	Construction of an Energy Recovery Facility
<b>PINS reference</b>	APP/D1265/W/23/3327692
<b>LPA reference</b>	WP/20/00692/DCC
<b>Site Address</b>	Portland Port, Castletown, Portland, DT5 1PP
<b>Local planning authority</b>	Dorset Council
<b>Appellant</b>	Powerfuel Portland LTD
<b>Date of inquiry</b>	5 December 2023

**STOP PORTLAND WASTE INCINERATOR  
AND  
THE PORTLAND ASSOCIATION**

**RULE 6(6) JOINT STATEMENT OF CASE**

**10 OCTOBER 2023**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Stop Portland Waste Incinerator (“SPWI”) and The Portland Association (“TPA”) are community-based groups based in Portland, Dorset. SPWI has around 1,000 supporters and TPA has over 1,300 members.
- 1.2. Since 2019, SPWI and TPA have engaged with, and submitted objections to, the application by the Appellant (“Powerfuel”) for planning permission for the construction of a waste incinerator at Portland Port, Dorset (“the Incinerator”). In March 2023, Dorset Council (“the Council”) refused permission on three grounds.
- 1.3. Powerfuel subsequently appealed against the Council’s refusal. We oppose this appeal and on 14 September 2023 we were both separately granted Rule 6 status. This is our joint statement of case. It seeks to assist the inspector by explaining why permission for the Incinerator ought to be refused.<sup>1</sup>
- 1.4. We are mindful that the Council is defending its three reasons for refusal, which we support. We are community groups with finite resources, and we do not wish to duplicate the Council’s representations, so we have limited our representations to those aspects of the Incinerator which will most affect the local communities who we represent. We have therefore focused on the following topics:
  - Need, sustainability and amenity.
  - Landscape.
  - Heritage.
- 1.5. We set out our concerns in relation to each of those topics below, before addressing the overall planning balance. In light of the Incinerator’s significant breaches of the development plan – and the lack of material considerations that could otherwise justify granting permission – it is our case that the planning balance weighs decisively against granting permission for the Incinerator.

---

<sup>1</sup> We reserve the right, if necessary, to change the detailed aspects of our case as relevant material is reviewed and to respond to any supplementary material submitted by others during the inquiry process. This includes adapting our arguments if and when Powerfuel provides further information on the scope of its application (important aspects of which remain unclear).

## 2. SUMMARY OF CASE

- 2.1. The prospect of a waste incinerator receiving consent in an area which is enveloped by the Dorset AONB and Jurassic Coast (a World Heritage Site) – and which hosts numerous important heritage assets – has, perhaps unsurprisingly, generated a considerable amount of concern among the local community.
- 2.2. The Council has received 3,419 objections and only 35 letters in support. A petition against the Incinerator, which was presented to Parliament on 8 December 2020 by Richard Drax MP, received 6,792 signatures. Indeed, the Incinerator has been opposed by MPs (including the former Minister for Heritage), town councils, parish councils, charities and businesses, amongst others.
- 2.3. We support the Council's reasons for refusal, the conclusions of which were supported by the expert opinions of the Council's landscape and conservation officers, Historic England, Dorset Wildlife Trust and the Jurassic Coast Trust. In summary, we contend that the Council was right to conclude that:
- The Incinerator, which would be situated on unallocated land, would not comply with planning policy.
  - The Incinerator would have significant adverse effects on the quality of the landscape and views of the Isle of Portland within the setting of the Jurassic Coast and Dorset AONB.
  - The Incinerator would result in unacceptable harm to a range of important heritage assets.
- 2.4. We will provide evidence that supports the Council's reasons for refusal, with which we agree. We will do so by providing evidence of the heritage and landscape impacts of the Incinerator, with a particular focus on the perspective of the local community in which the Incinerator would be situated.
- 2.5. We will also show that the Incinerator's benefits have been overstated in a number of respects; and so, if anything, the planning balance weighs even more decisively against granting permission than the Council decided.

