Planning Committee

Application Address	Eco Composting Ltd Chapel Lane Christchurch BH23 6BG
Proposal	Proposed development comprising the installation of a low carbon Energy Recovery Facility for the generation of electricity and heat through a low-emission thermal process using residual waste; including a new administration building and associated car parking area; associated reconfiguration of existing and permitted uses; an increase in permitted waste throughput; landscaping and associated works.
Application Number	8/21/0207/FUL
Applicant	Mr Justin Dampney
Agent	Mr Alan Hannify
Ward and Ward Member(s)	Commons – Cllr Margaret Phipps and Cllr Vanessa Ricketts
Report status	Public
Meeting date	08 March 2021
Summary of Recommendation	**Approve subject to a S106 and conditions**
Reason for Referral to Planning Committee	Number of objections received contrary to the Officer's recommendation
Case Officer	Sophie Mawdsley

Executive Summary

1. The application seeks full planning permission for the development of an energy recovery facility (ERF), administration and welfare building and the reconfiguration of waste streams on an existing waste management and recycling site. There would be an increase in the site's throughput from 266,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) to 341,000 tonnes per annum. The additional 75,000 tonnes consists of 60,000 tonnes of non-hazardous residual waste for the ERF, of which an anticipated 10,000 would be suitable for recycling and exported off the site for this purpose. The remaining 15,000 tonnes comprises of green waste and wood waste which the site already deals with. The ERF building would be sited in the north west part of the site and the associated emissions stack would have a height of 38m.

2. The site is positioned within the South East Dorset Green Belt and lies in an area of countryside between the Aviation Business Park, adjacent to Bournemouth Airport to the south east and the urban settlement of West Parley to the west. An Environmental Impact Assessment has been undertaken and an Environmental Statement is submitted with the application.

3. Taken as a whole, the proposed development is considered to constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is, by definition, harmful and therefore should only be approved in very special circumstances. It is considered that very special circumstances do exist that outweigh the potential harm to the purposes of the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriateness and all other identified harms, justifying a grant of planning permission. The factors considered to establish whether there are very special circumstances had particular regard to the absence of alternative suitable sites in the local area, the capacity requirements in the Plan area for managing residual waste, the movement of the management of residual waste up the waste hierarchy from disposal to recovery, the reduction in waste miles from transporting residual waste outside of the Plan area and the resulting production of an anticipated 3.4MW of electricity and 11.5 MW of heat.

4. The Local Waste Plan (2019) establishes that there is an identified shortfall in the capacity for non-hazardous residual waste of 232,000 tpa by the end of the Plan period of 2033. Residual waste is currently dealt with at a mechanical biological treatment plant at Canford Magna and also exported for treatment or disposal in landfill outside of the Plan area. The application site is an identified and allocated site for intensification to manage residual waste within the Local Plan, details of which can be viewed in Inset 7 of the Waste Plan.

5. The proposed facility is considered to have a net positive climate impact with the reduction of 376 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent emissions being released resulting from the production of electricity from non-fossils fuels and a reduction in waste sent to landfill. The combustion process within the ERF would produce 3.4 megawatts electrical (MWe) and provide 11.5MWth of heat for use on the site as well as exportation to the electrical grid and providing opportunities to distribute heat to neighbouring occupiers.

6. The proposed development has been carefully considered in light of the potential impacts on air quality from the ERF and additional traffic activity. It must be understood that there is a separate environmental permit regime which requires the applicant to apply to the Environment Agency for a Permit to operate the facility and it must be demonstrated how the risks to the environment and human health will be minimised. Detailed dispersion modelling of emissions from the stack has been undertaken and it has been assumed that the proposed ERF operates at maximum operating capacity for the whole year and releases emissions at the proposed emission limits all the time. The proposed ERF incorporates abatement technology to lower emissions of oxides of nitrogen, sulphur dioxide, hydrogen chloride and ammonia. The Environmental Impact Assessment provides evidence that the effect of process emissions on human health is predicted to be ‘not significant’ and the methodology and results have been verified by Air Quality Consultants on behalf of the Council.

7. Given the proposed scale of the facility and the associated emission stack, it has been concluded that there will be an adverse impact on the landscape character and visual context of the landscape. The proposed landscape mitigation is not sufficient to screen all of the development and the stack and on occasion, the emissions plume, will be visible on the skyline above the existing tree belts. The Landscape and

Visual Impact Assessment which forms part of the Environmental Statement concludes there would be a Moderate Adverse effect to the landscape character within 2km to the north and east of the site reducing to a Slight Adverse effect to the south and west within 2km of the site. In terms of visual amenity, the LVIA concludes the ERF building and stack would have a Moderate Adverse effect within 1km of the site and from Chapel Lane and Bridleway E62/29 there would be a Major-Moderate Adverse effect. However, beyond that there would be a Slight-Moderate Adverse effect within 2km of the site. The landscape assessment undertaken by Dorset Council and Laird Bailey Consultants on behalf of BCP both conclude there would be harm to the landscape character and visual amenities close to the site and the presence of the emissions stack which is visible from the surrounding area is clearly a negative of the scheme. However, this needs to be carefully balanced against the requirement for additional residual waste management facilities in the Plan area and its movement up the waste hierarchy, the reduction in waste miles and the provision of a low carbon energy source.

8. The site is surrounded by European designated habitats, specifically Dorset Heaths Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar. Hurn Common and Parley Common are also designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The Applicant is applying for stack emission limits for oxides of nitrogen, sulphur dioxide, hydrogen chloride, and ammonia which are lower than the maximum limits allowed by current legislation in order to protect the ecological habitats around the site. The modelling and assessment have predicted that nitrogen deposition will not exceed 1% of the relevant Critical Load at Hurn Common SSSI, which is part of the nearest European designated site located to the east of the application site. An appropriate Assessment of the proposed development has been undertaken by BCP Council as the Competent Authority and it is deemed that the proposal with mitigation in place will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the designated habitat sites.

9. The increased traffic associated with the development, in particular the increased number of HGV movements for the importation of residual waste on the local highway network is not considered to result in a severe impact on the network or result in highway safety concerns. The proposal results in an additional 107 movements per day (53 arrivals and 54 departures) with 38 of these (107) being classified as HGV trips. However, the movement of waste is already on the highway network, so the flows to the application site represent diverted trips. The cumulative impact of this development along side the other major projects within the area, specifically the expansion of the Aviation Business Park is considered to be acceptable and the impacts from the Business Park are considered to be greater than the traffic movements associated with the proposal.

10. There are heritage assets within the vicinity of the site and the setting and significance of these has been assessed. Two bowl barrows, funerary monuments are located to the north west of the site at Gibbet Firs and an additional bowl barrow is sited to the north east on East Parley Common. The setting of these Scheduled Monuments has already changed given the presence of the solar farms around them. Although the emissions stack will be visible above the intervening trees and vegetation, it is not considered to result in harm to the significance of these bowl barrows or result in any disturbance to the archaeological remains within them. The stack would also be visible from a distance from some of the listed buildings to the north east and south of the site. The Council has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the buildings or its setting as set out in section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Whilst it has been established that less than substantial harm is caused from the visibility of the stack, it is considered this is outweighed by the wider public benefits of the scheme

of providing low carbon energy and moving the management of waste up the waste hierarchy along with reducing waste miles. The two Conservation Areas within the vicinity are not considered to be harmed by the proposal due to the intervening land uses and built form and the amount of tree and landscaping around the site and beyond.

11. The site is not within a flood zone; however, given the nature of the site which consists predominantly of hard surfacing and built form, surface water management is extremely important to prevent flood risk on and off the site and prevent pollution of the surrounding natural environment. The construction, operating and decommissioning phase have the potential to cause pollution to ground and surface water. The drainage strategy includes the use of surface water treatment ponds and the northern drainage ditch. There are also a variety of mitigation measures to prevent pollution from the various sources on the site and given most of the polluting activities are enclosed it is considered that there is minimal risk of contamination.

12. The incineration process will result in two separate ash streams; Incinerator bottom ash (IBA) and Air pollution residue (APCr). IBA is non-hazardous waste which can be recycled. However, APC is classified as hazardous and requires specialist landfill disposal or treatment a suitable waste management facility. APC residue will be removed from the site in enclosed tankers, thereby minimising any risk of spillage and dust emissions.

13. The Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations are clear that the cumulative effects of the proposal and other existing and/or planned projects on the environment must be considered. The expansion of the Aviation Business Park, the extension of Hurn Quarry and the mixed-use development at Parley Cross in combination with the proposed development have been considered throughout the Environmental Statement. It is considered that there are economic and social benefits when considered together and cumulatively they do not give rise to significant adverse effects on the environment.

14. Overall, despite the proposals amounting to inappropriate development in the Green Belt and all the other identified harms on the landscape and heritage assets, it is considered that there are very special circumstances to justify its provision in the Green belt. Overall, having regard to all the benefits, the balance weighs in favour of approving this application. Whilst there are some conflicts with specific policies in the Waste Plan and Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan, the scheme is considered to be in accordance with the Development Plan read as a whole and provides a sustainable form of development in accordance with paragraph 11 of the NPPF.

Description of Proposal

15. The proposed development comprises the installation of a low carbon Energy Recovery Facility for the generation of electricity and heat through a low-emission thermal process using residual waste including an associated stack, a new administration building and associated car parking area; associated reconfiguration of existing and permitted uses; an increase in permitted waste throughput; landscaping and associated works.

16. In detail, the proposal is for;

- An Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) for the generation of heat and electricity through a thermal process using up to 60,000 tonnes of non-hazardous residual waste per annum. From the initial 60,000 tonnes, approximately 10,000 tonnes

will be suitable for recycling. The remaining 50,000 tonnes of residual waste would be subject to the combustion process. The ERF would consist of a waste reception and processing hall; boiler and turbine hall; flue gas treatment; exhaust stack; and ash skip collection.

- Construction of a new administration building with offices, welfare facilities and a visitor centre. This will replace the existing offices on site which are to be demolished along with the existing green waste reception building.
- Re-positioning of the green waste composting to east of the site providing space for the new administration building and additional space for wood processing.
- Reduction in the scale of the consented Anaerobic Digestion Facility and its repositioning to the east of the ERF.
- Overall increase of the site's throughput from the consented 266,000 tonnes per annum to 341,000 tonnes per annum. This increase 75,000 tonnes consists of 60,000 tonnes of non-hazardous waste for the ERF and 15,000 tonnes of additional green waste and wood waste which will go through the existing green waste composting and wood processing on-Site
- Construction of a new access to Chapel Lane to serve the administration and welfare building and car park. It would be around 50 metres to the south of the existing main access and gain access to the 'southbound' side of Chapel Lane.

Energy Recovery Facility

17. The proposed ERF building will have an overall length of 163.8m and a width of 46.6m. The eaves would measure 13.5m and the total ridge height would be 16m. The total internal floorspace would comprise of 6,842.16 sqm. In addition to this, a 38m high emissions stack would be positioned within the boiler and turbine room at the eastern end of the building. The stack would have an outer diameter of 1.37m and its top would be fitted with 4 aircraft warning lights.

18. The main elements of the ERF would consist of; waste reception and processing hall; boiler and turbine hall; control room; exhaust stack; ash skip collection; and workshop. To the southern side of the building, there will be a pump house, fire tank, air-cooled condensers and blast coolers. The Air-cooled condensers have a height of 16.3m. Alongside the northern side of the building, there is a dedicated weighbridge and associated gatehouse for traffic associated with the ERF.

19. The ERF building has a shallow pitched roof and gable end form. The lower section of the building is clad in a metal trapezoidal wall cladding in a brown colour (Van Dye brown) with the upper section in the same cladding but in a grey shade (Hamlet). Metal trapezoidal profile roof cladding would be utilised along with panels of vertical western red cedar timber cladding. The emissions stack would consist of Polyester Powder Coating metal stack casing in a grey colour (oyster).

20. It is anticipated that the ERF will have a generating capacity of 11.5 megawatts thermal (MWth) and 3.4 megawatts electrical (MWe). The electricity generated would be used within the site and the remainder would be directed to the local distribution network via the existing electrical substation located opposite the site on the western side of Chapel Lane using the existing cabling in place. The resultant heat would be used on site and also exported off site. The applicant is currently in discussions with the owners of the Aviation Business Park and Airport and BCP Council about potential heat networks and end users for the heat.

21. The ERF would only use non-hazardous residual waste. Residual waste is defined as; "*Non-hazardous residual waste arises from kerbside collections, household*

recycling centres and the commercial and industrial waste stream. It comprises 'black-bag' waste containing all waste that is left after materials for recycling and composting have been removed by the householder or producer" as set out in the Local Waste Plan.

Administration building

22. The existing office buildings and car parking area would be removed and replaced with a new administration building southeast of the site entrance. The building would be mainly two storeys and the parapet level would measure 9.3m from ground level. The additional third storey element within the centre of the building gives an additional height to 12.2m. The overall external floor space would be 1,476 sqm with 641sqm office space; 316 sqm for the visitor centre and the remainder for the welfare facilities and amenity space at roof level.

23. The materials are similar to those on the ERF building, but the use of the western red cedar cladding is more prevalent. Staff and visitor parking would be sited to the west of the new building comprising 71 spaces, including 7 disabled spaces. Cycle parking is situated at the southern end of the building. Parking and drop off areas for coaches and minibuses is provided at the northern end of the car park.

Green waste composting, anaerobic digestor and bio-energy facility

24. The green waste composting windrows will be relocated further east onto the site to make room for the new ERF building and enable increased capacity. The anaerobic digestor was granted permission under 8/14/0515 and although the permission was implemented, this facility was never constructed. This proposal involves a reduction in the scale of the permitted anaerobic digestor from 6 digestor tanks and 2 storage tanks to 3 digestor tanks and 2 storage tanks. They would be positioned to the east of the ERF of the building.

25. The development of the bio-energy facility was implemented following permissions in 2011 and 2014; however the facility itself was not constructed. The development involved the processing of 30,000 tonnes of waste and wood per annum and included a stack of 22m. It is proposed to relinquish this permission as the applicant considers the ERF represents a more environmentally efficient technology and provides a more streamlined process across the site. The relinquishment will be secured through the s106.

Environmental Impact Assessment

26. A Scoping Opinion was submitted to the Local Planning Authority August 2020 to determine the contents of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the proposed development. The requirement for an EIA arises from the development being of a type listed in Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) and deemed likely to have significant effects on the environment.

27. The development exceeds the threshold of Part 11 (b) of Schedule 2 of the Regulations (waste disposal installations) and also exceeds the threshold set out in Part 3(a) (generation of energy). The EIA Regulations provide that a planning authority shall not grant planning permission in respect of EIA development unless they have first taken into consideration environmental information that must be presented and made publicly available in an ES.

Description of Site and Surroundings

28. The application site is currently occupied by an existing waste and recovery facility and includes the following waste streams and processes;

- Green waste composting
- In-vessel composting
- Soils and aggregates processing and recycling
- Waste wood processing and recycling
- Combustion and recycling of waste wood
- Road sweepings waste recycling
- Drying plant for processing of non-ABPR liquid waste

29. There are extant planning permissions for the following;

- Bio-energy facility for waste wood
- Anaerobic digestor for food waste
- Solid recovered fuels facility

30. The site includes a number of buildings (drying sheds for wood and biomass, biomass CHP facility, green waste reception building, open stock piles and a variety of plant machinery). There is a single storey building in use as offices and a small car parking area along with a weighbridge arrangement for waste vehicles as they enter and exit the site. There are also waste storage lagoons in the south west corner of the site along with surface water treatments ponds at the south eastern corner.

31. The site lies along Chapel Lane to the north of the Airport and associated business park. Chapel Lane has a number of residential properties at its southern end and other commercial enterprises along its stretch. The surrounding area which lies between the main urban envelopes of Christchurch, Bournemouth, West Parley and Ferndown has a mixture of uses close to the airport and employment area including the Bournemouth Sports Club, Sewage treatment works, Portfield School and two solar farms. There are a handful of residential properties along Chapel Lane, the closest being Whitemere House which is positioned to the north west of the site. 3 other properties are sited to the south and there are dwellings on Barrack Road to the west of the site with Parley Common in between.

32. The lies within the South East Dorset Green Belt. The BCP and Dorset Council Strategic Green Belt Assessment 2020 identifies the site in BA10 (area to the north of the Airport and Aviation Business Park) and states: *"The parcel is not close enough to the large built-up area to be associated with it. Therefore, development would not be perceived as sprawl of the large built-up area. Overall, the area makes a strong contribution to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment"*.

33. The existing facility is well screened by the existing 5 metre bund around the northern and eastern boundaries and the mature vegetation. The site is not visible from the B3073 given the intervening vegetation and land uses. The land to the north and east of the application site is dominated by a solar farm.

34. Vehicular access is from Chapel Lane which links to Enterprise Way providing western access to the Aviation Business Park and to Chapel Gate roundabout which provides access around the perimeter of the airport towards Hurn and to the west to the urban settlements of West Parley and Ferndown. The site access has a splitter island installed to prevent conflicting movements and the site itself features a loop one-way system. Only the first 130-150 metres of Chapel Lane is publicly adopted with the remainder in the applicant's ownership. A public bridleway runs along the remainder of the Chapel Lane (Route E62/4). A further bridleway (Route E62/29) runs in parallel to the lane along its western side. Chapel Lane and Bridleway E62/4 continue beyond the Site as an agricultural track, passing the Palmersford Sewage Treatment Works and linking to Trickett's Cross approximately 2km to the north.

35. The application site itself is not covered by any wildlife or nature conservation designations. However, there are European designated sites within the vicinity of the application site. The Dorset Heathlands is a Special Protection Ares (SPA) and lies directly adjacent to the east site boundary and also beyond the western and southern boundaries of the site. The Dorset Heaths are also designated as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar site. The Avon Valley is a SPA and Ramsar although this is located 2km to the east of the site. The River Avon SAC is located 3km to the east. In addition to these international recognised sites of ecological importance, Hurn Common and Parley Common which lie around the site are designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which are of national importance.

36. There are a number of Scheduled Monuments within the vicinity of the application site. Two bowl barrows are located to the north west of the site at Gibbet Firs and an additional bowl barrow to the north east on East Parley Common. Barnabas Lodge, the former Church of St Barnabas on Chapel Lane, to the south of the site is a Grade II listed building and Fir Grove Farmhouse is a Grade II listed property positioned about 1km to the north east of the site. Parley Court Barn, Tudor Cottage and Parley Manor are Grade II listed buildings approximately 1.6km south of the site accessed off Parley Road and form a group. There is a further grade II listed building to the south east of the site, beyond the garden centres on Christchurch Road, Woodtown farmhouse. To the south-south west off Parley Lane, Merritown House and Merritown barn, 2 grade II listed building are positioned. The closest Conservation Area is within West Parley, 2.5k to the west of the site on Church Lane adjacent to the river Stour and Hurn Conservation Area is located approximately 3km to the east.

Relevant Planning History

37. There is a long and complex planning history for the site. The following are the main and most relevant applications for the site.

8/93/0155	Use of land for conversion of green waste into compost together with construction of raised bund, composting bunkers and ancillary structures	Granted 19/07/1993
8/95/0188	Construction of composting plant	Granted January 1996
8/96/0546	Installation of inert waste recycling centre	Granted 21/02/97
8/98/0435	7 portacabins for office space, storeroom, workshop, messroom and wash facilities in association with	Granted 6/10/98

	approved composting plant.	
8/01/0351	Extension and rationalisation of existing composting facility and soils recycling including landscaping access offices and educational centre and part restoration to heathland and willow woodland	Granted 18/11/2003
8/02/0429	Relocation of existing bridleway onto new dedicated route in association with planning application for extension of composting operations.	Granted 18/11/2003
8/2006/0656	Storing and bagging of imported materials together with those emanating from the activities of Eco Composting Ltd	Granted 05/12/2006
8/2006/0633	Revision to existing landscaping, concrete pad, reception barn and clamps and layout of soils recycling plant within existing permission 8/2001/0351	Grated 08/10/2009
8/11/0268	Development of a renewable and low carbon Bio Energy Facility (BEF) for the generation of electricity through a low emission, thermal process using wood from existing waste wood recycling operations, including new plant, buildings and landscaping. (Resubmission)	Granted 26/07/2011
8/11/0258	A part retrospective application for the storage, transfer, recovery and recycling of non hazardous and inert waste, to include treated wood waste, a vehicle sheeting gantry and associated development. The construction of two new buildings; an office extension with associated parking and replacement workshop/store	Granted 15/02/2012
8/12/0354	Proposed development of an Anaerobic Digestion (AD) Facility for the generation of renewable biogas through the processing of mixed maize and food waste, with new landscaping, amendment to existing In-Vessel Composting unit and soils area, and associated matters	Granted 25/09/2013
8/13/0404	Modification of Conditions 2 and 16 of Decision Notice 8/11/0268] for the development of a renewable and low	Granted 13/02/2014

	carbon Bio Energy Facility (BEF) for the generation of electricity through a low emission, thermal process using wood from existing waste wood recycling operations, including new plant, buildings and landscaping: amendments to the design of the buildings and plant and an increase in the permitted throughput from 25,000 to 30,000 tonnes per annum.	
8/14/0515	Proposed reconfiguration of existing and consented development; introduction of new plant and processes; increase in permitted throughput; partial widening of access road; provision of a permissive path; new landscaping and associated matters	Granted 11/08/2016 subject to s106
8/16/2910	Variation of Conditions 2 (Development to Be In Accordance With Approved Plans) and 3 (Operation in Accordance With Application Documents) of 8/14/0515 (Variations to the precise location and design of the Biomass CHP Plant.	Granted 11/04/2017
8/20/0998	Proposed storage building associated with the operation of the Biomass Burner on the existing waste recycling and recovery site.	Granted 26/01/21

Constraints

38. In considering whether to grant planning permission or permission in principle for development which affects a listed building special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest - section 66 - Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

- Flood Zone 2 current
- FZ3b 30cc 2093
- FZ3a 30cc 2093
- FZ3a 40cc 2133
- FZ3b 40cc 2133
- Flood Zone 3a (2019)
- Flood Zone 3b (2019)
- SSSI Impact Risk Zone
- Land Fill Sites
- Green Belt
- Heathland 400m Consultation Area - 0.00m
- Rights of Way

- Airport Safeguarding
- Dorset Minerals Consultation Area
- Contaminated Land - Refuse Disposal
- Contaminated Land - High Risk

Public Sector Equalities Duty

39. In accordance with section 149 Equality Act 2010, in considering this proposal due regard has been had to the need to —

    - eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
    - advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
    - foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Other relevant duties

40. In accordance with section 40 Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, in considering this application, regard has been had, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of this function, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. For the purposes of this application, in accordance with section 17 Crime and Disorder Act 1998, due regard has been had to, including the need to do all that can reasonably be done to prevent, (a) crime and disorder in its area (including anti-social and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment); (b) the misuse of drugs, alcohol and other substances in its area; and (c) re-offending in its area.