### **3. PLANNING POLICY**

- 3.1. In terms of local planning policy, we will rely in particular (but not exclusively) on the Bournemouth, Christchurch, Poole and Dorset Waste Plan (2019) (“the Waste Plan”), the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan 2011-2031 (2015) (“the Local Plan”), the Portland Neighbourhood Plan (2020) (“the Neighbourhood Plan”), and the Jurassic Coast Partnership Plan (2020).
- 3.2. In terms of national planning policy, we will rely in particular (but not exclusively) on the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (“the NPPF”) and the National Planning Policy for Waste (2014) (“the NPPW”).

### **4. NEED, SUSTAINABILITY AND AMENITY**

- 4.1. This section sets out our case in relation to the purported need for and benefits of the Incinerator. We support the Council’s first reason for refusal. But we contend further that there are additional reasons and evidence that demonstrate why the benefits of the Incinerator have been overstated and why the Incinerator would not comply with the development plan.

#### Relevant planning policy and decisions

- 4.2. We will refer primarily to Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 12, 13 and 15 of the Waste Plan. We will rely on Policies INT1, ENV3, ENV13, ENV16, COM7 and COM11 of the Local Plan, and Policies Port/ENV2 and Port/EN6 of the Neighbourhood Plan. We will also rely on chapters 2, 4, 6, 8, 14, and 17 of the NPPF.

#### Carbon neutrality

- 4.3. The purported “low carbon” benefits of the Incinerator have been overstated by Powerfuel. We will provide evidence as to the carbon intensity of electricity that is generated by waste incinerators. We will also demonstrate that the Incinerator would be unsustainable in light of projections of rising recycling rates and of a reduction in the quantity of residual waste, in light of existing contracts for refuse derived fuel, and in light of the expected decarbonization of the national grid over time.
- 4.4. The Incinerator would undermine the Council’s stated efforts to address climate change and to become carbon neutral. In addition to producing a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions, it would incentivise the production of waste, rather

than contributing to the circular economy. The Incinerator would therefore undermine attempts to reduce waste production through recycling and reuse. It would also increase emissions from HGV movements, which would increase greenhouse gas emissions.

- 4.5. As such, the Incinerator would undermine a host of important central and local government policy objectives, including the Government's commitment to halve residual waste by 2042, which is contained in the Environmental Improvement Plan (2023).

#### Onshore power, district heat network and energy provision

- 4.6. The provision of onshore power is not a requirement of the development plan. And there is no requirement for ships to connect to onshore facilities even when those facilities are available. We will make reference to important policy objectives, such as those contained in the Clean Maritime Plan, which is the Environment Route Map of Maritime 2050 and sets out in more detail how Government sees the UK's transition to a future of zero emission shipping. Powerfuel's assessment does not take sufficient account of future technological development, nor that alternative sources of power could be found that would be cleaner and more appropriate.
- 4.7. What is more, the Incinerator would not in any event represent an effective or acceptable means of providing onshore power. The power that would be generated by the Incinerator would not provide enough capacity to utilize the full onshore connections capability without drawing from the National Grid. And the stated amount of power that the Incinerator would produce would not be so significant to outweigh the harm that the Incinerator would cause.
- 4.8. The Incinerator's anticipated speed of contribution to the local grid has been overstated. We will challenge the feasibility of the Incinerator delivering combined heat and power through a district heat network to local receptors (although, in any case, we contend that this apparent benefit cannot be relied upon in the planning balance given that it is not part of Powerfuel's application, and its deliverability would not be secured).

#### Alternative sites

- 4.9. Irrespective of the carbon impact of waste incinerators in general, this Incinerator is located in the wrong place. We will interrogate Powerfuel's assumption that there would be sufficient refuse derived fuel at a local level to sustain the Incinerator. We will also demonstrate that the Incinerator would not adhere to the proximity principle in Policy 1 of the Waste Plan as a result of its location. We will rely on the existence

of alternative strategic sites such as Canford Magna which, unlike the Incinerator, are allocated for waste management development and which would comply with the principles of co-location and proximity that are enshrined in the Waste Plan.

- 4.10. We will contend that existing allocations would provide sufficient capacity for residual waste treatment and that these sites are considerably advantageous in planning terms over Powerfuel's proposal. These sites, rather than (non-existent) landfill facilities, should serve as the Incinerator's point of comparison in any assessment. We will interrogate Powerfuel's contention that the Incinerator would not prejudice or sterilize other, more advantageous sites coming forward.

#### Noise

- 4.11. We will demonstrate that the Incinerator would have adverse noise effects on receptors in the surrounding area, including residential properties, and may produce odours too. We intend to interrogate Powerfuel's evidence as to the level and impact of the noise generated in the construction and operational phases of the Incinerator. We will also demonstrate that the Incinerator's noise impacts would have a harmful effect on the character and quality of the landscape, as we explain in greater detail below.

#### Traffic

- 4.12. We contend that the Incinerator will exacerbate existing traffic problems on the local highway network. We will provide evidence of congestion on the highways network and show why the addition of 80 HGVs on narrow, residential roads would result in unacceptable levels of congestion, particularly in Castletown. We contend that the effect of this increased congestion on amenity is unjustified in light of the existence of alternative, more appropriate sites for waste management development. These sites would require fewer HGV movements as a result of increased co-location benefits.

#### Economic harm

- 4.13. We contend that the Incinerator's long-term consequences for the economy of Portland would be detrimental. Portland's economy depends on tourism, which in turn depends on the character and quality of its landscape. We will provide evidence that Portland's seascape, in particular, is vital for many businesses, including operators of sightseeing and boat trips. For the reasons given below, the Incinerator would harm the character of the surrounding area and as such it would damage Portland's economy.

- 4.14. Portland and Weymouth – and Underhill in particular – are among the 10% most deprived places in the UK. We will contend that as a result of this high level of deprivation, the adverse economic impacts of the Incinerator would have a disproportionate impact on the local community. We will contend that rather than conferring economic benefits on the local community, the Incinerator could reduce productivity in certain ways.

#### Planning assessment

- 4.15. We therefore support the Council's first reason for refusal: the Incinerator would not comply with Policies 1 and 4 of the Waste Plan and paragraph 158 of the NPPF. In addition, we contend that the Incinerator would breach Policies 2, 3 and 6 of the Waste Plan, given that the Incinerator would not be situated on an allocated site and would be located at an inappropriate distance from relevant treatment facilities. We also contend that the Incinerator could sterilize or prejudice the delivery of allocated sites which would be advantageous and as such it would breach Policies 4 and 6 of the Waste Plan.
- 4.16. We contend that the Incinerator would have a significant effect on the amenity of the locality, in particular because of its noise and traffic impacts, and so would breach Policy 13 of the Waste Plan and Policies EN16 and COM7 of the Local Plan (amongst others). We further contend that the Incinerator's economic benefits have been overstated and the Incinerator would in fact have adverse economic effects. The Incinerator would therefore not constitute sustainable development within the meaning of paragraph 8(a) of the NPPF (in addition to paragraphs 8(b) and (c)).

## **5. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT**

- 5.1. This section explains why the landscape and visual impacts of the Incinerator would be harmful and unacceptable in planning terms.

#### Relevant planning policy and decisions

- 5.2. We will make reference to Policy 14 of the Waste Plan, Policies ENV1 and ENV12 of the Local Plan, Policy Port/EN7 of the Neighbourhood Plan, and Policies R4 and IM3 of the Jurassic Coast Partnership Plan. We will also make reference to paragraphs 176 and 186 of the NPPF.

### Incongruity with surrounding area

- 5.3. The Incinerator would be situated on the Isle of Portland, which forms a dramatic and distinctive wedge-shaped peninsula at the end of Chesil Beach and a unique coastal landmark that has sweeping views of the coast.
- 5.4. We will show that the Incinerator would be incongruous with its surroundings. The Incinerator would dominate and transform the shape of the Isle of Portland as a result of its scale, mass and siting. Although the Incinerator's most immediate context is a brownfield site that contains a number of industrial buildings, the Incinerator's size and location on the coast – at the very edge of Portland's exposed, wedge-shaped peninsula – would change the perception of the entire island, puncture its skyline and result in the loss of its distinctive character. Indeed, it would result in a transformation to a landform which is the focal point of far-reaching views along the coast, as experienced both from land and sea.
- 5.5. Powerfuel have added a design amendment into the Appeal application, to alter the façade with a different cladding, leaving the precise detail of the external materials to be dealt with by means of a planning condition. This offer does nothing to make the overall design of the facility acceptable. We contend that scale and massing of the incinerator buildings and stack, together with the lighting which would highlight this mass within the landscape – would adversely affect the character of the Incinerator's surroundings. It would result in the Incinerator being an unnatural, artificial and incongruous feature of the landscape.
- 5.6. We will provide evidence to demonstrate that Powerfuel's assessment of the landscape and visual impacts of the Incinerator is based on incomplete and misleading evidence. For example, the assessment fails to capture the Incinerator's impacts at night and from within the Isle of Portland, and is based on views that understate the Incinerator's dominance within its setting. We will also contend that the Incinerator would adversely affect the quality of life of residents living near the site of the Incinerator, due to the visual impacts and dominance of a development of this scale.