41. For the purposes of this application to the extent it is relevant, in accordance with regulation 18 Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 regard has been had to the following provisions of the Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EU) (as amended), (a) Article 13; (b) the first paragraph of Article 16(1) and (c) article 16(2) and (3).

42. Article 13 Protection of human health and the environment

    Member States shall take the necessary measures to ensure that waste management is carried out without endangering human health, without harming the environment and, in particular: (a) without risk to water, air, soil, plants or animals; (b) without causing a nuisance through noise or odours; and (c) without adversely affecting the countryside or places of special interest.

43. Article 16 Principles of self-sufficiency and proximity

    1. *Member States shall take appropriate measures, in cooperation with other Member States where this is necessary or advisable, to establish an integrated and adequate network of waste disposal installations and of installations for the recovery of mixed municipal waste collected from private households, including where such collection also covers such waste from other producers, taking into account best available techniques.*

    2. *The network shall be designed to enable the Community as a whole to become self-sufficient in waste disposal as well as in the recovery of waste referred to in paragraph 1, and to enable Member States to move towards that aim individually,*

taking into account geographical circumstances or the need for specialised installations for certain types of waste.

3. The network shall enable waste to be disposed of or waste referred to in paragraph 1 to be recovered in one of the nearest appropriate installations, by means of the most appropriate methods and technologies, in order to ensure a high level of protection for the environment and public health.

4. The principles of proximity and self-sufficiency shall not mean that each Member State has to possess the full range of final recovery facilities within that Member State.

Consultations

44. **Hurn Parish Council – Object to the proposal**

- "The plant will burn plastics which would otherwise be recyclable, thus working against waste reduction principles and providing an outlet to dispose of recyclates in a carbon unfriendly manner. This will not encourage recycling, as once the plant is built, it will have to be fed with anything which is available to keep it running including recyclable items". Reference made to UKWIN (United Kingdom Without Incineration).
- "Councillors are concerned about the emissions from the "low" stack. Due to constraints of having Bournemouth Airport as a neighbour, the height of the chimney can be not more that 38.4m, therefore the applicant has been forced to ensure the stack is lower than that, and the plans include a chimney stack of only 38m in height. Plastics will be burnt, and the higher the levels of plastics that are burnt, potentially the higher the emissions will be. Incineration is a highly carbon intense method of generating electricity. Evidence suggests that incineration is not a sustainable solution, and production of energy from waste is not a renewable energy source. In addition, the chimney stack, although low by necessity because of the Airport, is of sufficient height to likely be visible from Bournemouth, Christchurch, Ferndown and the outskirts of Wimborne. This is still a very high structure in the green belt and on the horizon, which is visually detrimental to the local area.
- Councillors raised concerns that as the plant has a lifespan of 25 years, technology and regulation will change in this time. They are very concerned that the plant will be locked into current technology which will soon become outdated and it may not have to meet the latest regulatory standards as time goes forward. There is no guarantee that filters will prevent release of toxic air pollutants. In addition, residual ash produced will be deemed toxic waste, and will require specialist disposal. There is no mention if the plant itself will be toxic at the end of its life and require specialist disposal as well. These are serious concerns which are not addressed.
- The proposal is in the green belt and the NPPF states that construction of new buildings within the green belt is inappropriate unless there are exceptional circumstances. It is not considered that any need for this facility has been demonstrated as the UK already has overcapacity of incinerator plants, and they are now being proved to be ineffective in reducing carbon emissions (see above). Demonstration of need is a material planning consideration.
- The operation of the facility will result in adverse effects on the heathland SSSI protected areas at Hurn Common, Parley Common, St Leonards and St. Ives Heaths and Town Common. Some of these ecologically sensitive areas are in line of the prevailing winds, but all will be subject to increased emissions pollution. There are no such emissions emitted on to those areas at the moment.

- In addition to electricity the plant will produce thermal energy. Documents state – "the proposed ERF will generate combined heat and power with an anticipated generating capacity of 11.5 megawatts thermal (MWth) and 3.4 megawatts electrical (MWe)". The plant will therefore produce much more thermal capacity than electrical. It is not made clear where the thermal capacity will be used, it is only suggested where it might be. There is no infrastructure in place to divert any thermal capacity to any other location and there is no evidence that it will even be required anywhere. There is no demonstration of need for the output which is a material planning consideration.
- The large increase in HGV movements will have an adverse effect on local residents. Refuse lorries also frequently shed litter onto roads. Waste will be imported from surrounding areas in order to feed the incinerator and the operation will require an additional 38 heavy vehicle movements per day. These will be diesel vehicles of a highly polluting nature which will put further pressure on congested the local highway network and impact on noise and local air quality".

Following re-consultation the following comments have been received;

- "Eco Composting Ltd purport to have addressed a number of the issues the Parish Council raised previously. Councillors still have concerns about the impact the proposals will have on Hurn. In particular the extra HGV traffic through Hurn. This will increase the conflict of vehicles with cyclist and pedestrians at Chapel Gate.
- Councillors are also aware that the Government is considering a moratorium on new residual waste plants as there is considered to already be sufficient capacity in the country, therefore this plant is not needed".

45. **West Parley Parish Council –** Strongly object to the proposal

- "The extra traffic that will be generated by the proposal to increase the permitted waste throughput, will impact adversely, on Northbourne, Longham and West Parley.
- The potential increase also shows disregard of the fact the Bournemouth Airport and the Industrial Estate are not operating at anywhere near maximum capacity. Whilst it has been suggested traffic to the Eco site could enter via the A338 and leave via West Parley or vice versa, we are yet to be convinced an operable monitoring scheme can be implemented. There will also be the extra traffic generated from the Eastern and Western housing and nursing home developments permitted by the Planning inspectorate on examination of the current a Local Plan. On the eastern site there is also planned a large store, along with numerous office and retail units.
- The application talks about the provision of low carbon energy through the incineration of 'residual waste' expanding on the permitted waste throughput. The current volume of 'permitted waste' under existing consents has not been fully utilised. What is not clear is whether medical waste is also allowed to be incinerated.
- West Parley is a semi-rural village and there are a large amount of horse owners/riders and ride the circular route from Barrack Rd then up Chapel Lane to Parley Common who already have to run the gauntlet of traffic there. Whilst there is one bridleway that takes riders off Chapel Lane it is very narrow and not well maintained as it is overgrown in places, so not an easy or safe route for riders or other users such as cyclists etc. This aspect appeared to be overlooked until raised at ECO's presentation to the Parish Council several months ago. We note, there is a proposal off the back of the Transforming City Fund to improve this bridleway but it has not as far as we are aware been given

the go ahead as there has to be discussions with landowners to be made. This must be a condition of any application.

- The site is not only within the heart of local greenbelt, it is in close proximity to protected Dorset Heathland and a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The protection of these habitats should be paramount and will obviously be adversely affected when considering the predominance of wind direction for the plume.
- The height of the chimney has been restricted due to the proximity to the airport, however this has a direct correlation to the fall of the pollution particles from the chimney, which means the pollution would fall closer to the site than if a taller chimney was installed. Given the population of the local area, this can have a negative impact on the health of those residing in the 'drop zone'.
- Both Dorset and BCP Councils use the existing facility and are the likely major candidates to use the expanded facility. The current operation is undoubtedly well managed and tidy. The suggested educational centre sounds great. There are great local pressures to plan for the future disposal of 'waste' and local landfill sites are operating near capacity. People need to weigh these considerations when making a determination. It therefore seems perverse that the decision on the application will be made by a party with a heavy vested financial interest in the outcome. One of the other consultees (Dorset Council) again has the same financial vested interest. Individuals would have to recuse themselves from any determination if a Council Member, hearing the application. It is akin to the Council being judge and jury for the application".

46. **Ferndown Town Council – Strongly object**

- "The facility which is to be expanded is situated close to the southern boundary of the largest inland town in East Dorset and is therefore a major threat to the health of Ferndown's 26,000 residents by reducing the air quality. To the south is the large conurbation of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole housing 465,000 residents and considerably more holiday makers and day trippers in season who would to a lesser extent be affected. It could also impede the resort maintaining its good air quality figures. Closer to the incinerator are the airport industrial estates and airport personnel. All will be affected, dependent on variable wind direction.
- The extraction chimney due to its proximity to an airport is insufficient in height to guarantee good local air quality as the reduced height will not allow for adequate disposal of fumes and chemicals. Conversely full height would be dangerous to aircraft but better for air quality.
- There are numerous and widespread Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) in close proximity to the site particularly to the west, east and north. The prevailing winds will ensure that virgin land will steadily become polluted from the gases and particulates from the chimney to its detriment and also to that of the numerous species of wildlife currently enjoying these areas. The risks to them would be legion.
- Having an industrial waste burning facility in the midst of greenbelt land and so close to multiple SSSIs goes against the very nature of these two institutions of safeguarding. It can be only harmful to local ecology.
- The application does not encourage recycling as all plastic waste, whether recyclable or not, would constitute a fossil fuel and can be incinerated. This will inevitably lead to a reduction in recycling in the catchment area as other items are also incinerated.
- It is clear that the waste materials sourced locally will be insufficient to sustain operations. Therefore, waste from further afield [other authorities] will be required. Vehicle movements are also likely to be exasperated by other vehicles removing the waste ash for disposal from the furnaces. Therefore, traffic

movement from the Wessex Way to the east, Ham Lane to the west and through Ferndown town centre from the North will all be increased to service the facility. As well as causing additional congestion and noise there will be extra pollution from the HGVs. Additionally, in Longham the roadside nature of many properties means that vehicle-emanating vibration would be an increasing issue.

- No mention has been found in the documents of how many very heavy vehicle movements a day the removal of the toxic waste ash from the site will require. There is also a safety concern involving such a movement in residential areas such as Longham and Ferndown, and ultimately the safe disposal of such hazardous waste materials.
- It is clear that as well as producing electricity the plant will produce a larger quantity of heat. There appears no mention of how this will be dissipated or used. Maybe this will be lost to the air to worsen global warming. There is perhaps a lost opportunity to pipe this to heat local homes or industrial units as in the manner of Battersea Power Station situated on the south bank of the River Thames that decades ago supplied free heat to blocks of flats across the Thames on the north bank.
- A multi-million drive to install cycle lanes on all Ferndown's major roads will reduce the road capacity for all vehicles. Thus, Ferndown's already problematic traffic can only worsen with all the HGVs needed to maintain supplies for the incinerator and remove waste materials potentially at peak times adding to the frequent gridlock of the area.
- BCP has a stated aim of making its council area carbon-neutral by 2030. Clearly this cannot happen with such an operation being carried out within its own unitary area. We trust that the fact that BCP awarded Eco Sustainable Solutions LTD the contract of waste disposal only last year will not influence this planning decision".

47. **Natural England – No Objection**

- "The application does not involve any direct land take or activities in the designated sites, Hurn Common SSSI, Parley Common SSSI, the Dorset Heathlands SPA and Ramsar and Dorset Heaths SAC which lie in close proximity to the site.
- The authority will need a planning condition to require a lighting strategy to ensure that onsite lighting does not result in displacement of specially protected bat species or foraging/in flight nightjars using the designated sites to the east and west of the application site. This strategy will require technical and ecological advice which is best provided by the applicant's ecological advisor. Natural England advise that the strategy will need to be prepared prior to the commencement of construction and that it should be signed off in writing by the ecological advisor. The sHRA provides a good basis for setting out the lighting specifications.

Air Quality

- It is clear that in the absence of mitigation measures such as increased height of the exhaust stack (restricted by the airport proximity), air pollution removal measures etc the proposal would have an adverse effect on the adjacent designated sites both alone and in-combination. Other proposals at the site which modify previously approved activities will have positive impacts on air quality. The key pollutants are enhanced levels of NOx, NO2 (Nitrogen deposition) and acid deposition.
- Since the application was submitted the applicant has submitted further information including soil survey results and a review of the sensitive plant species currently present compared to historical survey reports. Careful analysis has enabled Natural England to agree with the applicants advisors that the

evidence available confirms that the site has not been significantly impacted by acid deposition and retains the capacity to buffer modelled small additional contributions

- The views of the applicant set out in the sHRA are agreed and that the conclusion of no Likely Significant Effect may reasonably be concluded by the authority in respect of the three combustion pollutants: NOx, nitrogen deposition and acid deposition.
- The sHRA dated 28 July 2021 has been the subject of a number of comments by Natural England which have been incorporated by the applicant. It forms a sound basis for the authority to carry out its own Appropriate Assessment.
- The applicant makes a number of recommendations concerning other mitigation measures in the EIA which should be secured through suitable planning conditions. Natural England has no objection to the authority granting a permission if the proposed measures set out above and in the EIA are suitable secured".

48. **Environment Agency**

- No objection subject to conditions on a Remediation Strategy and a Verification Report for contamination being imposed along with a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Piling.

49. **Dorset Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor -** None received

50. **Bournemouth Airport Safeguarding**

- "This proposal and Bournemouth Airports objection due to potential Aerodrome Safeguarding impacts has been reassessed as the developer has supplied additional information and the requested assessments which have now been studied. It has been shown that all the highlighted areas from our original objection, Instrument Flight Procedures, Radar Technical Safeguarding, Heat and Emissions and Bird control have all satisfied Safeguarding criteria and the Airports objection can now be removed.
- In relation to proposals being advanced at Aviation Business Park BCP has raised an issue regarding the safe crossing of Chapel Lane, and they have required a crossing to be implemented here. Meanwhile the Eco Sustainable Solutions application will take access from Chapel Lane, and the increased traffic from that scheme will have a direct impact on the safety at this crossing point. If the Aviation Business Park proposals will increase the pedestrian and cycle movements on this crossing, and the Eco Sustainable Solutions proposals will also increase the vehicular (and HGV) traffic here, then if BCP insist on this improvement both applications should be liable for securing it. To resolve this, and if BCP regard it as an essential feature, a planning condition should be attached to both permissions (i.e. for Aviation Business Park and Eco Sustainable Solutions) requiring the crossing to be implemented, which would effectively fall away for the other once one party makes the improvement first.

- The further information supplied regarding Ecology has been found to be acceptable".

51. **Public Health Dorset -** None received

52. **Historic England –** Do not wish to make any comments

53. **Dorset Council** (full response available on line and see main body of report for further comments)

- "The Bournemouth, Christchurch, Poole and Dorset Waste Plan identifies a clear need for non-hazardous waste management capacity. The application provides for 60,000tpa of residual waste management capacity, making a contribution towards this need. The proposal is on a site allocated in the Waste Plan and generally in principle therefore can be considered acceptable.
- In terms of addressing ecological issues and minimising potential impacts to an acceptable level, having reviewed the further information submitted Dorset Council have no objections, subject to the following recommendations:

- BCP Council undertake an Appropriate Assessment of the updated plans, which include measures to avoid/mitigate the otherwise adverse effects on European Site integrity.
- Long-term support management and monitoring is undertaken, as suggested in the sHRA but with the modifications recommended by the Dorset Council NET.
- Other mitigation measures, as suggested by the applicant and subject to the details/amendments recommended by Dorset Council's NET, are secured by suitable planning condition(s).

- It is noted that the 5 m high timber fence proposed as part of the sensitive lighting strategy is undesirable from a landscape perspective. BCP Council should consider the ecological justification for the fence, and if determined as a necessary element of the sensitive lighting strategy appropriate (native species) soft landscaping could be considered to break-up the visual impact.

  No outright objection to the proposal but following landscape recommendations are made;
- Additional photomontage carried out in Sept 2021 shows vegetation in full leaf. It is acknowledged that this Viewpoint area may be difficult to access – so the 'views' may not be experienced as frequently as other publicly accessible areas. Dorset Council would be satisfied with the predicted impact of 'Moderate Adverse' arising from the presence of the Stack above the tree line. The impact will, undoubtedly, be more pronounced during the trees' dormant period.
- Despite the undertaking of a technical supporting document (Fichter Consulting Engineers Ltd) which advised on the 'worse-case scenario' of a vertical plume against a clear sky, it is disappointing that the two additional photomontages conveyed the Plume within a clouded sky where the potential visual effects of the emissions would be reduced.
- The proposal, as existing, would fail to provide satisfactory visual screening/visual enhancements owing to a lack of available 'space' within the proposed Site Layout. The apparent reliance on substantial engineering embankments and 5m high fencing would clearly conflict with the aims and objectives of the Green Belt designation.
- It is also advised that the architectural treatment of the proposed ERF fails to respond to its contextual setting. Whilst the use of timber is to be commended on the elevations, the strong geometric form and horizontal 'banding' of materials serve to 'emphasise' the massing of the Building, and does little to 'settle' it into the receptor landscape. The Building will clearly legible as a large-scale industrial unit, with horizontal axis accentuated by contrasting colours and texture".

54. **BCP Trees & Landscaping**

- "Due to the current site use, vegetation is restricted to the edges of the site. The access to the site is from Chapel lane, along which a thick belt of mainly deciduous vegetation, comprising of trees and shrubs, screens the site. There are limited views of the development site and the wider landscape from the majority of Chapel Lane or Barrack Road due to the height & density of this vegetation.
- There are prominent areas of trees when viewed from the eastern, southern and western areas of the development site, comprising of a mixed quality tree groups. These act as reasonable screening, and it is considered that the site is fairly well concealed by the surrounding tree cover. Much of the land surrounding the site is identified as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Special Protection Areas (SPA), Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar, as well as being covered by Green Belt.
- Whilst it is considered that the existing vegetation on and off site will help screen the proposed buildings, the visibility of the stack in the wider landscape can not be mitigated through planting. The visual impact of the Chimney on the wider landscape is beyond the area of expertise of the BCP Tree and Landscape Team. Based on this, we are unable to provide expert advice on this aspect.
- The current proposal, as per previous approvals, is supported by landscape strategies that intended to retain all existing boundary vegetation, supplemented by additional planting. The proposed landscaping scheme, planting of mixed native trees and shrubs and infill planting, is acceptable, and with selected species that are appropriate for the location. There is a lack of detail on the car park area in terms of proposed landscaping, which has the capacity for the planting of additional trees and shrubs.
- Recommendations: No objection to the proposal in its current form however, the submitted information does not include precise details on the proposed landscaping for the car park area".

55. **BCP Highways** (full comments can be viewed on line and also see body of report)

- "Whilst the impact of the development on the overall highway network is limited the impact when considered against the immediate Chapel Lane is a significant increase in movements both all traffic and HGV. To reduce potential harm to other users' improvements to Chapel Lane are necessary to safely accommodate the additional trips.
- No objections subject to conditions and s106 to secure the dedication of land for the widening and resurfacing of Bridleway E62/29".

56. **BCP Lead Flood Authority**

- "While infiltration would normally be the preferred option the fact that much of the site has been excavated and replaced with inert fill of unknown quality "as the potential for leachable contaminants to be present cannot be discounted and therefore a potential impact of moderate magnitude to groundwater and surface water could be feasible prior to any mitigation." makes the situation more complex.
- The application form states that surface water will be disposed of to a Sustainable drainage system and they are within 20m of a watercourse. There does not appear to be any current "Main River" or Surface Water flooding issues on the site (as per the FRA) and indeed from other applications in this general area I understand the main river modelling has been recently updated in this area (not shown on current mapping) which has shown that generally the flooding is not as extensive as original modelled although both these outputs do not include allowances for Climate change. The site is already extensively

developed so depending on how it is drained there may already be significant brown field run-off.

- The Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary says:- 11.4 The detailed drainage strategy which will be a planning condition and will ensure that the proposed SuDS are designed with a future climate change allowance in accordance with policy requirements; and later 12.7 The proposed drainage strategy will involve surface water runoff from all hardstanding surfaces around the Site conveyed using pipes through a combination of treatment techniques to ensure that discharges to the Moors River are within consented limits. These may include oil interceptors, aeration, filtration or surface water treatment ponds.
- The principles seem acceptable BUT we in the FCERM team are not able to comment on the suitability or otherwise of the proposed treatment of surface water discharges prior to discharge. Presumably that would be the EAs role?
- In conclusion there is no "Flooding" objection to the proposals but I would recommend conditioning any approval (as suggested) to provide a detailed drainage strategy based on any permitted discharges agreed with the EA once full details are available. AND Further that it is provided before any construction commences on site.

57. **BCP Environmental Health –** No objection subject to conditions.

Noise – "The provisions relating to noise and vibration in the environmental statement follow standard best practice, in consideration of the proposed works and the sensitivity of the site's surroundings. With regard to operational noise, based on the information provided in the Noise and Vibration Chapter, we agree that the construction/ decommissioning and operation of the proposed development is not likely to adversely impact on the amenity of local residents".

Air Quality – "The relevant sections of the applicants Environmental Statement for Air Quality have been peer reviewed by specialist consultants appointed by the council. (Full details attached).

The air quality chapter has shown that it is unlikely that there would be any significant effects as a result of construction phase traffic associated air quality impacts from the Proposed Development on surrounding habitats. The Construction phase assessment of dust emissions has been completed in line with best practice guidance and mitigation recommended which is generally in line with best practice IAQM methodology.

The assessment of traffic has been completed in accordance with methodology recommended in TG(16) and verified to local monitoring. The effect of traffic emissions in isolation are not considered to be significant. Emissions from the proposed ERF, have determined that there is potential, in a worst-case modelled scenario for there to be exceedances of the long-term limits for human health of Ammonia and Chromium from the development. It is recommended that emissions limits be in place for Arsenic and Chromium and controlled by condition in line with the modelled emissions representative of the currently permitted facility. Should the facility be built, it will be operated under a strict permit issued by the Environment Agency. The Environment Agency will set Permit conditions / emission limits for several parameters including Ammonia and Chromium.