### Character and quality of Dorset AONB, the Jurassic Coast and other settings

- 5.7. The Incinerator would be situated in the setting of the Dorset AONB and the Jurassic Coast (a World Heritage Site). We will provide evidence – such as landscape character assessments and the national character area – to demonstrate that these sites contain significant individual landmarks, and much of



the coast is undeveloped.<sup>2</sup> We will also provide evidence to explain how the coast's uninterrupted views, from locations such as the southwest coastal path, are actively enjoyed by residents and visitors. The coast has a rich cultural history; indeed, as we will show, it has been and continues to be the subject of artistic, historic and literary interest.

- 5.8. We will demonstrate that the Incinerator would fundamentally transform the character and quality of these settings. The Incinerator would be visible from important viewpoints within these sites which offer unrivalled panoramic coastal and sea views. These views would be transformed in particular by the stack, which as a result of its design (including its aviation lighting), siting and emissions would result in a harmful, industrial interruption to the views of and from the AONB, the Jurassic Coast and the surrounding coastal waters. We will also demonstrate that the Incinerator would negatively impact the views from and of other important settings, such as Portland Castle, Portland Marina, Sandsfoot Castle, Verne Castle, East Weare Battery, the Royal Naval Cemetery (the heritage impact on these assets is discussed further below), and from well-used footpaths and cycle paths.
- 5.9. We will provide evidence to demonstrate that Powerfuel's assessment of the landscape and visual impacts of the Incinerator is based on an incomplete and misleading evidence base and, as such, it does not adequately capture the full effects of the Incinerator on the character and quality of the Dorset AONB, the Jurassic Coast and other important sites.

#### Experiential qualities

- 5.10. We will demonstrate that the Incinerator would adversely affect the existing natural asset of soundscape in all its variety, which is appreciated on this island and can be enjoyed in the Incinerator's immediate surroundings, the Dorset AONB and the Jurassic Coast. We will provide evidence of the importance which local residents attach to the area's sense of remoteness, and how this would be negatively affected by the Incinerator's design and siting.
- 5.11. We will interrogate Powerfuel's contention that the noise impact of the Incinerator – and in particular its noise at night – would not undermine the amenity and tranquility of the area. For example, we will query whether Powerfuel has adequately assessed the Incinerator's effects on areas that are relatively undisturbed by noise and that are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.

---

<sup>2</sup> In doing so, we will make reference to the consideration of the Jurassic Coast (and other heritage assets and landscape features) in the Navitus Bay Wind Farm decision referenced above, which is an important material consideration.

### Planning assessment

- 5.12. The Incinerator would not comply with Policy 14 of the Waste Plan. The Incinerator would not conserve or enhance the character and quality of the landscape. Furthermore, as a “major development”, the Incinerator should only be permitted if there are “exceptional circumstances” and if it would be in the “public interest” and, specifically, if (i) it would meet an identified need and there are no suitable alternatives for meeting the need, (ii) account has been taken of AONB management plan objectives, and (iii) there would be sustainability benefits of siting a development that meets a local need within an AONB. None of these criteria are satisfied, and so there would be a clear breach of Policy 14.
- 5.13. The Incinerator would not comply with Policies ENV1 and ENV12 of the Local Plan and paragraph 176 and 185 of the NPPF. The Incinerator would harm the character and special qualities of the Dorset AONB and Jurassic Coast, including its views, individual landmarks and sense of tranquility and remoteness. And the Incinerator’s siting, design, scale and mass would not complement the character of the surrounding area. The Incinerator would also not comply with Policies R4 and IM3 of the Jurassic Coast Partnership Plan because it would harm the landscape, seascape, and cultural heritage that constitute the Jurassic Coast’s setting.

## **6. HERITAGE**

- 6.1. This section explains why the heritage impacts of the Incinerator would be harmful and unacceptable in planning terms.

### Planning policy

- 6.2. We will rely in particular on Policies ENV4 and ENV12 of the Local Plan, Policies 14 and 19 of the Waste Plan, Policy Port/EN4 of the Neighbourhood Plan and Policy IM3 of the Jurassic Coast Partnership Plan. We will also rely on chapter 16 of the NPPF.

### Heritage assets and their significance

- 6.3. The Incinerator would affect the following heritage assets in particular (in addition to affecting a number of non-designated heritage assets):
- Verne Citadel (Scheduled Monument).

- Battery 200 yards east of the Naval Cemetery (Scheduled Monument) and three other East Weare Batteries (Grade II).
- Portland Castle (Scheduled Monument and Grade I).
- Dockyard Offices (Grade II).
- East Weare Camp (Grade II).
- 1 Castletown (Grade II).
- Underhill Conservation Area, which encompasses many listed buildings.
- Mulberry Harbour Phoenix Caissons (Grade II).
- Sandsfoot Castle (Grade II\*).
- The Coaling Shed (Grade II)
- Inner and Outer Breakwater (Grade II).
- Dorset and East Devon Coast World Heritage Site (Jurassic Coast).

6.4. The Incinerator would also affect other features of the surrounding area that have local historic and cultural associations.

6.5. We will provide evidence that demonstrates the significance of these features and assets (many of which have considerable national importance). We will show that Powerfuel's assessment has undervalued their significance. We will do so by illustrating the assets' relationship to one another, their shared associative value, and their historical, educational and cultural importance; for example, by outlining their role in contributing to and explaining the area's maritime and naval history.

#### Harm to heritage assets and mitigation

6.6. The impact (both individual and cumulative) of the Incinerator on these assets would be significant. The Incinerator would dominate the assets, transform their setting, and undermine their contribution to the understanding of Portland's history and culture. We will provide evidence which demonstrates that Powerfuel has underestimated the level of harm which would be caused by the Incinerator and which demonstrates why the harm to the significance of designated assets would be "less than substantial".

6.7. We will also provide evidence that shows how Powerfuel's assessment has underestimated the harm that would occur in relation to non-designated heritage assets and the local distinctiveness of the area. Indeed, we will show that the Incinerator would fundamentally undermine the area's role in serving as an important and unique repository of history and cultural interest.

6.8. The mitigation that has been proposed by Powerfuel is misconceived and would, in any event, be inadequate and does not comply with chapter 16 of the NPPF. It

would not address the harm that would be caused to the associative value of the assets, for example. Indeed, we will provide evidence to demonstrate why the mitigation would fail to offset in any meaningful way the harm that would be caused to the heritage assets and in particular to the local distinctiveness of the area. The offering of a permissive path at the last minute, with a route which appears to impact on the curtilage of a historic building, is indicative of Powerfuel's disregard for heritage issues. The original path strategy mitigation was withdrawn because it was considered to be inadequate (for example by Natural England). Powerfuel's new mitigation has been proposed too late in the day, and is also inadequate.

### Planning assessment

- 6.9. To the extent that the test in paragraph 202 of the NPPF applies, the Incinerator's benefits would not outweigh the harm to designated heritage assets. For the reasons given above, Powerfuel has overstated the benefits of the Incinerator, such as the need for onshore power in the short-term, the feasibility of the district heat network, and the Incinerator's economic effects. But even on Powerfuel's own case (i.e. assuming that the Incinerator would bring the benefits which Powerfuel says it will), it is clear that the harm to designated heritage assets would not be outweighed by the benefits.
- 6.10. In addition to the harm to designated assets, the harm to non-designated assets and the wider area would be significant. Accordingly, the Incinerator would not comply with Policies ENV4 of the Local Plan, Policies 14 and 19 of the Waste Plan, Policy Port/EN4 of the Neighbourhood Plan and Policy IM3 of the Jurassic Coast Partnership Plan, as well as national planning policy.