The short-term impact of sulphur dioxide emissions have been presented as >10% in the summary report table but additional commentary is provided detailing the use of a lower ELV for the purposes of protecting habitats. It is accepted that this would reduce the emissions to a level considered 'negligible' but may be enforced through planning condition".

Contaminated land – No objection, recommend contamination conditions

Light nuisance – "The lighting information submitted for the proposed development does not consider the potential effect of the development with regards to the change from the baseline environment. This review has been limited to a review of the proposed lighting strategy and whether sufficient lighting is provided for the purpose of lighting task areas and compared against environmental limits at surrounding potentially light sensitive receptors. The lighting strategy shows that the risk of lighting off site to sensitive ecological receptors is low and has been further minimised by dimming lighting levels to the northern, and part of the western access road. Lighting levels will be reduced by 50% in these areas to provide lighting for pedestrians only outside of vehicle delivery hours. This conclusion is accepted.

Lighting has been designed in accordance with British Standard BS EN 12464-2 'Lighting for Outdoor Workplaces'. No information is given for upward light spill, though it is noted that several of the lighting products used specify 'no upward tilt'. The maximum permissible upward light ratio of luminaires in Environmental Zone E2 is 2.5% and this should not be exceeded at the proposed development.
While the information submitted with regards to lighting is not in the form of an assessment of the potential effect of lighting, it is considered that it is sufficient to be able to assess whether there are any likely significant effects. It is considered that, with the lighting scheme provided, the effect of lighting is not significant. It should be noted that the lighting layout submitted is indicative at this stage and is subject to final site layout and detailed design".

58. **BCP Planning Policy (**see online for full comments)

- "As the applicants planning statement acknowledges (paras 7.22 and 7.31 and table 5) the proposals do result in a net increase in built development. I consider therefore that the buildings and structures would have a greater impact in the openness of the Green Belt than the existing/permitted development. Notwithstanding the existing and permitted development; the proposed development would therefore constitute "inappropriate development". Therefore, to be supported against Green Belt policies "very special circumstances" would need to be demonstrated.
- The response from Dorset Council emphasises that the allocation of the site in the Waste Plan followed an assessment of need for facilities to manage non-hazardous residual waste; and a full review of alternative sites. I suggest therefore that in principle this proposal could amount to very special circumstances provided the proposals adequately deliver the requirements of the waste strategy as set out in the Waste Local Plan. However, this is a judgment for the case officer in the light of detailed advice from the Dorset Council Waste Team.
- However, given its Green Belt location, opportunities should be taken to minimise the impact on the openness of the Green Belt, by way of ensuring facilities on the site are essential and proportionate to the operational uses allocated in the waste local plan; and to ensuring that the size and layout of the buildings and structures maximise openness in so far as possible. The proposed administrative building/visitor centre is over and above development allocated in the Waste Local Plan. To be supported it would need to be demonstrated that this facility justified very special circumstances or that there are overriding benefits and/or other material considerations to justify departing from Green Belt policy".

59. **BCP Conservation/Heritage**

- "As the submitted heritage statement notes: 'the site is located on relatively flat, low-lying land and the height of the exhaust stack for the ERF plant (38m) is likely to become a feature that will be visible across the wider landscape, particularly to the north and west.' In assessing the impact of the proposal on the setting of listed buildings it is unhelpful that section 14 (Visual & Landscape Assessment) of the Environmental Statement (ES) fails to acknowledge the presence of Fir Grove Farmhouse in fig 1 (landscape designations). Whilst CGIs are given of the plant from the north and south, it would have been helpful to have included CGIs of the views towards the proposed stack from the nearest listed buildings.
- The former Church of St Barnabas is well treed to the northern boundary and any impact on its setting will be more related to wider effects such as any increase in vehicle movements rather than a visual impact. From the information available, despite some intervening tree cover the proposed chimney stack will be visible from the Farmhouse at Fir Grove Farm, and to a lesser degree from the listed buildings slightly further afield. Due to the distance from the application site, the conclusion of the Heritage Statement is broadly agreed with in that the impact upon the setting of the buildings is low, overall a slight adverse impact at the lower end of less than substantial harm.
- Whilst the harm to heritage is low, it nonetheless represents a degree of harm and the case officer needs to be satisfied that the proposal would bring about public benefit to seek to outweigh the adverse impact to the significance of nearby designated heritage assets".

60. **BCP Rights of Way -** None received

61. **BCP Waste and Recycling –** No objection

62. **BCP Biodiversity – "**No objection. Support comments by Natural England. The application with mitigation measures secured by s106 and conditions implemented in full will not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of the European sites.

Bats - Although several species of bat have been recorded in the area, the survey of site showed that trees and building had negligible potential to support roosting bats, but there is scope for area to be used by foraging bats. Bats can be adversely affected by inappropriate man-made lighting schemes. In this case the information supplied on lighting specifications for site as given in External Lighting Strategy will minimise impact and is appropriate.

Birds - *T*he application site does no support notable or rare birds, associated with European sites and the proposed enhancements of tree, scrub and reedbed planting will provide more habitat for the more common species of birds in area.

Reptiles and amphibians - Majority of site is unsuitable for reptiles, with just peripheral areas of scrub and semi-improved grass that might support common species of reptile. Most of this habitat will be retained, that which will be lost is from creation of attenuation ponds that are already consented and conditioned with surveys and any required subsequent mitigation Similarly, the site is not suitable for common species of amphibians, let alone great crested newt. While there are 5 ponds on site, these are concrete attenuation ponds which have poor suitability for great crested newts. Beyond site there are two other ponds, neither are impacted by this development, one has poor suitability and a lake with below average suitability for great crested newts. However, it has been agreed that on a precautionary basis that this lake will be subject to eDNA survey, this will help to inform if any measures are required within Construction Environment Management Plan for this species.

Enhancement - The proposed enhancements of tree, scrub and reedbed planting will provide more source of food for foraging bats, so is welcome. he habitat creation and enhancement measures, of green roof, tree and scrub boundary planting, planting of reedbed habitats and landscaping as given in Site Masterplan will provide net gains for biodiversity. Additionally, the applicant has expressed willingness to provide offsite payment to improve condition of Dorset Heathlands SPA and Ramsar and Dorset Heaths SAC, by contributing to funding of purchase land at St Catherine's Hill, part of Town Common SSSI, a constituent site of the European sites. This is additional enhancement and if not delivered for extraneous reasons, this development still compliant with NPPF and ME1.

Representations

63. There have been a total of 727 representations received for the proposal and 1 petition objecting to the scheme. Two rounds of consultation have been undertaken. The first on 12/05/2021 and the second following the submission of further information on 30/09/2021.

64. 719 objections have been received. Please note that given the number received and the level of detail within them, the comments have been summarised and the general themes of concern from all the representations have been collated. Please visit the website for full details of all the representations. Some of the representations come from BCP Council area but a high percentage come from within Dorset Council administrative area, in particular West Parley and Ferndown. All representations have been given consideration in preparing this report. However, given the detail in some of the representations, Members may wish to peruse the comments that have been submitted.

Pollution

- Increased traffic and specifically HGV movements resulting in additional exhaust pollution.
- Pollution from the emissions stack. Reference to asthma and death of a child
- Excessive CO2 production
- Residual ash is highly toxic
- Plume Plotter – impact from plume from incinerator
- Odour pollution
- Cumulative impact with airport

Health

- Increased risk of asthma and potential birth defects linked to noxious chemicals discharged by ERF
- Incinerators emit dioxins, Ni and ultrafine particulate matter
- Scientific reports on negative health effects of incinerators
- Elderly population put at significant risk

Environment

- Increase in greenhouse gases
- Harmful impact on wildlife and their habitats
- Negative impact on local green spaces
- Visibility of 38m high stack

Traffic

- Increased traffic from heavy lorries
- Importation of waste from other counties
- Congestion in residential area
- Local highway networks already congested
- Level of traffic in area is unsustainable

Climate change

- There should be greener and more sustainable solutions to waste management rather than burning plastics (fossil fuels)
- Desire to see re-use and recycling of materials rather than incineration
- Significantly increase emissions compared to fossil fuels
- More carbon intensive than landfill
- Scheme contrary to BCPs Climate and Ecological Emergency Declaration and Action Plan
- Scheme contrary to waste reduction principles
- UK currently has overcapacity for incineration
- Barrier against circular sustainable economy
- Application is a green-wash
- Already over capacity of Incineration Plants in the UK
- Development would lock in GHG emissions for 25+ years

Schools

- Negative impact on health of children (more susceptible to pollution) that attend local schools and nurseries.
- Parkfield School adjacent to the airport
- Health and welfare of pupils at Portfield School which provides care and education of autistic children and young people with additional challenges. Extensive use of outside facilities to provide outdoor education.

Wildlife and biodiversity

- Wildlife thriving in woodland and open spaces may be affected by pollutants and additional road traffic
- Flaura and fauna affected
- Nitrogen pollution from incinerator disrupt soil chemistry and damage heathland at Parley Common SSSI and Hurn Common SSSI

Airport

- Particulates from the chimney may be ingested by plane engines at Hurn Airport – contrary to Civil Aviation Regulations.
- Cumulative impact from pollution from Hurn Airport and proposed site increase pollution in local area
- Increase likelihood of aircraft accidents due to smoke stack

Green Belt

- Unacceptable use within the Green Belt
- Desire to protect natural beauty areas, habitats and enjoy outdoor activities

65. The petition with 12 signatures is for the following reasons;

- Impact on tourism and resulting impact on local economy
- Local air pollution
- Traffic congestion
- Incineration is exacerbating climate change
- Not a renewable energy resource

66. The 4 'comments' are on the following grounds:

- Require assurances the emissions will not represent a risk to health
- Energy from waste not a low carbon or renewable energy source
- Impact on people walking, cycling from increased vehicle emissions
- What odour there is and distance it could travel

67. The 4 letters of support are on the following grounds:

- Cannot continue to burying rubbish which creates methane, pollutes groundwater and creates odours. Incinerators are the way forward.
- Reduces impacts on environment on behalf of our children and the future

Key Issues

68. The key issues involved with this proposal are:

- Principle of development
- Green Belt
- Climate Change and sustainable construction
- Economy and education
- Airport Safeguarding
- Amenity and quality of life
- Air quality and pollution
- Design, form, scale and Landscape
- Transport
- Ecology
- Heritage
- Hydrology and Hydrogeology
- Contaminated land
- Cumulative and in-combination effects

69. These issues will be considered along with other matters relevant to this proposal below.

Policy Context

70. Development Plan:

Bournemouth, Christchurch, Poole and Dorset Waste Plan 2019 - 2033

Policy 1 – Sustainable waste management
Policy 3 – Sites allocated for waste management development
Policy 6 – Recovery facilities
Policy 8 – Inert waste recovery and disposal
Policy 12 – Transport and Access

Policy 13 – Amenity and quality of life
Policy 14 – Landscape and design quality
Policy 15 – Sustainable construction and operation of facilities
Policy 17 – Flood risk
Policy 18 – Biodiversity and geological interest
Policy 19 – Historic environment
Policy 20 – Airfield Safeguarding areas
Policy 21 – South East Dorset Green Belt
Policy 22 – Waste from new developments
Policy 23 – Restoration, aftercare and afteruse
Policy 24 – Safeguarding waste facilities

Appendix 3 – Inset 7 – Eco Sustainable Solutions, Parley

Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan 2010

Policy KS1 Sustainable development
Policy KS3 Green Belt
Policy KS11 Transport and Development
Policy KS12 Parking Provision
Policy HE1 Valuing and Conserving our Historic Environment
Policy HE2 Design of New Development
Policy HE3 Landscape Quality
Policy ME1 Safeguarding Biodiversity and Geodiversity
Policy ME2 Protection of the Dorset Heathlands
Policy ME6 Flood Management, Mitigation and Defence
Policy ME7 Protection of Groundwater

Saved policies of the Christchurch Borough Local Plan

ENV1 Waste facilities in new development
ENV3 Pollution and existing development
ENV5 Drainage and new development
ENV21 Landscaping in new development
BE15 Setting of listed buildings
EI7 Airport safety zones
T14 Cycle routes

Supplementary Planning Documents, Guidance and other Material Evidence

BCP Parking Standards SPD 2021

Dorset Heathlands Interim Air Quality Strategy 2020-2025

Character Assessment

National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF"/"Framework")

Section 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development

Paragraph 11 –

"Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.
…..
For **decision-taking** this means:
(c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

(d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

(i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or

(ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of this Framework taken as a whole."

Section 6 – Building a strong, competitive economy

Section 9 – Promoting sustainable transport

Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places

Section 13 – Protecting Green Belt land

Section 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Section 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Section 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

71. **National Planning Policy for Waste 2014**

When determining wate planning applications, waste planning authorities should**:**

- only expect applicants to demonstrate the quantitative or market need for new or enhanced waste management facilities where proposals are not consistent with an up-to-date Local Plan. In such cases, waste planning authorities should consider the extent to which the capacity of existing operational facilities would satisfy any identified need;

- recognise that proposals for waste management facilities such as incinerators that cut across up-to-date Local Plans reflecting the vision and aspiration of local communities can give rise to justifiable frustration, and expect applicants to demonstrate that waste disposal facilities not in line with the Local Plan, will not undermine the objectives of the Local Plan through prejudicing movement up the waste hierarchy;

- consider the likely impact on the local environment and on amenity against the criteria set out in Appendix B and the locational implications of any advice on health from the relevant health bodies. Waste planning authorities should avoid carrying out their own detailed assessment of epidemiological and other health studies;

- consider the likely impact on the local environment and on amenity against the criteria set out in Appendix B and the locational implications of any advice on health from the relevant health bodies. Waste planning authorities should avoid carrying out their own detailed assessment of epidemiological and other health studies

- ensure that waste management facilities in themselves are well-designed, so that they contribute positively to the character and quality of the area in which they are located;

- concern themselves with implementing the planning strategy in the Local Plan and not with the control of processes which are a matter for the pollution control authorities. Waste planning authorities should work on the assumption that the relevant pollution control regime will be properly applied and enforced;

- ensure that land raising or landfill sites are restored to beneficial after uses at the earliest opportunity and to high environmental standards through the application of appropriate conditions where necessary.

72. **Waste Management Plan for England 2021**

Fulfils the requirements of the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 in which the objectives are; To protect the environment and human health by preventing or reducing the generation of waste, the adverse impacts of the generation and management of waste, and by reducing overall impacts of resource use and improving efficiency of such use.

73. **Resources and Waste Strategy for England**

'Currently England generates around 29 million tonnes of municipal residual waste per annum (Mtpa98). We manage this waste in three main ways: sending it for energy recovery, exporting it as a refuse-derived fuel (RDF), and landfilling it. We also attempt to extract recyclables from this waste where the technology exists to do it, although the quality of this material tends to be poor. Landfill is the least preferred option given its environmental impact and long-lasting nature.

The proportion of local authority collected waste going to Energy from Waste (EfW) plants increased from 9% in 2000/01 to 41% in 2017/18100. In 2017 incineration of biodegradable waste produced about 3.4% of the UK's renewable energy, offsetting the use of virgin resources.

We will work closely with industry to secure a substantial increase in the number of EfW plants that are formally recognised as achieving recovery status, and will ensure that all future EfW plants achieve recovery status'

Background to Waste Management

74. The EC Waste Framework Directive defines waste as: *"any substance or object which the holder discards or intends or is required to discard".*

75. There are three types of waste: inert (does not undergo any physical, chemical or biological transformations); non-hazardous (no significant hazardous properties and may be biodegradable); hazardous (hazardous properties and poses a risk to environment and human health).

76. The Government document, 'Energy from Waste – A guide to the debate' 2014 defines Residual Waste as;

"Residual waste is mixed waste that cannot be usefully reused or recycled. It may contain materials that could theoretically be recycled, if they were perfectly separated and clean, but these materials are currently too contaminated for recycling to be economically or practically feasible. It may also be that there is currently no market for the material or it is uneconomic to take to market. An alternative way of describing residual waste is 'mixed waste which at that point in time would otherwise go to landfill'. Generally energy recovery should be from residual waste."

77. The National Planning Policy for England at paragraph 5 states that Waste Authorities should assess; "*the cumulative impact of existing and proposed waste disposal facilities on the well-being of the local community, including any significant adverse impacts on environmental quality, social cohesion and inclusion or economic potential".*

78. The recent Waste Management Plan (2021) confirms the Governments' support for efficient energy recovery from residual waste. The document states; *"energy from waste is generally the best management option for waste that cannot be reused or recycled in terms of environmental impact and getting value from the waste as a resource. It plays an important role in diverting waste from landfill".*

79. Throughout this report, there is reference to The Waste Hierarchy. This principle is enshrined in law through the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 and is also embedded within the Local Waste Plan. The Plan states in paragraph 3.7; '*The hierarchy sets out a sequential approach which should be followed when considering options for waste management, and seeks to ensure that unavoidable waste is treated in the most sustainable manner possible, considering disposal only as a last resort'.* The 5 elements to the Hierarchy are as follows;

Prevention – using less material in design and manufacture

Preparing for reuse – includes repair and refurbishment

Recycling – turning waste into a new product or substance

Other recovery - waste as fuel to produce heat, electricity and gas

Disposal – residual waste by landfill and incineration without recovery

Planning Assessment

Principle of development

80. The Local Waste Plan states; *'Around 1.6 million tonnes of waste was produced in the Plan area in 2015'* and paragraph 7.11 states that it is estimated that the total waste arising (non-hazardous) in Bournemouth, Christchurch, Poole and Dorset will grow by approximately 191,000 tonnes per annum by the end of the Plan period.

81. Residual waste from within the Plan area is currently treated at a mechanical biological treatment plant at Canford Magna and is also exported for treatment in other counties. The remainder is disposed of through landfill and again a proportion is exported outside of Dorset to Hampshire and Somerset. Table 7 of the Waste Local Plan within para 7.73 sets out the capacity and need for non-hazardous residual waste management. By 2023, the projected need in the Plan area is set at 320,000 tonnes per annum (tpa) with current capacity at all available facilities at 142,000 tpa. This equates to a shortfall of 178,000tpa. By 2033, the end of the Plan period the identified shortfall is 234,000 tpa.

82. It is clear from the up-to-date Waste Plan and the evidence underpinning it, that the Plan area requires additional facilities to deal with the increase in residual waste. The figures take account of the future planned housing, wider population and economic growth projections. It is acknowledged in the Plan in paragraph 7.78 that if no new facilities are brought forward, facilities outside the Plan area would need to be relied upon and there is no guarantee that they have the capacity to deal with the projected increases of residual waste. The movement of waste outside of the Plan area is contrary to the principles of proximity to ensure waste is dealt with as closely to source as possible.

83. The proximity principle has its origins in the Waste Management Directive 2018. Reference to this matter can also be found in Part 1 of Schedule 1 to the Waste

(England and Wales) Regulations 2011 where it states: *'The network must enable waste to be disposed of, or be recovered, in one of the nearest appropriate installations, by means of the most appropriate methods and technologies, in order to ensure a high level of protection for the environment and public health. The network shall be designed in such a way as to enable a movement towards the aim of self-sufficiency in waste disposal and the recovery of waste. However, consideration must be given to the geographical circumstances or the need for specialised installations for certain types of waste. This principle must be applied when decisions are taken on the location of appropriate waste facilities'.*

84. The Local Waste Plan in its Spatial Strategy states:

'Residual waste management - Landfill capacity in the Plan area is diminishing and existing treatment capacity for residual waste is insufficient to meet our projected needs. At the end of the Plan period it is estimated that there will be a shortfall of approximately 232,000tpa of capacity for managing non-hazardous waste. Appropriate facilities are needed to manage this waste, whilst ensuring that value is obtained through the recovery of energy wherever practicable. Provision will be made for residual waste treatment facility(s) to manage waste derived throughout the Plan area. The need for strategic residual waste treatment facilities will primarily be addressed through new capacity in south east Dorset. However, additional capacity may also be appropriate elsewhere to ensure the capacity gap is adequately addressed and when it will result in a good spatial distribution of facilities providing benefits such as a reduction in waste miles. Four existing waste management sites are allocated to address this need through the intensification or re-development of existing operations (Inset 7, 8, 9 and 10').

85. The application site is one such allocation as identified in **Policy 3** and Inset 7 specifically refers to Eco Sustainable Solutions. It states; "*There is scope to re-develop and intensify waste management uses on this site and increase the capacity to manage larger quantities of waste and provide the ability to manage waste further up the waste hierarchy. The proposed uses are likely to replace permitted, undeveloped uses".* As part of the preparation of the Waste Plan, the site was assessed for its potential to manage c.160,000tpa of residual waste. This is on top of the existing permitted uses, excluding the permitted solid recovered fuel (SRF) facility (8/14/0515) which it was assumed would not be developed. There are 12 Development Considerations set out in Inset 7 that any proposal must be assessed against and these will be dealt with in the relevant sections of this report.

86. In addition to the requirements set out in Inset 7, there are strategic policies which must be fully considered and development management policies 12 to 24 to be applied. Policies 4, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 cover matters not relevant to this proposal. Subject to full consideration of the impacts of the proposal, it is clear that there is need within the Plan area for additional waste management facilities to deal with non-hazardous residual waste.

87. **Policy 1** – '**Sustainable waste management'** requires facilities to demonstrate how they will support the delivery of the waste hierarchy, how they contribute to the county being self-sufficient in waste management and requires proposals to adhere to the proximity principle. Dorset Council have confirmed in their consultation response that; "*residual waste cannot be managed at a higher level of the hierarchy and this facility provides capacity at a higher level than landfill".*

88. The Waste Management Plan for England 2021 states that energy from waste from residual waste is the best management tool available and enables obtaining value from the waste as a resource. The Resources and Waste Strategy promotes the greater efficiency of energy from waste plants through seeking facilities to reach R1

recovery status. '*Recovery status acts as a proxy for the energy-generating efficiency of facilities. Facilities, including gasification and pyrolysis plants, which achieve the status are classed as a recover'.*

89. The applicant has confirmed they will be applying to the Environment Agency for R1 recovery status at the same time as the Environmental Permit. This can be secured through condition to provide the assurance that this proposal is recovery rather than disposal and lies higher up the waste hierarchy. The proposal would also contribute to the move towards self-sufficiency by enabling waste created within the Plan area to be dealt with in the same area rather than being transported outside of the Dorset and BCP locality.