## **7. PLANNING BALANCE**

- 7.1. The benefits of the Incinerator have been overstated. Although the Incinerator would provide some electricity to the national grid, we contend that the need for and delivery of onshore power in the near term has been overestimated, that the viability of heat provision is uncertain, that there is sufficient capacity within the four allocated sites, and that these sites constitute more suitable and advantageous locations for a waste management facility. Rather than bringing economic benefits to the local community, the Incinerator would have adverse economic effects.
- 7.2. Against these very limited benefits, the Incinerator would give rise to significant harms, which would dwarf its purported benefits. In summary:

- The Incinerator, as an unallocated and inappropriate site for waste management development, would breach the policies in the Waste Plan which enshrine well-established principles like proximity and co-location.
- The Incinerator would cause significant harm to the landscape and views in the local area within the setting of the Jurassic Coast and Dorset AONB.
- And the Incinerator would cause considerable (and insufficiently mitigated) harm to the significance of an important group of heritage assets and their setting, which would not be offset by its very limited benefits.

7.3. For these reasons, we support the Council's reasons for refusal and contend that, if anything, the planning balance weighs even more decisively against granting permission than the Council concluded. The Incinerator would give rise to clear and stark breaches of the development plan and there are no material considerations which would otherwise justify the grant of planning permission.

## 8. AMENDMENTS TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 8.1. The Appellant has introduced three revisions to the proposed development since the refusal of planning permission. Two were introduced with the appeal submission: (1) an amendment to the façade cladding material, and (2) the introduction of a footpath extension as part of a Framework Heritage Mitigation Strategy. The proposal at (2) was removed from the planning application 10 days before the Council's determination, possibly based on an objection to the footpath by Natural England.
- 8.2. A third revision was proposed five days ago on 5 October 2023. The third revision was the introduction of an additional fuelstock 'residual waste'. The implications, and in particular the environmental impacts, of introducing a new fuelstock are unknown. For instance the composition of the fuelstock has ramifications which are technical matters which could have an impact on the amount of waste required to be incinerated depending on calorific value (CV), for example to achieve the correct heat intensity to reduce toxic emissions. If more waste is required, there will be more traffic – RDF has a higher CV than residual waste. It should be noted that the Appellant has sought to make this amendment to its Environmental Permit application, but the Environment Agency has declined to allow the variation.
- 8.3. Allowing these amendments would not comply with the *Wheatcroft* principles, as most recently set out in *R (Holborn Studios) v London Borough of Hackney (No 1)* [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin). The amendments would fall foul of both the substantive and the procedural test in *Holborn Studios*. They would entail a

fundamental change to the scheme and if accepted would cause procedural unfairness because consultees would not have had the opportunity to comment on them.

## 9. LIST OF REFERENCES AND DOCUMENTS

- 9.1. We will make reference to the following policies, decisions and documents at inquiry in particular (although we reserve our right to make reference to further documents and policies if necessary).

### Decisions and reports of the Secretary of State

Inspector's Report and Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Waste Plan.

Navitus Bay Wind Park (ref. EN010024).

Former Ravenhead Glass Warehouse and other land, Lock Street, St Helens, WA9 1HS (ref. APP/H4315/A/14/2224529).

Land at Former Rufford Colliery, Rainworth, Nottinghamshire, NG21 OET (ref. APP/L3055/V/09/2102006).

Land at Levitt's Field, Waterbeach Waste Management Park, Ely Road, Cambridgeshire (ref. APP/E0535/W/19/3225123).

Land at New Barnfield, Hatfield (ref. APP/M1900/V/13/2192045).