90. **Policy 2** – **Integrated waste management facilities** seeks waste management facilities which incorporate different types of waste management activities at the same location unless there would be unacceptable cumulative impacts. The proposal does incorporate different waste activities and as such is considered to be in accordance with the principle of this policy. The potential impacts on air quality and European wildlife sites will be discussed elsewhere in the report.

91. **Policy 3,** as well as outlining the allocated sites in the Plan area, has 4 criteria that need to be met. These are as follows; **"***a. the proposal complies with the relevant policies of this Plan; b. the relevant Development Considerations have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Waste Planning Authority; c. there would not be an unacceptable cumulative impact, from the development, in combination with existing waste management operations; and d. possible effects (including those related to proximity, species and displacement of recreation) that might arise from the development would not adversely affect the integrity of European and Ramsar sites either alone or in combination with other plans or projects".* These issues are covered within the report and the cumulative impacts are discussed in each section and close to the end of the report.

92. This Policy also refers to proposed developments demonstrating that emissions will not impact on the features (species and habitats including lichens and bryophytes) of the nearby European sites. If it is shown there could be adverse impacts, then avoidance/mitigation to ensure there is no adverse effect on the integrity of the European sites must be designed in to any development in order for it to take place. The impacts from emissions from the ERF and vehicles is full considered and assessed from paragraph 230 in the Section entitled 'Ecology'.

93. **Policy 5** covers facilities to enable the **recycling of waste.** Criteria a) refers to the operation of the facility and how it should support the delivery of the Spatial Strategy and contribute to meeting the needs identified in this Plan. The Plan clearly identifies a need for additional facilities to manage non-hazardous residual waste and so this proposal provides some capacity for managing this waste stream on an existing waste management site. The proposed increase in capacity for recycling wood and green waste means it is diverted from landfill and the proposals does not displace the management of waste which is higher up the waste hierarchy. Therefore, it is considered the proposal is compliant with criterion b) of the Policy. Criterion c) refers to operations taking place within enclosed buildings. The existing green waste (windrow composting) is being relocated but there is no change to the open-air processing which already occurs on the site. With regards to criteria d), the potential impact on the European sites will predominantly come about from the new ERF plant which will be discussed in depth below; however, the relocation of the existing recycling processes that have permission and increased capacity is not considered to have an adverse impact on the integrity of the European sites neighbouring the site.

94. **Policy 6** of the Waste Local Plan covers the general Recovery Facilities. In brief they must meet the following criteria;

a) Support the delivery of the Spatial Strategy, contributing to meeting the needs in the Plan;

b) Not displace the management of waste by a process which is further up the waste hierarchy unless the benefits outweigh the displacement;

c) Proposals to take place within enclosed building unless no proven benefit for doing so;

d) Where energy is produced, they provide combined heat and power;

e) Where gas produced, it is injected into the grid; and

f) Possible effect would not adversely affect the integrity of European and Ramsar sites either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

95. The proposals are discussed above are considered to be in accordance with a), b) and c) of the Policy. The provision of energy is discussed in the forthcoming paragraphs and the effects on European and Ramsar sites will be discussed in detail further on in the report. Criterion e) is not relevant to this proposal.

96. Policy 6 d) refers to the provision of combined heat and power which this proposal will provide. Para 3.23 of the Waste Local Plan states' *"Energy recovery facilities provide particular opportunities to provide low carbon energy and heat to customers and suppliers. In particular, combined heat and power schemes provide opportunities for providing efficient, low carbon energy to sites such as hospitals, leisure centres, commercial buildings, factories, and industrial estates, although small businesses and residential developments can also benefit. Applications for energy recovery should demonstrate that opportunities for co-location with potential heat customers and heat suppliers have been sought. This is to ensure the maximum use of energy from waste and enable the utilisation of the heat produced as an energy source".*

97. The proposed ERF will result in 3.4 megawatts electrical (MWe) being produced. It is proposed to use some of this on the existing waste management site and then the remainder would be distributed on to the network via the existing electrical substation located opposite the Site on the western side of Chapel Lane. The cable connection between the site and the substation is already in place as it serves the existing biomass plant, so no further infrastructure is required. The provision of electricity from the ERF is considered a clear benefit arising from the proposed development.

98. The proposed ERF would provide 11.5MWth of heat (equivalent of heating 6000 homes) and currently whilst there are no specific end users or projects in place, with the exception of within the application site, the applicant has been working with potential end users to establish recipients for the heat generated. There are discussions about the electricity and heat being used at the adjacent Aviation Business Park and the Airport and also with BCP Council for a potential heat network extending into Bournemouth and Christchurch. A Steering Group is being set up to look at the opportunities and a Feasibility Study and Heat Map will be prepared to look at capital costs and energy and carbon benefits. The Resources and Waste Strategy states that attention should be given to the location of the plant to maximise opportunities for heat use. It is considered that the location of the application site within proximity to the adjacent Business Park, Airport and urban area provides opportunities for a range of end users for the heat created. A condition can be used to secure the details of the scheme to ensure the benefits from this energy recovery

facility are realised in the provision of low carbon energy. In addition, a requirement of the Environmental Permit is to provide a 'Heat Opportunities Report' and associated Cost-Benefit Analysis. If and when additional infrastructure is required, it is extremely likely that further planning permission will be required for the transportation of this heat off the site.

99. Turning back to Inset 7, point 5 states; '*There should be no net loss of capacity for waste streams that would affect the Waste Plan's spatial strategy'.* The proposal includes the relinquishment of the permission for the bio-energy facility which would have managed 30,000tpa of wood waste. However, the current proposal involves the increased capacity of the site for managing wood waste to 50,000 tpa. Dorset Council have confirmed that; "*In preparing the Waste Plan's forecasts for wood waste capacity, this facility was not taken into account and so its 'loss' does not affect the Plan's strategy for this waste stream….. Although there is no specific need for wood management capacity identified in the Waste Plan, this small increase is welcomed given that the diversion of this type of waste from landfill and energy recovery assists in moving waste up the waste hierarchy."* The anaerobic digestor, which would manage food waste would be reduced in scale from that originally permitted and this results in a reduction of 10,000tpa of capacity for this waste stream. This is regrettable as the Waste Plan identifies a small shortfall in existing capacity; however, overall, it is considered to be small scale and does not affect the overall strategy outlined in the Waste Plan. Therefore, it is considered the proposal complies with criteria 5 of Inset 7.

100. Having regard to the Waste Management Plan for England, the Resources and Waste Strategy and Waste Local Plan, it is clear that there is support for energy recovery facilities in waste management and they offer opportunities for the reduction in landfill and enabling movement up the waste hierarchy. There is clearly a need for this form of waste management in the Dorset and BCP locality and it would enable a decrease in the amount of waste being dealt with outside of the County in line with the proximity principle.

101. A significant number of the representations received consider that allowing this form of waste management facility would undermine the push towards the prevention of waste, re-use and recycling. It is fully appreciated that a zero-waste economy is what we should be striving for and the Waste Plan has; *'established a suite of planning policies and site specific allocations for facilities to recycle or recover our waste in a sustainable manner, contributing towards the aim of a zero waste economy. It plays a key role in establishing a reasonable balance between the waste management options in order to move waste up the hierarchy throughout the Plan period.'* However, it needs to be recognised that there is a clear need for the management of non-hazardous residual waste as demonstrated in the paragraphs above, and this proposal provides an opportunity to move the management of this type of waste up the Waste Hierarchy from 'disposal' to 'recovery' and reduce the reliance on exporting residual waste outside of the Plan area.

102. The application documentation is demonstrating that there would be no need to import residual waste from outside of the Plan area given the capacity requirements that Dorset and BCP currently face. However, this matter needs to be carefully considered as the basis of the proposal and the benefits of it include the reduction in miles the waste is travelling, and the additional facilities needed in the Plan area to manage residual waste. The representations received also make reference to the importation of waste. Condition 8 has been proposed which restricts the importation of waste to within the Plan area and requires records of the origins of waste to be maintained and kept available. This condition is considered necessary and relevant to the application given the very special circumstances for allowing the development

in the green belt (discussed in section below), the reduction in waste miles and reducing the reliance on landfill outside of the County.

103. Therefore, notwithstanding the further assessments required in terms of the impact of the proposal on amenity and air quality, landscape, ecology and transport networks, it is considered that the need for this facility has been demonstrated and the Waste Planning for England and the Local Waste Plan is in general support for energy recovery facilities from waste. Having regard to paragraph 11 of the NPPF, the Waste Local Plan is considered to be up to date and the relevant policies in the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan are also considered up to date. It is considered that the scheme complies with the Policies 1,2,3, 5 and 6 of the Waste Local Plan in relation to the principle of allowing an energy recovery facility on the allocated application site. However, the above issues will need to be carefully considered and weighed up in the planning balance to ensure that the proposal offers a sustainable form of development and is in accordance with the Development Plan when read as a whole.

104. In addition, the site does lie within the Green Belt and is therefore subject to Green Belt policy as set out in Chapter 13 of the NPPF and the policies within the Waste Local Plan and Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan.

Green Belt

105. As stated previously, the application lies within the South East Dorset Green Belt. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence, and the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl.

106. Paragraph 147 of the NPPF states; "I*nappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances".* Paragraph 148 goes onto say; *"When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations".*

107. Paragraph 149 of the NPPF sets out how new buildings are inappropriate development within the Green Belt. However, there are exceptions to this which include replacement buildings and limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. Local Waste Plan Policy 21 reflects this national policy on Green Belt and states: "*the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations to an extent that can demonstrate very special circumstances, including a need for the development that cannot be met by alternative suitable non-Green Belt sites".* Criteria 8 of Inset 7 cross references to Policy 21 and National Policy on Green Belt.

108. The proposed development does involve the partial redevelopment of the site which is brownfield land and is currently already used for recycling and composting. However, the proposed buildings, mainly the ERF facility and administration building are greater in scale than those currently on the site and do have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Therefore, it is considered the proposed development constitutes 'inappropriate development' and special circumstances need to be demonstrated in line with paragraph 147 of the NPPF.

109. Para 151 of the NPPF recognises that elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development; it states, *"In such cases developers will*

need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed. Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.".

110. The application recognises that the proposed development is inappropriate development and has put forward the following special circumstances:

- National and local policies support the development of decentralised, efficient, local sources of energy
- National and local policies support the development of low carbon energy
- Integration of proposed development with existing operations on the current site.
- Provision of local facility for treatment of non-hazardous residual waste
- Site is visually contained and no additional material impact on openness
- No reasonable alternatives
- Enhance the current contribution of the site to sustainable waste recycling and recovery within BCP
- ERF represents a logical and integrated addition to the existing facilities
- Existing facility accepted as major waste recycling and recovery facility in the green belt.
- Contribution to the energy supply
- Contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions
- New office and welfare accommodation improve facilities for staff and provide a flexible, energy efficient space capable of adaptation and provide a 'frontage' for the site.
- Provision of visitor centre and education resource
- Biodiversity enhancement through green roof
- Contribute to local economy through investment and employment and diversification f economic activities
- Need to locate waste management facilities close to the urban areas
- Offset carbon emissions associated with new development
- Development not add to unrestricted sprawl as allocated waste management site.
- No encroachment on countryside
- Need for additional waste management capacity

111. As part of the Waste Local Plan process, alternatives sites were considered to manage non-hazardous waste arisings prior to the identification of the 4 allocated sites for intensification and re-development as set out in Policy 3. The Waste Plan

Sustainability Appraisal Report which supports the Local Plan outlines the consideration of options and alternatives in Chapter 4. The different sites went through various stages during the consultation of the Local Plan and the 4 chosen sites for the management of residual waste were the result of a county wide site selection exercise. The Plan determined that South East Dorset is where the greatest quantities of waste are produced. The summary for the application site as set out in the Sustainability Report states; "*This is an existing waste site proposed for additional uses. Although other sites may be better located this is an existing waste management facility which provides benefits from co-location. The site is also in the green belt. There are also potential conflicts between the need to protect ecological interests and stack height in close proximity to the airport".*

112. As part of the Environmental Statement, Section 7 deals with Alternatives and the applicant has supplied additional information in relation to potential alternatives sites and the evidence for the development being within the existing Eco-Composting site. Alongside the work carried out by the former Dorset County Council on site selection, the applicant has also explored a range of alternatives for the development including land around Portland Port. This site does not lie within the Green Belt and is outside of the Dorset AONB but has implications for views from the AONB and potential impacts on the seascape character. This area was discounted by the applicant given the potential impacts on the landscape and seascape; the location of the site would fail to address the issue of 'waste miles' and there was concern in combination with other projects that there could be an adverse effect on the integrity of neighbouring designated sites. Following the Site Options Assessment, carried out by Dorset County Council in 2015 this site was not allocated for waste management. There is a current planning application registered with Dorset Council for an energy recovery facility at Portland Port, reference WP/20/00692/DC but this is on a bigger scale with a maximum output of 202,000 tonnes a year, a stack measuring 80 metres in height and the main ERF building measuring up to 47m high. No decision has been made on this application and therefore there is no guarantee that this proposal would come forward to help with the requirements for increased capacity to deal with residual waste.

113. The applicant also considered the other 3 allocated sites within the Plan and recognises that each of the sites has opportunities and constraints to development. The site at Canford Magna (Inset 8) currently includes a mechanical biological treatment plant, a landfill gas compound, and a materials recovery facility. It also includes a partially constructed low carbon energy facility. However, this site is also located within the Green Belt and is adjacent to SAC and SPA designations. Mannings Heath (Inset 9) is within Poole and current consists of a materials recovery facility and waste transfer station. This site does lie outside the green belt and has a greater capacity than Canford Magna; however, given the close proximity of residential properties the applicant considered it was not sequentially better than the Eco Solutions site. The 4th allocated site for redevelopment is at Binnegar Environmental Park in East Stoke and this site includes an existing permitted waste management facility consisting of materials recovery, inert recycling and in-vessel composting. The Sustainability Appraisal undertaken scored this site as Amber, the same as the application site in terms of constraints and opportunities. Given the more remote location, it did not provide a good option for a strategic site for waste management across the Plan area. The applicant has put forward that due to the road network and urban areas HGV's would need to pass through to transport waste from the BCP area, this would not be optimal and furthermore, Stokeford Heath SSSI and Dorset Heathlands SAC, extend along the southern boundary of the site adding further constraints to the site.

114. Overall, the applicant does consider that the current application site offers the optimum location for the development of an Energy Recovery Facility. Paragraph 7.76 of the Waste Local Plan states that the potential capacity within the 4 allocated sites amounts to 385,000 tpa, which exceeds the identified needs of the Plan area. However, there are currently no planning applications in for the other allocated sites for the management of residual waste through energy recovery and the site would contribute a capacity of 60,000 tonnes tpa towards the required 234,00 tonnes tpa by 2033. In addition, whilst the application site does exhibit its own constraints, in particular being within the Green Belt and surrounded by European designated habitat sites, Officers are satisfied that the evidence is sufficient to show there are currently no sequentially alternatives sites for this specific proposed development. In order to fulfil the capacity requirements in the Plan area for the management of residual waste, it is very likely a combination of the allocated sites would need to come forward. This proposal offers the opportunity to contribute 60,000 tonnes tpa to the overall need.

115. It is considered that given the lack of alternative sites which has been robustly demonstrated through the Waste Local Plan process and the required capacity within the Dorset area for the management of non-hazardous waste, this constitutes a very special circumstance in terms of green belt policy for allowing the ERF facility.

116. There is a clear need for additional capacity in the Plan area for the management of residual waste as outlined in the previous section. The energy recovery facility will enable the management of waste to move up the waste hierarchy and reduce the distance waste is transported for disposal in landfill. The creation of a low carbon energy facility will assist in the reduction of release of greenhouse gas emissions (explained in detail in forthcoming paragraphs). These reasons are considered to result in environmental benefits of the scheme. This report recognises that the proposal results in some harms which are fully discussed in the upcoming sections. The main adverse impact is considered to be on the landscape character and visual amenities of the landscape and the less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed buildings. It is concluded that the matters discussed above constitute very special circumstances for allowing the ERF development within the Green Belt.

117. The proposed administration and welfare building is not considered to fall into the above reasoning as it is not specifically providing waste facilities and not identified within the Waste Local Plan or Inset 7, the allocation policy. However, it is still considered to be an integral part of the scheme, providing employees with a better working environment and facilities. The current offices appear as more temporary structures and do not provide an energy efficient, up to date office environment for current employees or visitors.

118. With the provision of showers and lockers, it will encourage cycling and reduce reliance on the car. The building as stated by the applicant will provide greater opportunities to facilitate education visits for schools and the community. The floor plans show a seminar room on the first floor and a terrace on the roof which provides space for groups to visit the site. The Planning Statement provides the following comments; "*it is considered that improving education will form part of the solution to the local waste challenges, which may be partly addressed through improved awareness, education and action by residents and businesses to reduce waste, reuse and recycle more"*. It is considered that the proposed building enhances the opportunities of the site and is an appropriate form of development and will compliment the proposed and existing waste management facilities on the site. The new building is more aesthetically pleasing as well as well as being more efficient than the existing office buildings on the site which are to be demolished. Therefore, whilst bigger in scale and having a greater impact on the openness on the greenbelt,

they provide a visually more pleasing form of development on the site. It is considered the above constitutes very special circumstances to allow this building within the green belt.

119. The extant permission for a Bio-Energy facility on the site also needs to be considered in terms of the impact on the Green Belt. The permitted building had a maximum height of 17.9m and a stack of 15m. It was a smaller facility within the southern area of the site but would have had an impact on the openness of the green belt. If the current proposal did not come forward, there is some possibility of the Bio-Energy facility being constructed. In addition, the anaerobic digestor already has permission and it was deemed that this facility was acceptable in the green belt. The digestor would be reduced in scale from that approved as part of this scheme

120. The development, by reason of its scale will have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The review of the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment by the Landscape Architect Consultant Mr Laird on behalf of the Council, considers that: "*Development proposals will increase the visibility of development on the site, development will be seen to encroach further into the green belt from East Parley Common both above and below the skyline. The openness of the greenbelt will be affected, as such the proposed development is contrary to Policy 21*".The BCP and Dorset Council Strategic Green Belt Assessment does consider that the parcel of land in which the application is located makes a strong contribution to the safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. However, the site is an existing waste management facility and allocated in the Waste Local Plan for growth and an increase in waste management capacity. The proposals will be kept within the site's boundaries and views of the EF building and the stack will be partially screened by surrounding tree belts. Notwithstanding this, the increased amount and scale of built form on the site and intensification of the site with the increased tonnage being imported will clearly increase the prominence of the site and cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

121. Overall, it is recognised that the proposal is inappropriate development within the Green Belt and will result in harm to the openness of the Green Belt; The identified harms of the proposal, which mainly constitute landscape character and visual impact changes are discussed in forthcoming paragraphs. The planning balance section at the end of the report also covers the harms and weighs these in the balance with the other material planning considerations. However, for the reasons outlined above, it is considered very special circumstances exist for the whole of the development which outweigh the harms to allow this development within the Green Belt and as such it is considered to be in accordance with paragraph 148 of the NPPF and Policy 21 of the Waste Local Plan.

Climate change and sustainable construction

122. Policy 15 of the Waste Local Plan – Sustainable construction and operation of facilities ensures waste management facilities demonstrate that the site design, layout and operation make provision for climate change mitigation and resilience. The NPPF in Section 14 states that '*The planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate'*. Paragraph 154 refers to new development being planned that can help reduce greenhouse emissions and paragraph 158 states that applications for low carbon development should be approved if the impacts can be made acceptable.

123. Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement covers Climate Change and Sustainability. The report has been undertaken by Greengage, a Consultancy providing sustainability services within the built environment. The report identifies the

construction impacts of the development from greenhouse gas emissions, operational impacts from emissions from the ERF, energy consumption, displaced energy emissions and displaced landfill emissions.

124. Overall, there is an estimated reduction in CO^2 emissions associated with the proposal for the ERF. During the construction phase, it is anticipated that an overall minor negative impact on climate change will occur from embodied carbon within the materials and from construction activities. In terms of operational impacts, the report estimates that the total emission of $C0^2$ from the combustion of non-renewable waste is 20,750 tonnes a year. In addition, 4.6 tonnes of nitrogen oxides would be released along with 93.8 tpa of gas oil emissions from the auxiliary burners required for the start up and shut downs of the ERF. They have also stated that the purchase of electricity required outside the ERF operating times will be 11.2 tpa of CO^2. It has been calculated that the generation of electricity would displace the emission of 9,587 tonnes CO_{2e} per annum from electricity generated by the most efficient fossil fuel generating capacity. This has been determined to be natural gas given the phasing out of coal power stations and the move to renewable energy sources. They have also estimated that the proposal would reduce landfill waste emissions by 12,850 tonnes of CO^2 per annum.

125. It is concluded that overall the predicted emissions associated with the proposed ERF is minor positive with the potential net impact being a reduction of 376 CO^2 tpa. This does not include the provision of heat from the process.

126. According to the above report, the administration building will result in energy emissions of in the region of 35.8 tpa CO^2. However, it will be run from electricity and heat from the proposed ERF and as a result it is considered to be result in a minor negative impact. With regards to transport movements and the subsequent emissions, it has been calculated using data from the Transport Assessment that there would be a net reduction of transport emissions resulting from reduced distances of travel for transferring waste outside of the Plan area.

127. Despite an overall reduction in CO^2 emissions per year, a number of mitigation and climate resilience measures are proposed through the construction process and operational phase to further minimise greenhouse gases. These include;

- No idling vehicles and regular maintenance of construction vehicles
- Construction Transport Management Plan
- Site Waste Management Plan – 80% of non-hazardous construction waste diverted from landfill
- Material procurement undertaken with sustainable principles
- Surface water management strategy
- Mechanical ventilation to prevent overheating
- Native soft landscaping including brown roof of administration building with wildflower planting.
- Environment Management System
- Continuous Emission Monitoring System for NO× and other pollutants
- Provision of cycling parking and chancing facilities

- Grey water recycling
- Water recycling for the ERF

128. Policy ME3 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan deals with sustainable development standards for new development and Policy ME4 covers renewable energy provision. The proposal by its very nature will allow greater energy efficiency measures with the site being run on the electricity from the proposed ERF plant. The opportunities for a heat network for the surrounding area also exist although as stated above, the specific details of this are yet to be realised.

129. Solar panels were considered by the applicant, given the large expanse of roof on the ERF building. It was considered that the visual impacts of solar PV would increase the visual impact of the building and its roof on the surrounding landscape and in particular views from the south. The mitigation measures outlined above, including the surface water strategy, minimising waste and grey water recycling will also contribute towards minimising C02 emissions in line with policy ME3.

130. It is considered that with the above mitigation in place, the proposal will meet the aims and requirements of policy 15. Whilst it is regrettable that solar panels are not being utilised on the ERF building, the landscape justifications are considered acceptable. The provision of decentralised, low carbon energy is considered to meet the meet the aims of policy ME4. Policy ME5 refers to the impact of renewable and low carbon sources on landscape, ecology , local amenity and heritage assets. These will be discussed in the sections below.

131. As many of the objections have pointed out, BCP Council declared a climate and ecological emergency in 2019. It is the intention for BCP Council operations to become carbon neutral by 2030. The proposed actions for waste within the Climate and Ecological Emergency Action Plan include (but not limited to):

- Reduce council waste sent to landfill
- Procure new residual waste disposal and non-residual waste processing contracts exercising where possible the proximity principle
- Increase recycling and reduce residual waste
- Reduce resource use

132. It is appreciated that the proposed facility is not carbon neutral; however, it does very likely result in an overall reduction in carbon emissions compared to landfill and use of natural gas; allows for a reduced dependence on landfill and minimises the distance waste has to travel in line with the above proposed actions. The Council's Joint Head of Environmental Services has offered the following comments; "*The Councils declaration of a Climate and Ecological Emergency would also seem incompatible with us continuing to send our waste long distances to be treated and recovered in medium to long term. Given the estimated fluctuations in expected waste arising, anticipated as a result of the new waste strategy it is more likely that the industry will seek to build more smaller localised facilities rather than large regional facilities going forward. This will reduce carbon miles in terms of transporting waste, but will also enable plants to be decommissioned if waste arisings fall below the necessary economic threshold*".

133. The Waste Local Plan expects proposals for recovery facilities to show how they will provide low carbon energy generation. The Environmental Statement has done this and provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that taking into account the

emissions from the buildings and processes on site and from vehicle emissions, this is a low carbon energy plant. The representations have questioned the carbon emissions of the facility from the incineration of waste compared to land fill emissions and fossil fuel energy generation emissions. It is recognised that the development would result in a relatively small positive benefit in terms of a reduction of 376 CO^2 tpa. However, as stated previously, the applicant is applying for R1 status and this will be secured by condition to ensure the efficiency of the recovery facility and recognise that this moves the management up the waste hierarchy from disposal to recovery. It is concluded, that the scheme with the mitigation measures secured by condition will comply with Waste Plan Policy 15, Local Plan policies ME3 and ME4.

Economy and Education

134. Policy PC4 of the Local Plan refers to the Rural Economy and states; '*Although economic development will be strictly controlled in open countryside away from existing settlements, in order to promote sustainable economic growth in the rural area, applications for economic development will be encouraged where development is located in or on the edge of existing settlements where employment, housing, services and other facilities can be provided close together. Such proposals should be small scale to reflect the rural character'.*

135. Currently, the site provides for employment for 45 members of staff. It is anticipated that this proposal will result in increased employment opportunities with 10 additional members of staff on a full-time basis. In addition, the proposal provides the opportunity for employees to upskill and diversify their technical expertise. The Socio-Economic Chapter of the ES highlights how the proposal represents a local environment-led business initiative and will provide capital investment into the area.

136. The application site is an existing waste management facility and whilst in a semi-rural location, is in proximity to the commercial areas of the Airport and the Aviation Business Park and the neighbouring urban conurbations. The facility will help meet the requirements for the management of waste in Dorset and whilst the development is on a bigger scale than the current facilities, the intensification of an existing allocated waste site is considered to be a logical step in meeting the needs as clearly set out in the Local Waste Plan.

137. In addition to the employment opportunities, the new administration and welfare building provides an education resource with space for seminars, tours and community-based groups to visit the site. The climate and ecological emergency makes reference to engaging with staff, residents, schools and visitors on waste reduction and recycling initiatives and campaigns and this facility provides an opportunity to support the education of sustainable waste management within the community. It is appreciated that many of the representations do not consider this facility a sustainable option and more focus should be on preventing waste in the first place, re-use and recycling. However, at the current time it is clear that we still need provision to deal with residual waste and the proposed development offers a solution to managing this form of waste higher up the waste hierarchy and also providing increased opportunities for the local economy.

138. It is considered that the proposal meets the economic objective of sustainable development as set out in paragraph 8a) and helps towards the environmental objective by moving to a low carbon economy. Paragraph 85 refers to the use of previously developed land and sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist. As set out in para 117 above, the site is considered to be in a suitable location and the facility is on an existing waste management site. Overall, it is considered the proposal is

compliant with the economic objectives of the NPPF and PC4 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan.

Airport safeguarding

139. Given the proximity to the airport and the height of the building and emissions stack, the proposal must be assessed from an Aerodrome Safeguarding perspective and consultation with the owner/operator of the aerodrome within the area as set out in the Town and Country Planning (safeguarded aerodromes, technical sites and military explosives storage areas) direction 2002 has been carried out.

140. Policy 20 of the Waste Local Plan states; '*Proposals will only be permitted where the applicant can demonstrate through an aviation impact assessment that the proposed development and, where relevant, restoration and afteruse of the site, will not give rise to new or increased hazards to aviation'*.

141. Consideration is given to the following the following issues;

1. Protection of blocks of air through which aircraft fly
2. Protect the integrity of radar and other electronics to aid air navigation
3. Protect visual aids, such as Approach and Runway lighting
4. Avoid any increase of birdstrike to aircraft

142. The height of the emissions stack (38 metres) has been somewhat dictated by the presence of the airport within the vicinity of the application site. However, initial concerns were raised by Bournemouth Airport on Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) Safeguarding, Radar Technical safeguarding, heat and emissions from the stack and bird control.

143. Additional studies were undertaken to provide evidence to overcome the concerns raised in relation to safeguarding. The various reports show that the proposal would not affect the IFPs; radar performance will not be adversely affected; the effect of emissions from the ERF on temperature and visibility are predicted to be localised and of a small magnitude; and a bird and pest management plan will be in place to minimise nesting, resting and roosting of birds on the site. These reports were considered sufficient, and Bournemouth Airport have removed their safeguarding objections to the scheme.

144. It is considered that the scheme complies with Waste Plan Policy 20 and criteria 11 of Inset 7 and the operation phase of the development will not cause hazards to the aviation and operation of the airport.

Amenity and Quality of Life

145. Policy 13 of the Waste Local Plan refers to amenity and quality of life and states that proposals must demonstrate any potential adverse impacts on amenity from the waste facility can be avoided or mitigated to an acceptable level, having regard to sensitive receptors. The sensitive receptors can include schools and dwellings.

146. The waste management industry is strictly regulated by legislation to protect human health and the environment. The Environment Agency is responsible for the Environmental Permit, and this is only given once it has been established that the facilities and processes comply with standards and will operate in a safe manner.

Once the facility is operational the Environment Agency is responsible for ensuring the impacts on communities are within acceptable levels in terms of noise, vibration, vermin, dust and odour. The Waste Local Plan confirms this in paragraph 12.37;

'*it can be expected that waste facilities, irrespective of the processes they employ, will operate safely, with emissions being managed to an acceptable level.* The National Planning Policy for Waste states that modern, appropriately located, well-run and well-regulated waste management facilities operated in line with current pollution control techniques and standards should pose little risk to human health. C*onsiderations of impacts on health should therefore be in the context of whether the location is appropriate for a proposal".*

147. The Environment Agency in their consultation response have also made the following comments; "*The planning and permitting systems are separate and distinct. An operator may build a facility once they have planning permission from the waste planning authority but they cannot start to operate it unless they have an environmental permit in place from us and they will have to comply with the existing permit obligations. When the operator applies for an environmental permit from us, they must demonstrate how they will minimise the risks to the environment and to human health. In this instance there are existing permits in place which must still be complied with…. when we receive a permit application we will not issue a permit for new activities until the operator can show they can meet the required standards established by the EU End 5 directive. These standards are designed to protect human health and the environment. The list below summarises which issues are covered by the permitting process from the permitted activities only and so are our responsibility to regulate; Emissions to air; Pollution to surface and groundwater; Noise control; Dust control; Pest control; Fire risk; and Odour control".*

148. The following paragraphs will deal with the relevant criteria as set out in Policy 13 which reflects the location criteria as set out in Appendix B of the National Planning Policy for Waste.

149. **Noise and vibration** – Section 9 of the Environmental Statement covers noise and vibration and was carried out by Consultants Inacoustic and presents the results of an assessment of the likely significant effects of the construction, operation and decommissioning of the ERF on the noise climate of the area.

150. Saved policy ENV3 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan states that development which creates noise will not be permitted if the amenities of the users or occupants of nearby land will be harmed or out at risk unless there are mitigation measures. Policy HE2 refers to proposed relationships minimising general disturbance to amenity. The potential noise impacts resulting from the proposal are from the construction phase; noise linked from the operation of the development; and noise associated with transport movements on the local highway network. The NPPF in paragraph 185 states that planning decisions should mitigate and reduce to a minimum, potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development.

151. The construction phase of the development is anticipated to take between 18-24 months and it is proposed for construction activity to only take place between the hours of 7.00 and 19.00 Monday to Friday and 07.00 to 15.00 on Saturdays. The two receptor locations for construction noise were identified as R1 (Whitemere House – 80m to the north west) and R2 (West Lyn which lies to the west on Barrack Road – 450m from the site boundary). Portfield School which lies approximately 1km from the proposed ERF is a special school that cares for children and young people on the autism spectrum with associated learning and developmental difficulties. The school offers daily education and flexible boarding and also is the site for the Wessex Lodge respite facility. Representation has been received from the school and has raised

concerns with the impact of the development on the health and wellbeing of their students. Given the level of outside learning and play that is understood to take place at the school, the impact of construction and operational noise on the students' needs to be considered.

152. It has been concluded that noise effects during the construction phase are likely to give rise to a Negligible temporary effect on the identified receptors (R1 and R2) and therefore considered to be Not Significant. Whilst the School as identified above was not identified as a Receptor, R1 and R2 are close to the site than the school and therefore, it can be accepted that the effect on the school would have a Negligible temporary effect.

153. With regards to the noise levels from the ERF during operation, the assessment has been based on the ERF operating continuously over 24 hours and emissions have been designed to not contain impulsive noises or significant tonal features. The sources of potential noise include the air cooler condensers, lorry movements, steam turbine room, dry ash removal and the exhaust stack. Like above, the two same receptors have been used and measurements taken 1 metre from their façade. The report concludes that; '*The noise effects from the ERF have been calculated to be below the background sound levels at the nearest NSR's during both the day, evening and night-time assessment periods. The effect is considered, on the basis of this assessment, to be Negligible and Not Significant'.*

154. The noise impact of transport movements associated with the operation of the site has also been considered and the impact on Chapel Lane, Chapel Gate, Christchurch Road and Parley Lane has been assessed. Predictions from 2023 traffic flows were used comparing them with and without the proposed development and the results indicate that no worse than a minor change in road traffic under the future year 2023 scenario would occur.

155. BCP Environmental Health engaged with an Acoustic Consultants who undertook a Technical review of the submitted Acoustic report. They were satisfied with the methodology and results of the assessment. It has been concluded that; "*The provisions relating to noise and vibration in the environmental statement follow standard best practice, in consideration of the proposed works and the sensitivity of the site's surroundings. With regard to operational noise, based on the information provided in the Noise and Vibration Chapter, we agree that the construction/ decommissioning and operation of the proposed development is not likely to adversely impact on the amenity of local residents".*

156. The mitigation measures of;

- 5 metres high fence to north of the ERF building
- Construction Environmental Management Plan
- Works will be carried out in accordance with BPM as specified in BS 5228

are considered to minimise any adverse impact on the amenities of occupiers who reside in proximity to the site. However, a Noise Management Plan can be secured by condition to ensure HGVs do not arrive at the site between 19:00 and 07:00 and to ensure HGVs coming to the site are prevented from parking on the site access road, Chapel Lane, any public roads nearby with their engines idling. Whilst it is not possible to control vehicles on the public highway, the Management Plan should enable best practices to be adopted by the company and with their contractors and visitors. It is considered that the noise associated with all phases of the development will not cause an adverse impact and the proposes mitigation measures will ensure

that the amenities of local residents, students of Portfield School and users of the immediate area will not be harmed.

157. It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with the Policy 13 of the Waste Local Plan and saved policy ENV3 of the Local Plan as neighbouring residents, pupils and users of local facilities are not considered to be put at risk from noise from the development.

158. **Airborne emissions, including dust** – This section will cover the emissions that will result from the proposed ERF and other waste streams on the site in relation to the impact on air quality and the impact this could have on living conditions. Further assessment on the impact on biodiversity and habitats will be covered in upcoming paragraphs.

159. The NPPF in paragraph 185 states the following;

"*Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development"* and in paragraph 186 goes onto outline the considerations that can be relevant to determining a planning application;

"Lead to changes (including any potential reductions) in vehicle-related emissions in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development or further afield; Introduce new point sources of air pollution; Expose people to harmful concentrations of air pollutants, including dust; and Give rise to potentially unacceptable impacts (such as dust) during construction for nearby sensitive locations".

160. The locational criteria as set out in Annex A of the National Planning Policy for Waste refers to considerations for air emissions, including dust, the proximity of sensitive receptors, ecological as well as human receptors, and the extent to which adverse emissions can be controlled through the use of appropriate and well-maintained and managed equipment and vehicles.

161. In the UK, AAD (Ambient Air Directive) Limit Values, Targets and air quality standards and objectives for major pollutants are described in The Air Quality Strategy (AQS). AAD Target and Limit Values, AQS Objectives, and EALs (Environment Assessment Levels) are set at levels well below those at which significant adverse health effects have been observed in the general population and in particularly sensitive groups. Together, these are collectively referred to as Air Quality Assessment Levels (AQALs).

162. In order to appreciate the impact of the proposal, it is important to understand the baseline conditions for air quality. The Environmental Statement includes a detailed review of baseline conditions, and this uses data from local and national monitoring networks, site specific monitoring and the contribution from the existing biomass CHP plant. The Chapter also include a Dioxin Pathway Intake Assessment which considers both ingestion and inhalation from dioxins. Meteorological data from Bournemouth International Airport has been used from the last 5 years to predict the proposed process emissions and it has been established the prevailing wind direction is south westerly.

163. The Environmental Permit would include limits on emissions to air from the stack and these are known as ELVs. The assessments undertaken have assumed the proposed ERF complies with the requirements of the Permit. It is proposed to apply

for ELVs lower than those set out in the Waste Incineration BREF (Document for Best Available Techniques) for oxides of nitrogen, sulphur dioxide, hydrogen chloride and ammonia and the flue gas velocity will be 25 m/s rather than 15 m/s which will enhance the dispersion of pollutants. Therefore, the assessment and modelling has considered the effect of the proposed ERF operating at these levels.

164. The assessment of the pollutants from the ERF include; Nitrogen dioxide, sulphur dioxide, PM10 (particulate matter), PM2.5 (particulate matter), carbon monoxide, hydrogen chloride, Hydrogen fluoride, ammonia, VOCs (volatile organic compounds), mercury, Cadmium, PAHs (Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons), dioxins and PCBs (Polychlorinated biphenyls). In addition, a number of metals have been considered which include Cadmium, Mercury, Arsenic, Chromium and Lead.

165. The closest Local Air Quality Management Area is at Ashley Road, Poole which is located approximately 8.8km from the application site. The ES concludes that given the distance, the emissions from the stack are very unlikely to have a measurable impact on the AQMA. The ES has looked at 7 Receptors on Chapel Lane and Barrack Road which are the nearest residential properties to the site.

166. As with noise emissions, a particularly sensitive receptor for air quality is Portfield School which lies approximately 1km from the proposed ERF as stated above, although this has not been specifically identified within the Assessment. However, all the chosen receptors are closer than the School. The closest identified Receptor is R3 which is at a residential property at the southern end of Chapel Lane and slightly closer to the application site. It is considered that the results from this receptor could be broadly applied to the school.

167. The analysis within the assessment states that the annual mean impact (over a 5 year period) is less than 0.5% of the AQAL and the short term impact is less than 10% of the AQAL for all pollutants with the exception of nitrogen dioxide; VOCs as benzene; VOC as 1,3-butadience; cadmium; and sulphur dioxide and as such the magnitude is considered 'negligible'. With regards to nitrogen dioxide, there can be variations within the baseline concentration given the impact from traffic on the local highway network. The report concludes that the contribution to nitrogen dioxide levels from the ERF is less than 0.5% of the AQAL and as such there is no risk of exceedance of the annual mean AQAL. Baseline concentrations of benzene 1,3-butadiene and cadmium are very low and the contribution from the ERF is 2-5% of the AQAL and according to the report can therefore be considered as 'negligible'. With regards to cadmium, assuming the ERF is operated at the typical emission concentration for operational ERFs (8% of the ELV), the point of maximum impact is 0.29% if the AQAL which can be described as 'negligible'.

168. In terms of sulphur dioxide, there is an area to the north west of the site which would be subject to a 10% exceedance of the AQAL if the ERF was operating half-hourly ELV in worst case weather conditions for dispersion; however, it is considered this is very unlikely to happen in reality and the applicant will be applying for a lower daily ELV for sulphur dioxide within the Environmental Permit. Bureau Veritas, who have undertaken the Peer Review consider that this would reduce the emissions to a level considered 'negligible'.

169. In terms of metal emissions, the Emissions Modelling report concludes that the impact is less than 1% of the long-term and less than 10% of the short term AQALs with the Predicted Environmental Concentration (PEC) only predicted to exceed the long term AQAL for arsenic and chromium using the worst case scenario assumption. Bureau Veritas have provided the following commentary; "*The effect of point source emissions show that of the pollutants assessed the following exceed the annual objective limit at human health receptors when assessed at the combined*

metal limit: • Arsenic; • Chromium; However, the limit for arsenic is not exceeded when assuming that emissions are the same as that from a currently permitted facility. No further details are given to this existing waste facility so it cannot be verified whether these emissions limits are realistic for the proposed development operation. It is recommended that emissions limits be in place for Arsenic and Chromium and controlled through the environmental permitting process".

170. The emission levels will be controlled through the Environmental Permit process which ensures they are within the current limits to protect human health.

171. In addition, the impact from the construction phase and the additional traffic movements associated with the construction and operational phases on air quality has been assessed. In isolation given the projected number of additional vehicle movements there is no requirement for a detailed assessment; however, in combination with the stack emissions there is a greater potential for a significant effect, particularly on Chapel Lane. The calculations demonstrate that the overall emissions from stack and vehicles is below 0.5% of the AQAL for all pollutants considered and is therefore considered 'negligible'.

172. Dust from the proposed development is another source of air pollution which could affect the amenity of residents and the wider area. Section 10 has assessed the risk to human health from dust soiling during the construction phase as 'low'. The current practices on site could give rise to dust, in particular the stock piling and this is currently controlled through the Environmental Permit regime. In terms of the operation phase, the enclosed operations within the ERF building have lower potential to generate dust than the existing open-air stockpiling. The vehicles importing waste will be enclosed and the waste will be deposited within the enclosed waste reception and processing area of the building. The mitigation measures for dust control during construction, operation and decommissioning phases include the following and can be secured by condition;

- Dust management plan
- Fully enclose site or specific operations where high potential for dust production
- Cover stockpiles
- Ensure sand and other aggregates are stored in bunded areas and not allowed to dry out

173. The assessment concludes that the overall significance of effect of stack emissions from the proposed ERF on human health is 'not significant'. The effect of emissions from development-generated traffic is also 'not significant' .The applicants report has been Peer Reviewed by a Consultants on behalf of the Council, and they are satisfied with the methodology used for the assessment and the findings accepted. Given the emission controls through the Environmental Permit, Bureau Veritas have not raised any objections to the Air Quality section of the Environmental Statement and the accompanying reports.

174. It is clearly recognised that a significant proportion of the objections received have very strong concerns about the health implications of this proposal. It is understood that energy recovery facilities do give rise to emissions into the environment and the concerns from local residents are fully appreciated. However, the application needs to be determined on policy and the guidelines around waste management and air quality. As stated above, there are strict limits to emission levels which are controlled through a separate consenting regime. The current Government advice is that

modern, well run and regulated waste incinerators are not a significant risk to human health. Given the analysis above, it is considered that the scheme is acceptable in terms of the amenity impact on air quality and with conditions in place, the scheme complies with Waste Policy 13 and Local Plan policies ENV3 and HE2 and the NPPF.

175. **Odour** – Section 10 of the Environmental Statement covers odour issue but is linked with the emissions and air quality. Criteria 6 of Inset 7 for the Allocated site refers to suitable controls to minimise odour from the site to acceptable levels will be required. The current operations that take place on the site already have the potential to create odour in the environment, for example the open-air stockpiling. Windrow composting is also permitted on the site and the location of this is being changed within this application, however this operation also has the potential to result in odours.

176. As stated in the ES, all ERF operations will be conducted within enclosed buildings and waste will be deposited into an enclosed waste reception and processing hall. The report goes onto state; "*The waste reception and processing will be held under negative pressure, with the air being used in the combustion process. This prevents the release of odours and dust from the building when the doors are opened for short periods for deliveries. Residual waste will be stored within a waste bunker, albeit this will be within the enclosed waste recycling and waste reception and processing and waste would not be stored for prolonged periods helping to minimise the conditions which can lead to the generation of malodours. There will be no waste stored outside the buildings. Any odours from the waste stored within the bunker will be drawn into the combustion process by the induced draft fan, where the odorous compounds would be destroyed as a result of the high temperatures within the furnace. Therefore, under normal operations there will be no release of odour from the stack emissions".*

177. There is potential for odour from the vehicles delivering the waste. However, the vehicles will be enclosed to prevent the fugitive release of dust and odour. Odour and dust are released as the waste is disturbed, which will only occur within the enclosed waste reception and processing. As such, the risk of fugitive releases of dust and odour from the delivery of waste is negligible.