2 Ratty's Lane, Hoddesdon, Hertfordshire EN11 0RF (ref. APP/M1900/V/18/3195373).

Green Lane, Eccles, Salford M30 8AD (ref: Appeal A APP/U4230/A/11/2162115 & Appeal B APP/U4230/A/11/2162103)

Kemsley North Waste-To-Energy Facility (ref: EN010083)

Hownsgill Industrial Estate, Consett, Durham (Application Ref: DM/20/03267/WAS)

### Planning policies

NPPF 2023

NPPW 2014

NPS\_EN-1

NPS\_EN-3

waste-plan-2019-part-1

waste-plan-2019-part-2

137 Isle of Portland national character area profile

Isle of Portland Heritage and Character Assessment Mach 2017

Jurassic Coast Partnership Plan 2020 - 2025 Final

Land-and\_Seascape\_Character\_Assessment

Landscape Character Area - Harbour / wetland / lagoon  
Landscape Character Area - Limestone peninsula  
Landscape Review - (COE Design ) Nov20  
Portland Neighbourhood Plan June 2021  
South Dorset Downs | Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty  
West Dorset LCA February-2009  
West Dorset-Weymouth-Portland-Local-Plan-2015  
Weymouth and Portland landscape character assessment Feb 2013

Other policies and documents

Air quality - GOV.UK  
Clean Maritime Plan 2019  
decarbonising-transport-a-better-greener-britain  
Defra Resource efficiency and waste reduction targets Detailed Evidence report  
Date: 28 April 2022.  
DfT launches UK SHORE to take maritime 'back to the future' with green investment - GOV.UK  
DoT Port Air Quality Strategies 2019  
Energy & Waste - NIC  
Energy from waste A guide to the debate February 2014  
Environmental Targets (Residual Waste) (England) Regulations 2022  
Environmental-improvement-plan-2023 p144 p147  
From waste to resource productivity 2017  
Health matters/ air pollution - GOV.UK  
Maritime\_2050\_Report  
Our Waste Our Resources rws-evidence-annex.  
the price of plastic  
The waste prevention programme for England-Maximising Resources, Minimising Waste  
UK Parliament Incinerators: Recycling Question for Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs UIN 28465 30 June 2022.  
DCMS letter from Ministerial Support Team 24Nov22  
25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment.  
CCC Progress in reducing UK emissions 2023 Report to Parliament  
IUCN Technical Review East Devon Coast 23.04.07.pdf  
House of Common Library BRIEFING PAPER Number CBP 8400, 15 October 2018 Social Mobility Index by Constituency  
House of Commons Library DEBATE PACK Number CDP 2020/0014, 24 January 2020 Incineration of industrial and commercial waste.  
Nigel Huddleston MP Minister for\_Sport, Tourism, Heritage and Civil Society -28-06-22

Rebecca Pow Defra Waste Reduction

Consultee responses and other documents

ANOB - Consultee 30-10-20  
AONB (Reg 25) 27-09-21  
Cushman & Wakefield for the MOJ 06.02.23  
DC Conservation & Design Officer 3-11-20  
DC Conservation Officer - (Reg 25) 15-10-21  
DC Design & Conservation officer - mitigation - 22-02-23  
DC Design and Conservation March 2023  
DC Landscape Officer - 21-11-22  
DC Landscape Officer - Addendum - 20-02-23  
DC Landscape Officer - Consultee Response 30-10-20  
Dorset Wildlife Trust (Reg 25) 29-09-21  
Hampshire County Council (Reg25) 18-10-21  
Historic England 01-02-23  
Historic England 05-11-20  
Historic England 09-03-23  
Historic England 22-02-23  
Historic England 26-08-21  
Historic England 10-10-23  
JCT Consultee response - addendum 04-01-23.pdf  
JCT Consultee response - addendum 15-12-20.pdf  
JCT Consultee response 28-10-20.pdf  
JCT Reg 25 response - 29-09-21.pdf  
Natural England 08-03-23  
Osmington Parish Council - Consultee 03-11-2020  
Portland Town Council - Consultee 16-11-2020.pdf  
Portland Town Council (Reg 25) 24-09-21.pdf  
PTC - Freeths-Acoustics extract 17-09-2021  
PTC - RSK extract from objection 17-09-2021  
Ramblers - Consultee 10-11-2020.pdf  
Ramblers (Reg 25) 27-09-21.pdf  
The National Trust - 27-09-21  
WTC - Consultee (Reg 25) 29-09-21.pdf  
WTC - Consultee 17-11-2020.pdf

DC Case Officers Reports March 2023  
Supplement STPC Update Sheet 23-03-24.pdf  
Aspirational path DC email 19 March 2020  
Head of Emergency Planning: Flooding and storms



DC NECE Strategy 2023 refresh

DC Our approach - Climate and Ecological Emergency strategy

email 15.12.21 enquiries EA unbound municipal incinerator bottom ash

Using unbound incinerator bottom ash aggregate (IBAA) in construction activities/

RPS 247 - GOV.UK

DIRECTIVE 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions (integrated pollution prevention and control)

Directive 2014/94/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 October 2014 on the deployment of alternative fuels infrastructure.