178. As part of the Environmental Permit, odour escape would be controlled to ensure there is minimal impact beyond the site boundary. It is considered that the mitigation measures outlined above and the controls through the Environmental Permit will ensure that the nearby receptors are not affected by odour from the proposed development and therefore, the proposal is in line with Waste Policy 13 and Local Plan policies ENV13 and HE2.

179. **Lighting** – External lighting has visual, landscape and amenity implications as well as airport safeguarding. A Lighting Strategy accompanies the application which seeks to provide a safe working environment around the ERF but also minimising light pollution and the visual impact on the surrounding area. Lighting is provided around the ERF building, around the weighbridges and in the car parking area to the front of the administration building. The proposed lighting comprises of a mixture of luminaires on 6 and 8 metre columns and those mounted on the building itself. The lighting has a downward direction and external back light shields are being provided. The lighting would operate from dusk till dawn with some lighting along the northern and western boundaries which will be dimmed to 50% between 19.00 and 07.00.

180. BCP Environmental Health have considered the submitted Lighting Strategy and whilst it is recognised it does not provide an assessment of the potential effect with regards to the change from the baseline environment, it is considered that the information submitted is sufficient to determine there are not likely to be any

significant effects. No information has been given on upward tilt. BCP Environmental Health have stated that the maximum permissible upward light ratio of luminaires is 2.5% and this should not be exceeded. This can be secured by condition.

181. The amount of proposed lighting is considered to be commensurate with the type and size of facility and as said above, to ensure the provision of a safe working environment. It is clear that the proposed level of lighting on the site, in particular 24 hours a day, will result in an increased prominence of the site. However, external lighting is required for the proposed use and given the current nature of the site it is considered acceptable. A 5 metre high timber imperforate fence is proposed for the north and western boundary of the ERF which will prevent some light spill and in particular will protect the occupiers of the property to the north west, Whitemere House.

182. With the fencing in place, and the lighting prevented from exceeding measurements in relation to the upward tilt, then the amenity of the closest residential properties can be protected and the wider area minimised. The final lighting strategy for the layout and design will be secured by condition which will include the maximum upward light ratio as stated above. The proposal is considered to meet Waste Plan Policy 13 and policies HE2, ENV3 in this regard.

183. **Visual impact** – this section will solely deal with the visual impacts of the proposal and the impact on the wider landscape character will be covered in a separate section. The submitted Environmental Statement and the Landscape Visual Impact Assessment has looked at the construction impacts to visual amenity and used various visual receptors, including ones very close to the site and those further afield in the neighbouring urban areas. 13 viewpoints have been identified which include locations between Charminster Road, Bournemouth and West Parley to the west, and Ramsdown Hill to the east.

184. The report recognised that during the construction phase there would be a moderate adverse effect to the visual amenity of the area within the immediate vicinity of the site and to the north within around 1km of the site. Further afield on Parley Common and in Ferndown and to the south around Christchurch road, the construction of the stack would be visible above the tree cover around the site.

185. The main visual receptors within close proximity of the site are the users of the Bridleway E62/29 and 4 and East Parley Common. The LVIA concludes that the most visually prominent element of the scheme is the ERF building and the stack would have a Moderate Adverse effect to visual amenity within the immediate vicinity and 1km to the north. From Chapel Lane the Bridleway E62/29, this would increase to a Major-Moderate Adverse effect. Beyond this, the report considers that within 2km to the west at Parley Common there would be Slight-Moderate Adverse effect and this would decrease to a Slight Adverse effect within 2-3km to the south and east around Christchurch Road/Parley Lane including Chapel Gate campus and Matchams Lane.

186. It is clear that the proposed ERF building and the stack will result in a negative impact on visual amenity within the immediate vicinity but the severity will decrease the further you get from the site. The changes to the Anaerobic digestion plant (AD) will reduce its impact given the reduction in footprint from the approved scheme. The height of the buildings and tanks remain the same. The existing bund on site will help to screen the AD plant the relocation of the composting windrows as they are moving further east on the site.

187. With regards specifically to the occupiers of the closest residential property at Whitemere House directly to the north west on Chapel Lane , it is clear there will be

an impact on the visual amenities of the occupiers of this dwelling, in particular from the front aspect of the plot. There is intervening existing tree cover and a proposed 5 metre high imperforate timber fence although the building and stack would be visible above this. The dwelling has a large plot with the rear garden facing west away from the proposed ERF and its surrounding environment is already compromised to a degree with the presence of the solar farm direct to the west, the adjacent timber yard and the existing facilities on the application site.

188. With regards to the three residential properties to the south of the site, close to the Chapel Lane entrance from Chapel Gate, there is significant tree cover around their sites and there are business/industrial units and associated car parks between the sites and the application site. As part of the landscape proposals, it is proposed to plant native trees and shrubs to the south of the application site which will add additional screening to the new buildings. It is considered that from their private amenity spaces, the occupiers of these properties would not be harmed by the changes to the layout of the site and the scale and siting of the new buildings, in particular the new ERF building. The properties to the west on Barrack Road, in particular West Lynn, Holme Dale, Red Roofs and Heathlands have a belt of trees on their eastern boundaries so given the level topography it is unlikely the occupants would have direct view of the ERF building from their properties or gardens. Along Parley Lane on which Portfield School and a number of residential properties are sited, there are likely to be some views of the emissions stack as it will be visible on the skyline above the trees. However, given the intervening trees and distance to the site, the ERF building is unlikely to be visible.

189. There are clearly longer distance views of the ERF building and stack where the trees and vegetation do not appear tall enough to screen the proposals. The proposed landscaping scheme has benefits to reduce the visual impact from closer to the site but is limited in its impact to minimise longer distance views. Overall, it is not considered that individual dwellings will be compromised by the proposal in terms of visual amenity and with the proposed landscaping in place; however there is clearly a wider issue of visual amenity and this will need to be put into the balance with the positive aspects of the proposal.

190. **Site related traffic impacts** – The transport impacts will be covered in detail in the paragraphs below.

191. It is considered that with the mitigation measures as outlined above, there will not be adverse impacts on amenity arising from noise and vibration; odour, lighting and emissions. There will be a landscape visual impact from the ERF building and in particular the stack given its scale and height. Therefore, the proposal accords with Policy 13 as a whole but it is clear there is breach of criteria h. Overall, the proposal has minimised the impact on amenity in line with Local Plan Policy HE2 but again, it is recognised that there will be a negative impact in terms of visual amenity. As stated previously, the Environment Agency will also be considering the levels of noise, odour, air quality in terms of the environment and human health.

Air quality and pollution

192. The Environmental Statement explains how "T*he Waste Incineration BREF (Best Practice Document) was published by the European Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC) Bureau in December 2019. The Environment Agency will be required to implement conditions within all permits requiring operators to comply with the requirements set out in the BREF within four years of the publication date. This will include the Proposed ERF. The Waste Incineration BREF has introduced BAT-AELs (BAT Associated Emission Levels) which are more stringent than those currently set out in the IED for some pollutants. The Proposed ERF would be*

designed to meet the requirements of the Waste Incineration BREF for a new plant. Therefore, it has been assumed that the emissions from the Proposed ERF would comply with the BAT-AEL for dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs set out in the Waste Incineration BREF for new plants".

193. Paragraph 12.4 of the Waste Local Plan which states; "*Issues of pollution control are generally dealt with outside the planning system. The pollution control regime implements measures to prohibit or limit the release of substances to the environment to the lowest practicable level, and ensures that ambient air and water quality meet certain standards to protect against adverse impacts to the environment and human health. The Waste Plan complements the pollution control regime rather than duplicates its requirements"* echoes what is stated in the Planning Practice Guidance which provides the following; "*The focus of the planning system should be on whether the development itself is an acceptable use of the land and the impacts of those uses, rather than any control processes, health and safety issues or emissions themselves where these are subject to approval under other regimes. However, before granting planning permission they will need to be satisfied that these issues can or will be adequately addressed by taking the advice from the relevant regulatory body".*

194. Given the separate regime for controlling emissions, it is not appropriate for the Local Planning Authority to use conditions to specify or limit the potential pollutant emissions of the ERF. Notwithstanding the above, a condition is proposed to ensure that the Monitoring System is put in place prior to the first operation of the ERF. This must also include details of the 'source' mitigation of a selective non-catalytic reduction system (SNCR), a lime or sodium hydrogen bicarbonate injection system and a powered activated carbon injection system along with details of the flue velocity. Whilst this condition is required for ecological purposes, it will enable the Local Planning Authority to ensure that emissions are being monitored and regulated correctly and the mitigation measures embedded within the system do actually take place.

195. Apart from the electricity and heat created, there are by products of the incineration process. Approximately 10,000 tonnes of ash is likely to be created from the ERF process. Two types are created; Incinerator bottom ash (IBA) and air pollution residue (APC). The majority of ash will be IBA which is non-hazardous and can be recycled. It is the applicant's objective to supply the IBA to a recovery facility for use as aggregate. APC is hazardous and if released to the environment can pose a risk of contamination. The APC will be removed from the site in enclosed tankers and exported to specialist land disposal or treatment at a suitably licensed waste management facility. If possible, it is the intention to send the APC to an effluent treatment contractor to be used to neutralise acids and similar materials. It is also stated in the Planning Statement that during the tanker filling operation, displaced air will vent back to the silo and any releases would pass through a fabric filter. The Environmental Permit will cover this aspect of the proposal.

Design form, scale and Landscape

196. Waste Plan Policy 14 states that facilities should be compatible with their setting and would conserve and/or enhance the character and quality of the landscape through sympathetic design and location; having appropriate use of scale, form, mass, layout, detailing, materials and building orientation; and avoidance or mitigation of impacts on the landscape. Local Plan Policy HE2 seeks development to be compatible to its surroundings and Policy HE3 states that development will need to protect and seek to enhance the landscape character of the area.

197. The existing waste management facilities on the allocated site comprise of a number of buildings of varying scales, composting windrows, open air storage and soil heaps resulting in a visually poor-quality environment which does not positively contribute to the visual amenities of the area. However, its current appearance reflects the permitted uses on the site and the nature of the management of the different waste streams than enter the site. The proposed design of the ERF building does reflect its function as a large industrial facility and it is appreciated its overall scale reflects its purpose and requirements for managing the residual waste in the manner proposed.

198. The building would be positioned to the north of the existing main entrance to the site where the existing site office is located and soil stockpiles. The existing buildings on site have a maximum height of 9.5m and their external elevations are finished in brown profile sheet cladding. The Design and Access Statement provides the following description; "*The location for the ERF has been carefully chosen to help break down the visual impact of the facility when seen from distant views and making best use of the screening provided by existing tree belts on the site's northern and western boundaries. To further reduce its visual impact the building height has been kept as low as possible and other than the main stack and smaller vent, rooftop equipment has been avoided in order to maintain a visually clean roofscape".*

199. The treatment of the elevations with the lighter coloured cladding at the top of the building is to help the building blend with the sky and the use of darker colours on the lower section attempt to blend the building with the ground and other buildings on the site. It is considered that the proposed scale and appearance of the ERF building is acceptable and although it is a substantial building, its design has gone someway to reducing the impact on the visual amenities of the site and wider area. Within the second Landscape consultation response, issues were raised with the architectural treatment of the building and how it failed to respond to its contextual setting. However, these concerns were not raised in the first DC response and were carried out by a different Officer. Despite these comments, the submission shows how the evolution of the design and layout of the building came about and it is considered to be acceptable.

200. The administration and welfare building has been treated with similar Van Dyke brown cladding to the main ERF building along with timber cladding on the north, south and west elevations and will have extensive glazing on the western elevation. The building has been designed to provide a 'civic' frontage to the site. A biodiverse roof area will be created adjacent to the roof top terrace for visitors and staff. This building is of a scale commensurate with the existing buildings on site and will not be as dominant as the ERF. The design form and chosen materials are considered acceptable and it will enable there to be some coherence of design on the site. The building is considered to be of greater architectural merit than the existing buildings on site.

201. The proposed layout will result in a more formal setting with the different areas for parking and the various areas of waste management clearly set out. The new access for the parking and office and welfare building would keep this area separate from the adjacent access road for the HGVs, resulting in a safe environment for pedestrians, cyclists, employees and visitors. This also offers opportunity for some soft landscaping to be introduced into the site around the parking area which will soften this part of the site and create a visually enhanced area to the front of the non-operational side of the site. The approved but not yet constructed Anaerobic Digestor Plant was to be sited where the proposed ERF is located. It will be moved slightly further east but continues to be positioned adjacent to the northern boundary. The reduction in the number of tanks means it is now of a smaller scale and it is not considered to harm the visual amenities of the immediate locality or be more

dominant in the wider landscape. The proposed re-siting of the composting windrows to the central part of the site is also not considered to result in any demonstrative harm to the visual amenities of the area. The height of these are controlled by condition and cannot exceed 4 metres as per the previous permission 8/14/0515. The landscaping scheme indicates some tree and shrub planting directly south of the composting windrows which will provide a degree of screening. They are already a feature on the site and the re-positioning is not considered to cause an adverse effects.

202. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application as section 14 of the Environmental Statement. The application site lies within the River Terrace, Dorset Landscape Charter Type which acts as a transition or buffer between the heathland and heath/farm/forest types and the river valley pastures. The area is heavily influenced and impacted on by urban development. The overall management objective should be to *'maintain and enhance the value of the area as a buffer, control and minimise the impact of development and transport infrastructure/use and the opportunities for large scale multi-functional landscape restoration and creation should be promoted and explored'.*

203. The Character Assessment for Christchurch identifies the area in which the application site is located as Area 9: Bournemouth Airport and East Parley Common'. It states; '*To the north of the airport a collection of small commercial operations have encroached into the countryside alongside the bridleway. The uses are generally open air operations served by temporary site accommodation. The site uses include a commercial composting operation in an old gravel pit and fencing/shed manufacture. Beyond this the area opens out into managed open farmland with few strong features, but limited visible connection to the nearby built-up areas beyond the Borough boundary'.* This document is dated 2003 and operations have grown and progressed on this site since then, but it does provide some context for the setting of the site.

204. In terms of sensitivity the Assessment goes onto say; '*The more open farmland to the north of the airport, which is not particularly accessible from the urban areas, is relatively remote. As countryside this area lies on the Borough boundary and combines with open land to the north and west to create an extensive areas of open land between Ferndown and the Hurn Forest. This area should be seen as sensitive in terms of the strategic setting of the airport in 'countryside' In addition, the area of Parley Common heathland should also be seen as highly sensitive in that it is currently more isolated and remote than the other heathlands in the Borough'.*

205. The LVIA outlines how the Airport and Business Park, the large-scale solar farm, timber yard and the current waste management facilities on the application site all detract from the character of the area. Para 14.2.26 refers; '*However, it is quite rare that these elements are experienced together in combination due to the tree cover but are experienced sequentially so do influence the overall character of the area when travelling through the landscape*.' It is clearly recognised that the current operations and activity on site is currently well contained by surrounding tree cover and currently does not have a significant impact on landscape character. The LVIA has concluded that an overall High-Medium sensitivity has been applied to the landscape character. This takes into account the area is designated as Green Belt.

206. The LVIA includes a number of viewpoints from immediately around the site, within Parley Common across to West Parley and beyond to Charminster Road and then to the east and south east along Parley Lane, Matchams Lane and up to Ramsdown Hill. Views from the east on Parley Common have been taken; however this area is not subject to any public rights of way or known permissive paths.

207. Dorset Council, within the consultation responses have included comments from their Landscape Architects. In addition, the Council instructed a Landscape Consultant (Laird Bailey) to review the submissions and provide comments. In response to original landscape comments made on the proposal, additional information has been submitted. This included modified photomontages, plume visibility assessments and landscape plans.

208. Dorset Council and Laird Bailey Landscape Consultants have raised concerns with the impact of the ERF building and the stack on the landscape character and visual amenities and on the openness of the Green Belt. It is clear that due to the scale and height of the ERF building and the stack, the development will be visible from both the immediate landscape including Chapel Lane, the two Bridleways and adjacent time yard business and residential property and within the wider landscape with it being visible above the tree line and visible to the north, east and west in areas sensitive to development, such as Parley Common. It has been considered there would be a Moderate Adverse effect to the quality of the landscape character within the vicinity of the site and reducing in impact as the study area expands to 3k radius.

209. A Plume visibility assessment was undertaken which included photomontages to illustrate the plume visibility. Dispersion modelling has also undertaken to predict the frequency and length of visible condensation plumes. The report recognises that a plume of white condensation (i.e water droplets) will be visible at times when meteorological conditions are favourable. The worst case scenario would be on a clear cold day with blue skies. The above report concludes visible condensation plumes are predicted to occur for less than 1% of the year on average, and for 1.7% of the time in the worst-affected year modelled. The average length it would be visible is predicted to be 3.3 minutes and the maximum length over the 5 years modelled is predicted to be 31metres. The submitted photomontages show the plume against a cloudy sky and this has been criticised by the Landscape Architects. Additional blue sky photomontages have been submitted and whilst these clearly demonstrate the plume will be visible in these scenarios, this need to be looked at in the context of the frequency and length of time it will be viewed.

210. There is an existing bund to the north and east of the site which was part of a previous landscape scheme for the site. Dorset Council have offered the following; *"I would advise that substantial engineered bunds are an inappropriate method of 'visual screening' within a Green Belt – as they conflict with the perceptual qualities of 'openness".* However, the bund is in situ on the site and has been previously accepted. Therefore, it would not be appropriate or reasonable for this landscape element to be removed. It does provide some mitigation from the north and east as it will create some screening of the proposals. Directly to the south of the site, outside of the SSSI, a belt of native trees and shrubs are proposed. This will provide some mitigation from Chapel Lane and the Bridleways. Hedging will be replenished on Chapel Lane next to the main entrance on the one way system. Just to the south of the site on Chapel Lane, where the road will be widened, the existing vegetation that will be lost will be replaced by native hedging. It is also proposed to plant a native tree and shrub mix on top of the bund on the eastern boundary of the site.

211. There is a 5 metre imperforate timber fence proposed for the northern boundary of the site for ecological purposes to minimise light pollution. However, this raises landscape concerns as it will be clearly visible from the adjacent bridleway and adjacent path (not for use by public) during the winter months and will not screen the 16 metre high ERF building. It has been considered that it will introduce dominating built elements in contrast to the existing vegetated boundary. Given the reasons it is required; the reduction of light levels for night time bird species, in particular, the

Nightjar which are a species for which the Dorset Heathland qualifies as a Special Protection Area (SPA) and to protect the foraging and commuting routes for bats from lighting, this is considered to outweigh the landscape visual impact.

212. Criteria 7 of Inset 7 states that a comprehensive landscape and ecological scheme for the site must be provided with enhancement opportunities for the eastern fields. The proposed landscape scheme for the site and wider area within the applicant's control is the same Plan that has been previously approved for the 8/14/0515 application, but much of which has not been implemented. Given the nature of the site, there are minimal opportunities for planting within the site. It is understood by all parties, that given the scale and height of the development, there is not sufficient scope to provide full visual mitigation for the building and stack through landscaping proposals.

213. It must be recognised that there is an extant permission for a Bio-Energy facility which will be relinquished as part of this proposal. However, that permitted a new building of a maximum height of 17.9m (higher than the proposed ERF) and a stack of 15m. It was a smaller facility with a smaller footprint but this development along with the approved anaerobic digestor and windrow composting demonstrates that the site already has permission to be intensified and increase the management of waste streams on the site.

214. It is absolutely clear that the proposed development, specifically the ERF building and the stack will cause some harm to the landscape character and landscape visual amenities. However, this needs to be understood in the context of the approved and extant permissions on the site which involve additional built form, structures and processes and the needs to provide additional capacity in the Plan area for the management of residual waste. Despite this, the proposal is contrary to policies HE2 and HE3 of the Local Plan and Waste Plan policy. This needs to be carefully put in the planning balance and weighed against the benefits of the scheme. It is proposed to secure a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan by condition which will ensure the proposed planting takes place and is managed in order to help provide some mitigation for the development.

Decommissioning

215. Policy 23 of the Waste Local Plan covers restoration aftercare and aferuse and how there measures will be implemented at the earliest practicable opportunity. Planning Policy Guidance on Green Belt outlines how the duration of the development and its remediability must be considered when considering the openness of the Green Belt.

216. The proposed energy recovery facility and the technology used has been designed to have an operational lifetime of 25 years. The Decommissioning section of the ES states that there are two options;

Option A – utilisation of the building for other industrial processes/activities; or

Option B – restoration of the site to a baseline condition

217. The applicant favour Option A as they have stated that it would involve the sustainable re-use of the building and would reduce the number of vehicle movements associated with the exportation of materials off the site. With new planning permissions in place the building could be repurposed. However, given the view that the proposed strategic landscaping is poor, the Landscape consultation responses strongly consider that the site should be restored to an appropriate baseline condition.

218. The position of the applicant is recognised, in that it would not seem the most sustainable option to remove the ERF building itself even if the operations within it and the stack were no longer required and could be removed. However, given the landscape concerns with the proposal and the location of the site within the green belt, it is considered appropriate to ensure that following the 25 year operating lifetime, the ERF building and stack is remove from site and the site restored to a baseline condition. Some detail has been provided within section 4; however a full detailed up to date decommissioning plan will be required prior to any operations ceasing on site and this can be secured by condition.

Transport

219. Paragraph 110 of Section 9 of the NPPF (Promoting sustainable transport) states; *"In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:*

a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location;

b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;

c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code 46; and

d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree".

220. Policy 12 of the Waste Local Plan stipulates that proposals for waste management facilities provide safe access to the proposed site; and the development makes provision for any highway and transport network improvements necessary to mitigate or compensate for any significant adverse impacts on the safety, capacity and use of the strategic, primary and/or local road network, railway, cycle way or public right of way. Policy KS11 'Transport and Development' of the Local Plan ensures that development is permitted if any negative transport impacts are mitigated and to ensure sustainable transport methods are provided.

221. Point 4 of Inset 7 (Allocated site) provides the following; "*Any increased traffic would rely upon the improved Chapel Lane access and internal site infrastructure included within the 2015 Planning permission. Mitigation to address congestion in the area likely to be in the form of a contribution towards B3073 corridor improvements".*

222. The Environmental Statement, in section 15 'Transport' and a separate Transport Assessment looks at the potential effects of transport impacts within the wider highway network and outlines how impacts will be mitigated. Traffic counts were undertaken in Autumn 2020 and in light of the global pandemic situation, survey results from 2014 were used to adjust and uplift the results to ensure a more robust understanding of the 2020 traffic levels on Chapel Lane, Chapel Gate, Christchurch Road and Parley Lane Eco Site.

223. The existing site is limited to a 260,000 tonnes per annum by condition on the 8/14/0515 permission from 2016. The proposal would result in an increase of 75,000 tonnes of additional waste being imported onto the site. Waste for the ERF would be delivered to the site in a mix of 26 tonne vehicles and 8 tonne skip collections. Green waste and wood waste would be delivered in 8 tonne vehicles and 22 tonne vehicles.

With regards to the exportation of bottom ash and APC residue from the ERF, there would be a total of 714 HGV movements annually. In addition, recycled materials obtained from the original imported residual waste for the ERF would be exported and this would amount of 770 annual HGV movements.

224. The existing operation hours secured by a previous condition refer to 24 hour operation for the anaerobic digestion facility, biomass CHP plant and the previously consented Bio-Energy facilities. The rest of the site is restricted which includes deliveries is 07:00 to 19:00 Monday to Friday; 07:00 to 15:00 Saturdays and Bank Holidays and no operations on Sundays and Christmas Day. The proposed ERF will be a 24 hour operation but deliveries will continue to be restricted.

225. The Transport assessment states that the current vehicle movements on the local road network are as follows;

- 19,346 vehicle movements per day on Parley Lane of which 2,148 are HGV
- 930 vehicle movements per day (AADT) on Chapel Lane of which 337 are HGV (36%)
- 20,563 daily traffic flows on Christchurch Road with 1587 of these HGV.
- Site access experiencing an average of 556 vehicular movements per day (AADT), 226 being HGV (41~%).

226. The combined operational impacts from the proposal will result in an **additional 107 movements per day (53 arrivals and 54 departures) with 38 of these (107) being classified as HGV trips.** Annually the total vehicle movements associated with importation of waste and materials is predicted to be 8,430 HGV two-way movements. The expected annual HGV trips associated with the exportation of waste materials, recycled materials, bottom ash from ERF and APC residue is 1,484. This results in an annual figure of 9,914 HGV trips associated with the importation and exportation of waste and materials for the whole site. The additional waste will be transported to the site either via Parley Cross from the west or via the A338 Blackwater junction to the south east.

227. The vehicular trips associated with the new administration and welfare building have been calculated as being 71 daily trips which when combined with the daily HGV movements results in the total 107 vehicle movements to and from the site. The site is the most significant contributor to the traffic flows along Chapel Lane equating to 58% of the movements. The Transport Assessment and BCP Highways have concluded that the impact of the development on the overall highway network is limited. The site being close to the primary route network which links to the Strategic route network as shown on the Dorset Advisory Lorry Route Map (from Waste Local Plan) enables is in accordance with Policy 12. However, the impact when considered against the immediate Chapel Lane is a significant increase in movements both all traffic and HGV. Improvements to Chapel Lane are proposed and outlined in more detail below.

228. The cumulative impact of the increased vehicle movements associated with the proposed development and other developments within the area need to be considered. The development at Parley Cross; Hurn Court Quarry extension and the Aviation Business Park expansion plans. The transport assessment has taken into account these future development in their calculations to their results are considered to be fair and robust. BCP Highways have offered the following comments in relation to the Aviation Business Park applications which have recently been 'resolved to be approved' by the Local Planning Authority subject to completion of a s106; "*The*

Energy Recovery Facility and associated works subject to this application are unlikely to be materially impacted upon by these consents should they come forward. Specifically, the impact of the ABP consents is far greater on the wider highway network than this proposal and consideration of the interface between the two was made during the determination of the ABP applications with alterations to the junction at Chapel Lane being a requirement of the ABP consent".

229. The applicant's assessment make reference to waste streams already being within the highway network and as such the trips associated with this proposal represent diverted trips given the level of waste being exported outside of the county. This is recognised but also needs to be considered that the proposal will focus increased waste traffic movements within this specific locality.

230. Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states; "*Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe*". It is considered that the increased movements of 107 a day will not result in severe highway impact on the surrounding highway network and would not prejudice the operation of the neighbouring highways.

231. The proposal includes the provision of 71 car parking spaces within the new car park (including disabled spaces) along with a minibus drop off area and a coaches parking only area. The site is located within Zone C of the Parking SPD and this use requires 1.5 per 100m2 for Class B2, and 2 per 100m2 for Class E Office. The HGV requirement is 1 per 500m2 for Class B2, and 1 per 500m2 for Class E. The proposed provision is over what is required; however given the location is quite poorly served by public transport it is considered acceptable as there is only a minimal increase overall across the site.

232. The plans have been amended during the process to ensure all the parking bays are of the required dimensions and each bay is shown to have an active Electric Charge Point. With regards to cycle parking, the SPD requires a ratio of 1 per 100sqm for Class E office use and 0.4sqm per 100sqm for Class B2. In both use classes the LPA's SPD has a 0.2 per 100m2 visitor requirement. A cycle store is being provided for 20 cycles and there are showers and lockers within the welfare building. These elements will be secured by condition.

233. Bridleway E62/29 runs parallel to the Chapel Lane and then onto Tricketts Cross, Ferndown. As part of the Transforming Cities Fun, BCP Council are planning to carry out works to improvements to this Bridleway to provide an all weather bound surface route and widening it to 5m. A significant proportion of the land on which the Bridleway is situated is owned by the applicant and given these works would improve pedestrian and cycling access to the site and protect users from the HGV movements, it is expected the applicant will dedicate the required land from Chapel Gate up to and including behind Whitemere House and the Timber Yard. This has been agreed with BCP Highways and the applicant and forms part of the s106 Heads of Terms.

234. Equestrians using these bridleways will already be accustomed to HGVs using Chapel Lane and the existing waste management facilities on the site. Bridleway E62/29 provides a safer route for riders, off the main access and the proposed works to this bridleway will enhance the route for all users. The new ERF building and stack will clearly be visible from the bridleway as it passes the entrance to the site; however it is not considered to prejudice the safety of those using this public right of way.

235. Along a high proportion of Chapel Lane it is a single carriageway with passing places. As part of planning application 8/14/0515 a scheme of highway improvements to Chapel Lane was secured by planning condition which included the widening of Chapel Lane. The measures were designed to accommodate a more convenient two-way operation within the lower (southern) section of Chapel Lane. These highway works have not been fully implemented and therefore it is necessary to ensure a condition is imposed to secure these improvements to Chapel Lane to mitigate the increased number of HGV movements on Chapel Lane. The land subject to these improvements is within the applicant's ownership and therefore can be secured by condition.

236. There has been much local concern with the potential increased HGV traffic associated with the proposed development, especially around West Parley and Hurn. These concerns have been taken on board; however the evidence demonstrates that the increased number of vehicle movements above the existing and consented situation will not result in a severe impact on the local highway network on its own or in combination with the approved schemes in the vicinity. Improvements are being secured to the Bridleway and Chapel Lane and provision is being made to encourage employees to cycle to the site.

237. It is not considered that improvements need to be made to the B3073 (Parley Lane) as referred to in Inset 7 given the anticipated traffic levels. The improvements to Chapel Lane itself are considered to be sufficient. The scheme is therefore in accordance with Inset 7. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with Waste Plan Policy 12 and Local Plan policies KS11 and KS12.

Ecology

238. Paragraph 180 of the NPPF states

"When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

a) if significant harm to biodiversity 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;

b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;

c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and

d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate.

239. Policy 18 of the Waste Local Plan refers to the Habitats Directive and states that proposals must not be adversely effect the integrity of European or Ramsar sites, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. Criteria 1 of Inset 7 states the following; "*The applicant must provide sufficient information to enable the Waste Planning Authority to carry out screening and, if necessary, appropriate assessment at the planning application stage in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017. Where relevant, this should include studies that demonstrate that any emissions from development will not impact on the features (species and habitats including lichens and bryophytes) of the nearby European Sites".*

240. As outlined in paragraph 24, there are European designated sites within the vicinity of the application site. The Dorset Heathlands is a Special Protection Ares (SPA), a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar site. The Avon Valley is a SPA and Ramsar although this is located 2km to the east of the site. The River Avon SAC is located 3km to the east. In addition, Hurn Common and Parley Common which lie around the site are designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which are of national importance.

241. Whilst the proposed development is not actually taking place on the designated site, there are potential impacts on the integrity of the SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites from the construction phase, emissions to air and water from the ERF and the lighting along with increased traffic emissions It was determined that the nitrogen deposition was considered to have the greatest potential to have an adverse impact on the Dorset Heathland. Acid deposition from emissions is also another potential source of impact.

242. Exceedance of the critical load for nitrogen deposition on the qualifying features of the Dorset Heath SAC can lead to adverse impact on the habitat with changes in species composition with a decline in heather species and increased dominance of grasses. The impacts from acid deposition can include changes to species composition and the frequency of ground floor bryophytes (liverworts, hornworts and mosses).

243. The reports undertaken on behalf of the applicant found that the combined emissions from traffic associated with the development and the ERF with emission limits required by legislation and best practice guidance, resulted in exceedances of 1% of the critical loads for nitrogen and acid deposition at Hurn Common SSSI, Parley Common SSSI, Town Common SSSI and St Leonards and St Ives Heaths which all form part of the SAC andSPA. Light spill from the development, in particular night time lighting levels have the potential to impact on nocturnal species which are qualifying species of the SPA, such as nightjar.

244. It is clear that without any mitigation measures in place, the proposed development has the potential to have an adverse effect on the integrity of the internationally and national designated sites which would be contrary to the NPPF and the Development Plan. However, a range of mitigation measures have been put forward in order to protect the SPA, SAC and Ramsar site and the SSSIs. The ES provides the following description of the embedded mitigation;

"*'Source' mitigation in the form of lower emission limits for pollutants can be achieved using a combination of a selective non-catalytic reduction (SNCR) system to abate oxides of nitrogen (NOx), a lime or sodium bicarbonate injection system to abate emissions of sulphur dioxide (SO2) and hydrogen chloride (HCl), and a powdered activated carbon (PAC) injection system to abate emissions of volatile organic compounds, metals and dioxins. The flue gas would then be passed through filter bags to remove particulate matter, including the injected lime/bicarb and PAC. The*

SNCR system would inject ammonia (NH3) into the furnace at carefully controlled points to maximise the NOx reduction reaction without excessive amounts of unreacted ammonia passing through (known as ammonia slip).

This reduces the emission factor limit for ammonia from 5 mg/Nm³ before abatement to 2 mg/Nm³. Increasing the flue gas exit velocity from 15 m/s to 25 m/s further reduces the ground-level impact of the Proposed ERF".

245. Whilst the above measures have led to a reduction to less than 1% of the critical load for nitrogen deposition across Town Common SSSI and St Leonards and St Ives SSSI there are still minor exceedances of 1% critical load at Hurn Common and Parley Common SSSI. However, it was confirmed that only 0.2 Ha of habitat within Hurn Common SSSI is subject to exceedances of greater than 1% of the critical load for nitrogen deposition, and Natural England has advised this comprises goat willow Salix caprea, which is not a habitat type for which the overarching SAC is notified. Only 0.02 hectares within Parley Common SSSI appears to be subject to an exceedance of 1% of the critical load for nitrogen deposition, and is considered to be scrub with silver birch Betula pendula which is not a qualifying feature of the SAC. Therefore, it is considered any effect is negligible.

246. With regards to acid deposition, soil condition analysis was undertaken for Hurn Common SSSI and Parley Common SSSI and an analysis of plant species within Hun Common SSSI within the area that was subject to the 1% exceedance at the request of Natural England. The conclusions were that plant species sensitive to acid deposition are present at Hurn Common and that the soil across both SSSIs has buffering capacity against acid deposition and as such any effect is considered to be negligible.

247. Natural England is satisfied with these results; however to ensure there is no continuing adverse effect, monitoring surveys for air quality, soil sampling and botanical surveys of two areas of land (Unit 20 and Unit 29) within the SSSIs (part of the European designated habitat sites) adjacent to the site will be carried out over the lifetime of the development on five yearly intervals. A trickle fund of £500 per annum will be payable to… for the management of these areas including scrub removal (bracken invasion), liming, soil heaps for reptiles and grazing. The details of this are set out in the Heads of Terms for the s106 in the Recommendation section. Given the sensitivity of the neighbouring environment and the proposed emissions from the ERF it is considered that this Plan and the trickle fund meet the three tests for planning obligations at set out in Regulation 122 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

248. The Habitat Regulations require that the cumulative impact on the SPA/SACs of the project in combination with other plans and or projects need to be considered. The ES Chapter on Ecology and the Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment has assessed the cumulative impacts of the proposal, the Parley Cross development, mineral extraction at Hurn Court Farm and Aviation Business Park proposals. It has been determined that any potential cumulative effects would be due to operational vehicle emissions on the Dorset Heaths SAC and SPA and Ramsar as the other development have point source emissions to air. The proposed developments at the Aviation Business Park and Parley Cross development will result in a significant increase in traffic and the evidence provided by the application shows how the traffic generated by these developments will interact to cause exceedances of 1% of the critical loads of nitrogen deposition and acid deposition on the habitat sites as identified above. However, it is clear that the ERF proposal contributes a very small amount of deposition contributing to these exceedances of 1% of critical load.

249. BCP Council and Dorset Council have a Dorset Heathlands Interim Air Quality Strategy 2020 which strategically seeks to address the adverse effect of airborne nitrogen upon the Dorset Heathlands with a focus on vehicle emissions. Mitigation will be funded from Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or planning obligations, predominantly from residential developments. This planning application is not subject to CIL and there is no policy requiring this form of development to make a contribution towards the Strategy. However, as outlined above the impact of nitrogen deposition from the ERF and traffic has been robustly considered as part of this scheme. With the Strategy and the embedded mitigation measures in place as outlined above the in-combination effects of emissions on the Dorset Heathland is considered to be negligible.

250. Point 12 of Inset 7 of the Waste Local Plan refers to the consideration of a buffer zone in the south east section of the site and a surface water drainage system to help ensure no hydrological effects on the European sites. As will be described in greater detail below in the Hydrology section, there is a Surface Water Management Plan in place with the existing treatment ponds. Surface water will be filtered before being released into the River Moor drainage system.

251. An Appropriate Assessment has been carried out by BCP Council, as the Competent Authority and it has been determined that with the mitigation measures as outlined above secured, the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the European designated habitat sites. Natural England have confirmed they are satisfied with the Appropriate Assessment carried out. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with Waste Plan Policy 18 and Local Plan policy ME1.

Protected species and habitats

252. The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Appraisal submitted as part of the application found the current waste management site has low ecological value, however the wider landscape supports a variety of habitats. Within the site there are very small pockets of habitat, mainly to the south which provide scattered scrub and species- poor semi-improved grassland.

253. Great crested newt – The existing 7 ponds on and around the site and terrestrial habitats are highly unlike to support newts; 5 of them are concrete attenuation ponds. However, it has been agreed that on a precautionary basis the pond P7 (an active fishing lake) to the north of the site but within the same ownership of the application should be subject to additional surveys and this can be controlled by condition. This will help inform the Construction Environment Management Plan if any particular measures are required.

254. Bats – The surveys undertaken show no evidence of bats or roosts within the existing buildings or trees within or directly adjacent to the site. However, the trees offer opportunities for foraging and commuting bats. The tree line to the north of the ERF will be retained and additional tree planting is proposed to the south of the site. In order to protect any possible foraging routes, the lighting scheme has been designed in line with best practice guidance for lighting for bats. A 5m high timber fence is proposed to the north of the ERF to prevent light spill onto the adjacent tree line; powering off of the main lights attached to ERF outside of operating hours; and LED light sources selected which are less impactful on light sensitive species. The BCP Biodiversity Officer is satisfied with the initial lighting strategy, but a full lighting strategy will be secured by condition.

255. Birds – The data search identified 106 records of birds, but the baseline survey only resulted in one sighting of s swallow. However, the site does possess habitats that

could support nesting birds. As identified above, light spill from the site has the potential to impact on night time species so the lighting strategy is vital. Works should avoid bird nesting season and visual checks should be made prior to any removal of suitable habitats.

256. Badgers – the site offers very limited opportunities for badger setts; however, the report recommends that the site is resurveyed prior to commencement of any construction activities to check of badger setts.

257. Reptiles – Grassland that exists within the application site could be used by reptiles. The area around the surface water management ponds will be lost when the remainder of the ponds are created (under previous planning permission); however, any mitigation measures would be covered under the previous consent and conditions. However, the required LEMP (Landscape and Environment Management Plan

258. The NPPF requires development to pursue opportunities to secure net gains for biodiversity. As part of the scheme, the following enhancements include;

- Provision of a green roof on the administration building
- Additional tree and shrub planting to the south and wet boundaries of the site
- Reedbed habitats within the surface water treatment ponds
- Planting around the proposed car park
- The measures outlined above can be secured through a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan which can be secured by condition.

259. Notwithstanding the above, there are limited opportunities on the site to improve biodiversity given the nature of the proposals. Therefore, in addition to the above, the applicant has agreed to make a contribution to BCP which will assist the Council in purchasing a parcel of land at St Catherines Hill which lies in the same SPA and SAC as that which surrounds the application site. The Council would be able to manage this area and the surrounding SSSI and improve the heathland and the habitats it supports. Currently, it presents a fire hazard which puts the surrounding heathland at risk. This contribution of circa £5000 would provide off site biodiversity enhancements and assist in protecting the Dorset Heath SPA and SAC and

260. The site investigations and reports that have taken place and the proposed mitigation measures as set out are considered to ensure that Protected Species or their habitats are not harmed by the development. It is considered that with the conditions in place, the proposal is in accordance with Policy ME1 of the Local Plan.

Heritage

261. Waste Plan policy 19 'Historic Environment' states that development will be permitted where heritage assets and their settings will be conserved and/or enhanced in a manner appropriate to their significance. Local Plan policy HE1 has very similar aims to ensure the historic significance and importance of heritage assets are protected.

262. Para 199 of the NPPF states; "*When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance".* Para

200 goes onto say*; "Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification".*

263. In considering whether to grant planning permission or permission in principle for development which affects a listed building special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest - section 66 - Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

264. Heritage was scoped out of the Environmental Impact Assessment; however, a Heritage Statement was submitted in support of the application. There are a number of Scheduled Monuments within the vicinity of the application site. Two bowl barrows, funerary monuments are located to the north west of the site at Gibbet Firs and an additional bowl barrow to the north east on East Parley Common. Historic England, on their website states the following; "*The two bowl barrows on East Parley Common are part of a dispersed group of barrows on the heathland in this area. Well preserved examples of their class, they will contain archaeological remains providing information about Bronze Age burial practices, economy and environment".* The formal description is as follows;

"The monument, which lies in two areas, includes two bowl barrows at Gibbet Firs on East Parley Common, close to the parish boundary between Hurn and Ferndown Town. The northern barrow has a mound 16m in diameter and 1.8m high surrounded by a quarry ditch, 3m wide, from which material was excavated during its construction. The southern barrow has a mound 20m in diameter and 2m high surrounded by a quarry ditch, 3m wide. A 19th century gibbet formerly stood between the two barrows but there is now no trace of it. All fence posts are excluded from the scheduling although the ground beneath these features is included".

265. The three barrows are surrounded or partially surrounded by the solar farm and this has already effected the Monuments setting. The LVIA includes a viewpoint and photomontage from Gibbet Firs Tumulus and it illustrates that the roof of the ERF building and the emissions stack will be visible above the tree line. It is considered that the proposal will not directly affect these Scheduled Monuments and although the proposal will be visible, it is not considered to result in harm to the significance of these bowl barrows or result in any disturbance to the archaeological remains within them.

266. Archaeological investigations have been undertaken on the application site and within the area in the past but no archaeological finds or features were found. The Dorset Council Archaeologist has not provided formal comments but has informally confirmed that given the previous archaeological fieldwork and given the low to non-existent archaeological potential of the site decided not to comment. Historic England were also consulted and did not wish to provide any comments.

267. Barnabas Lodge, the former Church of St Barnabas on Chapel Lane, the south of the site is a Grade II listed building dating from 1862-3. BCP Conservation has offered the following comments in relation to this heritage asset; "*The former Church of St Barnabas is well treed to the northern boundary and any impact on its setting will be more related to wider effects such as any increase in vehicle movements rather than a visual impact".* It is considered that the setting of this heritage asset is already compromised from the existing use of Chapel Lane for HGV's and the location of the business park to the east of the sites boundary.

268. Fir Grove Farmhouse is a Grade II listed property positioned about 1km to the north east of the site. The Heritage Statement acknowledges that there could be views of

the site from the immediate area around the site; however, determines that the impact on their setting is low. Parley Court Barn, Tudor Cottage and Parley Manor are Grade II listed buildings approximately 1.6km (as crow flies) to the application site and form a group. The stack is likely to be visible on the skyline; however, the surrounding land uses of the airport, business park and busy Parley Lane provides some context to the buildings. The stack in itself is not considered to compromise the setting of the listed buildings and their significance and position within the landscape is not compromised.