A&P Falmouth win £6 million ZEV funding for clean power \_ Falmouth Packet

Brochure Vestas Wind Systems

Carnival Corporation plc - Sustainability Report 2022

AIR QUALITY EXPERT GROUP Ultrafine Particles (UFP) in the UK

Beyond-Waste-Essential-Skills-for-a-Greener-Tomorrow - CIWM

Guidance on the Carriage of Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) - British Marine

Shore-Power-Regs-BPA Sept2021

Study of ship emissions whilst at berth in the UK 18Apr18

Nature: 09 July 2020: Atmospheric CO2 during the Mid-Piacenzian Warm Period and the M2 glaciation

Refuse Derived Fuel - Code of Practice (CoP)

Skills-and-capabilities-for-a-sustainable-and-circular\_2017\_Journal-of-Clean

Suppressing the steam plume

The-circular-economy-at-work\_jobs-and-skills-for-Londons-low-carbon-future

Tolvik-UK-EfW-Statistics-2021\_Published-May-2022

UK expects to produce more electricity than it needs by 2030 - New Scientist

Zero Waste Europe - The hidden impacts of incineration residues

Chesil and the Fleet - European Marine Site - Management Scheme March 2001

Forgotten Towns Weymouth, Portland and the coastal economy

Development at existing deep-water berth DC Officers Report

Local industrial strategy | Dorset LEP

### Other representations

Adams Hendry Town Planning

b-side

Coalition Against The Burner

Dorset CPRE

Gary Hamer 17-8-2021 [Portland Bunkering].pdf

Grantham Research Institute 10.10.23

Lucy Grieve - Objection 1 (Carbon Assessment).pdf

Lucy Grieve - Objection 1a (Carbon Assessment).pdf  
Lucy Grieve - Objection 1b (Carbon Assessment).pdf  
Malcolm Robertson 22-11-20  
Malcolm Robertson 27.9.2021  
Rachel Russell 22.8.2021  
Raina Summerson - Agincare 02-03-22.pdf  
Raina Summerson - Portland Economic Vision.pdf  
Richard Drax MP 20Nov20.pdf  
Sarah Moyle Nov20  
Society for Poole 20-11-01  
SPWI 01-08-22 UNESCO Correspondence 2021  
SPWI Evaluation  
SPWI Evaluation of energy from waste incinerator plumes  
TPA (Reg 25) 21-10-20 Non-compliance with Marine Plan and Maritime Regulations.pdf  
TPA email to IUCN cc UNESCO  
TPA Overview & summary of the proposed Powerfuel incinerator  
TPA Portland incinerator WHS impact report.pdf  
UKWIN Dorset Objection Feb 2021.pdf  
UKWIN outline of submission.pdf - new document NAME TBC  
UKWIN September comments on Consultation for Dorset.pdf  
UKWIN-2018-Incineration-Climate-Change-Report  
UKWIN-2021-Incinerator-GHG-Guide.pdf  
UKWIN-Incineration-Overcapacity-Annex-2023  
UKWIN-Incineration-Overcapacity-Briefing-September-2023  
UKWIN-Incineration-Overcapacity-Methodology - September 2022  
W&P PCN (DrS).pdf  
Weyfish 9-11-2020.pdf  
Weyfish.pdf  
WHGLA  
World Heritage Watch - 15-01-23

CC Post combustion plant pre-feasibility assessment Aug21.pdf  
CHP-Ready Assessment 29Sep20  
EA-EP Appellants Schedule 5 Response full details  
EA-EP Appellants Clarification Response-Operator-IBA  
PPL ES 4.1 Updated carbon assessment 28Jul21.pdf  
BCP APP\_23\_00822\_F-PPL Canford EFW 29.09.23  
Supplementary SoC 231005.pdf  
Updated access path strategy paper August 2023