269. The Heritage Statement concludes that the listed buildings identified above will be protected from the existing screening with the exception of the stack but considers the effect is unlikely to be greater than negligible. BCP Conservation broadly agrees with this but concludes there is a slight adverse impact at the lower end of less than substantial harm. NPPF paragraph 202 states; "*Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use".*

270. In addition to the above listed buildings, Woodtown Farmhouse to the south east of the site within West Parley Woodtown farmhouse. To the western boundary, the site appears to be bounded by trees. Given the distance from the site, the intervening land uses and tree cover, the proposed stack of the ERF is not considered to harm the setting of this listed farmhouse. To the south-south west off Parley Lane, Merritown House and Merritown barn, 2 grade II listed building are positioned. They are adjacent to the Adventure Wonderland attraction. From this point, the stack will be visible above the tree line and similar to the position at Parley Court Barn. Given the intervening airport infrastructure and activities and activity and buildings on the Wonderland site, the top part of the stack being visible is not considered to compromise the setting of these heritage assets.

271. The public benefits of the scheme include the provision of waste management facilities that will move the management of residual waste up the waste hierarchy from disposal to recovery with the provision of electricity and heat. There would a reduced reliance on landfill and transporting waste outside of the BCP area in line with the proximity principle There would be employment and education opportunities as well as improvement to the Bridleway alongside Chapel Lane. It is considered that the overall reduced levels of carbon associated with the ERF compared to landfill and burning of fossil fuels, and the requirement for BCP and Dorset to increase capacity to deal with residual waste over the Plan period outweighs the slight less than substantial harm caused to the Grade II listed buildings. It is considered the proposal is in accordance with Policy 19, Local Plan policy HE1 and paragraph 202 of the NPPF.

272. The closest Conservation Area is within West Parley, 2.5k to the west of the site on Church Lane adjacent to the river Stour. There would be no direct visual relationship between the Conservation Area and the development site; however there could be views of the stack on the skyline. However, from this distance and with the intervening land uses it is not considered that the stack would result in a visually intrusive element that would result in harm to the character and appearance of this Conservation Area. Hurn Conservation Area is located approximately 3km to the east and again whilst there could be glimpses of the stack, in particular from the more open western side of the designated area it is not considered that views of the stack would give rise to harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The building associated with the airport and business park and the tree belts in between ensure that the stack would not be viewed in isolation across open countryside. It is therefore considered that there is no harm caused to the character

and appearance of the Conservation Areas and the development is in accordance with Waste Plan Policy 19 and Local Plan policy HE1.

Hydrology and Hydrogeology

273. The site is within Flood Zone1, the lowest risk areas and is not shown to be within the future flood zones. However, there is evidence to show that there are very small areas within the site which are susceptible from medium and high risk surface water flooding. Due to the nature of the proposals, there is also a risk of impacts to underlying groundwater. Section 12 of the Environmental Statement covers Hydrology and Hydrogeology and includes a Flood Risk Assessment.

274. Policy 16 Natural resources of the Waste Local Plan states the following:

"Proposals for waste management facilities will be permitted where all of the following criteria are met: a. it can be demonstrated that the quality and quantity of water resources (including ground, surface, transitional and coastal waters) would not be adversely impacted and/or would be adequately mitigated; b. ground conditions are shown to be suitable; c. site soils would be adequately protected, reused and/or improved as required; and d. there would not be a loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) unless the environmental, social and/or economic benefits of the proposal outweigh this loss and it can be demonstrated that the proposal has avoided the highest grades of land wherever possible".

275. Waste Policy 17 Flood risk requires waste management facilities to; Not be at a significant risk of flooding; provision of mitigation measures if risk is identified; provide for the management of surface water run-off and use of SUDS; and not have an unacceptable impact on integrity of defences. The NPPF in paragraph 169 refers to major development incorporating sustainable drainage systems which ensure an acceptable standard for the lifetime of the development and where possible provide multifunctional benefits unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate.

276. The construction phases will involve groundworks with excavating for the ERF building and administration building. This has the potential impact of contaminating the groundwater given that the data suggests that the superficial deposits and bedrock geology are highly permeable. This also has the potential to impact on surface water and this in turn could have an impact on the Moor River, which is part of the European designated habitat site. During operations there is a risk from storage tanks, fuels and oils and drainage systems and foundations for the buildings may create barriers to shallow groundwater flow. Similar risks are also anticipated during the decommissioning phase.

277. Given the above identified risks, a variety of mitigation measures are proposed to protect ground water and surface water. Although it is not considered that there will be significant sources of contamination given the majority of site operations are contained within enclosed structures or covered. The measures include;

- Construction Environmental Management Plan
- Continuous Emission Monitoring System
- Use of Best Available Technology (BAT) for emission control and pollution prevention

278. The NPPF states that surface water run off rates and volumes should not increase as a result of development. The FRA outlines the Surface Water Strategy and states that the clean water from the roof of the ERF will be discarded to the northern ditch (under the existing discharge consent) and all other surface water will be discharged to the treatment ponds. The water will be transported using pipes though a combination of treatment techniques to ensures that discharges to the Moors River are within consented limits. The treatment ponds lie in the south east corner of the site and have consent to discharge into the Moor River. The run off will pass through the silt lagoon, an oil interceptor and then into the reed bed system. The treatment ponds and reed beds provide biodiversity opportunities enabling multifunctional benefits of the strategy in line with the NPPF.

279. BCP Flood Authority have accepted the Strategy but it is clear that further information will be required and as such a condition is proposed to secure a detailed drainage strategy which must include discharge rates to the river Moor. The Environment Agency have raised no objection but have suggested a number of conditions relating to contamination which will be covered in the next section.

280. The proposals are not considered to increase flood risk on the site. There will be an increase in impermeable surfacing at the site but according to the ES this is not considered to detrimentally affect the underlying aquifer or the local hydrological regime. It is considered that with the mitigation places and surface water strategy secured by condition, the scheme is acceptable in hydrological terms and in compliance with Waste Policies 16 and 17 and Local Plan policies ME6 (Flood management, mitigation and defence) and ME7 (Protection of groundwater). Reference is made in Inset 7 Criteria 9 of the Waste Plan to not adversely affecting flood risk mitigation measures required to develop the adjacent employment site. It is not considered that the surface water management scheme which uses the existing treatment ponds on site will affect any possible mitigation measures on neighbouring sites.

Contaminated land

281. This section follows on from the preceding paragraphs. Point 10 of Inset 7 states that development must include measures to protect land and groundwater from contamination and oil storage. Para 183 of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure a site is suitable for its proposed use taking account of ground condition and any risks arising from ground contamination. Para 184 goes onto state: '*Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner'*.

282. BCP Environmental Health instructed the Consultants Mabbett to review the relevant submissions on contaminated land on their behalf. The potential sources of contamination on site include a number of storage tanks and a back up generator and historical backfilled landfill materials. Off site, the Airport, landfills, a slurry pit and timber yard represent other potential sources. The Environmental Statement identifies the following as receptors;

- Human health
- Sensitive ecology
- Superficial Secondary A aquifer
- Bedrock Secondary A aquifer; and Surface Water (Moors River)

283. The Technical review by Mabbett did initially identify some gaps within the Phase 1 Environmental Assessment report which forms part of the Land Use section in the Environmental Statement. Mabbett considered that the potential risk from landfill materials was not sufficiently addressed. The backfilling is understood to have occurred with inert materials; however, the potential for hazardous waste to be present cannot be ruled out. The Environment Consultants Hollis responded on behalf of the applicants and have stated; "*We understand the proposed ERF is not located in an area of the site that was historically subject to quarrying or landfilling. However, we agree that further information relating to ground conditions within the development area is required. Therefore, samples collected during the Phase II investigation in this area will be tested for contaminants typically associated with landfills, and ground gas monitoring will be undertaken to establish the ground gas regime. Appropriate mitigation measures will subsequentially be applied (if required).*"

284. Further clarification was required on the potential risk from off site contamination and risks to ground structures. Hollett have confirmed that the potential off site sources will be further considered in the Phase II investigation and chemical and geotechnical testing will be undertaken as part of the ground investigations and the results will inform the use of appropriate building materials and foundation design.

285. As stated previously the incineration process will result in two separate ash streams; Incinerator bottom ash (IBA); and Air pollution residue (APCr). IBA is non hazardous waste which can be recycled. However, APC is classified as hazardous and requires specialist landfill disposal or treatment a suitable waste management facility. APC residue will be removed from the site in enclosed tankers, thereby minimising any risk of spillage and dust emissions. During the tanker filling operation, displaced air will vent back to the silo and any releases to atmosphere would pass through a fabric filter.

286. A variety of mitigation measures are proposed during the construction, operation and decommissioning phase. These include risk assessments; Construction Environmental Management Plan, testing of imported soils, Materials Management plan and a decommissioning Environmental Management Plan. With these in place, it is considered that no potential for major or moderate impacts to the receptors from contamination is likely to occur. Mabbett have suggested contamination conditions, along with the Environment Agency and these can be seen in the Recommendation section of the report. It is considered that the proposal complies with Waste Plan policies 16 and 17 and Inset 7 in relation to contamination along with Local Plan policy ME7 and saved policy ENV3.

Cumulative and in-combination effects

287. Schedule 3 Paragraph 3(g) of the EIA Regulations refers to the 'Types and Characteristics of the Potential Impact' and requires "*the cumulation of the impact with the impact of other existing and/or approved development*" to be taken into account. Section 16 of the Environmental Impact Assessment has considered the effects of the proposed development in the context of 3 major development projects within the locality. These are; expansion of the Aviation Business Park; New mixed use development at Parley Cross; and the extension of Hurn Quarry.

288. In socio-economic terms the generation of employment opportunities at the application site, Aviation Business Park and non-residential elements of the West Parley development provide economic and social benefits for the area. The site could also be as an education resource on sustainable waste management practices. The generation of heat and electricity on site would have wider benefits and provides

opportunities for the 3 major developments to make use of the heat in particular being created.

289. The predicted emissions for the ERF have been assessed along with emissions from the additional vehicular traffic and taken into account the emissions from the other developments. The in-combination impact of the ERF and other projects exceeds the screening thresholds for nitrogen oxides and ammonia and acid deposition. However, Section 16 of the ES confirms; "*The shadow HRA undertaken by Tyler Grange has concluded that, while the total in-combination effect of emissions from the proposed ERF with vehicle emissions due to other plans and projects is potentially significant, the contribution from the ERF makes up an extremely small proportion of the total in-combination impact. The impact of the other plans and projects could be mitigated by wider strategic measures such as encouraging modal shift away from private vehicles. These measures would not be appliable to stack emissions or HGV movements from the proposed development". T*he air quality impact from traffic emissions from the waste site and the business park is being dealt with strategically through the BCP Interim Air Quality Strategy which offsets the traffic emissions on the protected habitats through projects which are funded from CIL contributions from residential developments.

290. Having regard to climate change, the construction activities and vehicle movements at the development at application site, West Parley development and the Aviation Business Park all are likely to result in the release of carbon into the environment. However, the proposed scheme has the potential to distribute heat from the recovery process to these developments enabling environmental benefits as well as economic advantages.

291. The proposals as outlined in previous sections, will have an impact on the landscape. The proposals at the Aviation Business Park, north of the airport will see additional built form on the site and therefore together, this area will see change in landscape character. However, given the intervening trees and landscape, the buildings on both sites would not readily be seen together. The emissions stack would be visible above the tree line beyond the business park; however, the cumulative impact on the environment is not considered to be significant.

292. Traffic impacts and flows from the major development have been considered in the Transport Statement. The proposal and the development at the Aviation Business Park both include enhanced provision for cycling and as such it is not considered the combined effects on the highway network would be severe. BCP Highway Authority have agreed that the combined impact from the movements associated with the proposed development and the proposals at the Aviation Business Park are acceptable and can be accommodated on the local highway network.

293. It is concluded that the proposed development will not give rise to any significant adverse effects when considered in combination with the other existing, consented and planned development projects in the wider area.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

294. This is clearly a very balanced decision and the benefits of the proposal need to be put in the balance with the negative aspects and impacts of the proposed development. Dealing with the disadvantages of the scheme first, the likely harm to the landscape character and visual effects on the landscape are clearly significant and therefore of some substance in the overall planning balance. The proposed landscaping scheme is not sufficient to provide adequate mitigation given the scale and height of the ERF building and the stack and therefore, the proposal is contrary

to Waste Plan Policy 21, criteria 7 of Inset 7 and policies HE2 an HE3 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan. The development would have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Green Belt given the scale and height of the ERF building and its associated 38m high emissions stack.

295. It has been concluded that less than substantial harm to a number of the listed buildings will result from the ERF and in particular the emissions stack; and as such the proposal could be contrary to Waste Plan Policy 19 and Local Plan policy HE1. However, as outlined previously in the report, this is considered to be outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme which are discussed previously and also below.

296. Turning to air quality and the potential impact on public health, the evidence submitted and verified by consultants concludes there will be minimal risk to health. However, the level of public objection to the scheme on health and pollution concerns has also been given some weight. Perceived risk is capable of being a material planning consideration; however, given the pollution control measures set out in separate legislation and the emission levels controlled through the Environmental Permit, the perceived health risks are not considered to weigh heavily in the planning balance.

297. Turning to the benefits of the proposal, the development is considered to contribute to the sustainable waste management of residual waste by diverting waste from landfill and moving the management of residual waste up the hierarchy from disposal to recovery. The site is currently used as a waste management facility and is allocated in the Local Plan for the re-development and intensification of waste management and the increased capacity to manage larger quantities of waste. This and the recovery of electricity and heat from the process is a significant benefit of the scheme. The reduction in greenhouse emissions from the facility and displacement of carbon emissions from non-renewable energy sources compared to the use of landfill are clear benefits of the scheme. The reduction in the exportation of waste outside of the Plan area results in a reduction in waste miles in line with the proximity principle. These are all considered to amount to very special circumstances in terms of green belt policy and are considered to outweigh the harm cause by reason of the inappropriateness and the identified landscape and heritage harm.

298. The development will provide economic and social benefits through the provision of enhanced employment opportunities and increased knowledge and skills regarding the waste management processes of existing and new employees. In addition, the administration and welfare building will provide education opportunities for schools and community groups to learn about sustainable waste management practices.

299. The ecological implications and potential impact on the European designated habitat sites that surround the application site have been very carefully considered. The Appropriate Assessment undertaken by the Local Planning Authority and verified by Natural England concludes that the proposal, with the mitigation measures secured by s106 and conditions would not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of the European sites.

300. There is not considered to be a significant increase in traffic flows on the surrounding highway network and the additional HGV movements can be accommodated on the surrounding roads. The route to the site along Chapel Labe will be enhanced along with the Bridleway providing a safer route for cyclists and equestrians using this public right of way. This will provide an alternative form of sustainable form of transport for employers and visitors to the site, especially with the provision of cycle parking, showers and lockers on site.

301. The submitted Environmental Impact Assessment and all its separate chapters has been examined and it is considered that despite the harm to the landscape as set out above which does have an impact on the environment the benefits of the proposal as outlined above outweigh this specific environmental impact. The cumulative and in combination effects from this proposal and the other identified major projects in the area are not considered to result in significant environmental effects.

302. Despite the scheme having an adverse impact on the landscape character and visual amenities of the landscape contrary to Waste Plan Policy 14 and Local Plan Policies HE2 and HE3 and given the weight attributed to the movement of management of residual waste up the waste hierarchy from disposal to recovery, the capacity requirements in the Plan area and the climate benefits compared to landfill and burning of fossil fuels for electricity and heat, the proposed development is considered to accord with the Development Plan when read as a whole. Having regard to paragraph 11 of the NPPF it is considered that on balance the proposal offers a sustainable form of development.

Recommendation

303. **GRANT** permission subject to:

(a) the following conditions with power delegated to the Head of Planning (or any other officer nominated by them for such a purpose) to alter and/or add to any such conditions provided any alteration/addition in the opinion of the Head of Planning (or other relevant nominated officer) does not go to the core of the decision; together with

(b) a deed pursuant to section 106 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) securing the terms below with power delegated to the Head of Planning (or any other officer nominated by them for such a purpose) to agree specific wording provided such wording in the opinion of the Head of Planning (or other relevant nominated officer) does not result in a reduction in the terms identified:

- Relinquish permission for Bio-energy facility 8/13/0404

- Monitoring and Supportive Management Plan (25 years) for two parcels of land within Hurn Common SSSI and Parley Common SSSI to include:
  1. Baseline air quality monitoring before operation of ERF commences carried out by the applicant
  2. 5 yearly Air quality monitoring carried out by the applicant
  3. 5 yearly Botanical surveys carried out by the applicant
  4. 5 yearly Soil sampling carried out by the applicant
  5. If thresholds exceeded the following needs to occur – meetings with LPA and Natural England – understand what and why – remediation measures if required.
  6. Trickle fund for £500 per annum for lifetime of development to be paid to BCP Council for the management of the areas of land to include
     - Grazing
     - Scrub removal
     - Liming

- Biodiversity Enhancement Contribution of circa £5000 for the purchase and capital improvements of a parcel of land at St Catherines Hill by BCP to enable improved management of the land within the Dorset Heaths SPA, SAC

and Ramsar and Town Common SSSI. To be payable 5 years from the date of commencement of development.

- Widening and resurfacing of bridleway E62/29 to 5m effective width from Chapel Gate to the land north of Timber Yard.

304. Section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), outlines how the Secretary of State can issue directions requiring consultation with him prior to the determination of an application. The Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009 (still applicable to planning application received before 21 April 2021) states that the Local Planning Authority shall consult the Secretary of State if they do not propose to refuse the application for green belt development which consists of inappropriate development and the proposal includes the provision of buildings where the floor space is 1,000sqm or more.

305. This planning application is within the green belt, is considered to be inappropriate development and the buildings would have a floor space of over 1000sqm. Therefore, if Planning Committee wish to approve this application in line with the recommendation then the Local Planning Authority will need to consult the Secretary of State before issuing the decision. If, before the expiry of the 21 day period, the Secretary of State has notified the authority that he does not intend to issue a direction under section 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in respect of that application, the Authority may proceed to determine the application.

Conditions

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

   Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

   1416_PL100 Location Plan
   1416-PL101 A Amended Site Plan
   1416-PL102 A Amended Site Plan
   1416_PL120 Admin Welfare Floor Plans
   1416_PL121 Admin Welfare Floor Plans
   1416_PL200 Proposed Site Elevation
   1416_PL201 ERF Cross Sections
   1416_PL202 Admin Cross Sections
   1416_PL300 ERF Elevations
   1416_PL301 ERF Elevations
   1416_PL302 Admin Elevations
   1416_PL303 Fire Tank Pump House Plans Elevations
   1416_PL304 Gatehouse Plans Elevations
   1416_PL306 Fencing Elevations
   1416_PL110 ERF Floor Plan
   1416_PL111 ERF Roof Plan
   1416-PL103 A Amended Admin Layout
   1416_PL104 A Amended Fencing Layout
   1416_PL105 A Amended Landscaping External Surfacing Materials
   1416_PL106 A Amended Vehicle Tracking Layout
   1416_PL305 A Amended Cycle Store Plans Elevations
   1416_PL307 Bin Store Plans Elevations

1416_PL308 AD Reception Elevations
1416_PL309 AD Drying Plan Elevations
1416_PL310 AD Drying Plan Elevations

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. Notwithstanding the submitted landscaping scheme, prior to the commencement of any part of the development or engineering operations hereby permitted a Landscape and Environment Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This must include details of (i) hard surfacing materials; (ii) (iii) planting plans; (iv) written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); (v) schedules of plants, noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities; (vi) details of any fencing or other means of enclosure; and (vii) implementation and maintenance timetables. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, all hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetables. Any trees or plants that within a period of five years after planting are removed, die or become seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable in the next planting season with others of species, size and number as originally approved.

Reason: To protect the landscape character and visual amenities of the landscape.

4. Prior to the commencement of any part of the development or engineering operations hereby permitted, a detailed Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement must be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The Plan must include details and result of the additional crested newt surveys to be undertaken in Pond 7 and any mitigation measures if required; details of the green roof on the administration building; reed bed habitat creation, boundary planting, a timetable of vegetation clearance outside of bird nesting season and a timetable for the measures as set out in the BMEP to be implemented. The development must be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable.

Reason: To protect and enhance protected species and their habitats and the biodiversity interests of the site and surrounding area

5. Prior to the commencement of any part of the development, a Construction and Environment Management Plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This must include pollution prevention measures; a clear protocol for identification of potentially contaminated materials and procedures for their safe handling and management, the use of plant and machinery; wheel washing and vehicle wash-down and disposal of resultant dirty water, oils/chemicals and materials; the use and routing of heavy plant and vehicles; the location and form of work and storage areas and compounds; and the control and removal of spoil and wastes. Until it has been completed the development shall thereafter only be implemented including at all times during its construction, in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason To ensure that satisfactory measures are implemented to regulate the impact of construction works on amenity and the environment.

6. Prior to the first operation of the Energy Recovery Facility hereby approved:

(i) there shall have been obtained from the Environment Agency in respect of the Energy Recovery Facility R1 status as ‘energy recovery’; and

(ii) confirmation of this status having been secured shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority in writing.

Thereafter the Energy Recovery Facility shall only be operated whilst this status is maintained.

Reason: To ensure the efficiency of the facility and the management of residual waste is moved up the waste hierarchy.

7. No later than one calendar year after first operation of the Energy Recovery Facility a scheme for the implementation of combined heat and power (CHP) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall provide full details of the feasibility studies and the heat network and a timetable of how and when the combined heat and power is being provided to the identified recipients. The Energy Recovery Facility shall be operated in accordance with the approved scheme and timetable or unless any variation to the approved scheme and timetable has formally been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the realisation of the benefits of the ERF in producing heat and electricity.

8. Residual waste for the Energy Recovery Facility hereby approved shall only be imported onto the site if it originates from the area of Dorset Council and BCP Council. A record of the origins of the residual waste that is delivered must be maintained and must be made available within 72 hours of a written request being delivered to the application site or any building within it or such other locations as have otherwise been agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure the reduction in waste miles which is one of the very special circumstances for allowing the development in the Green Belt.

9. Prior to the first operation of the Energy Recovery Facility, full details of the Continuous Emission Monitoring System (CEMS) must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must also include details for the provision of the 'source' mitigation of a selective non-catalytic reduction system (SNCR), a lime or sodium hydrogen bicarbonate injection system and a powered activated carbon injection system along with details of the flue velocity. The ERF shall only be operated in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To protect the integrity of the Dorset Heathlands SPA, Dorset Heaths SAC and Dorset Heathlands Ramsar.

10. Prior to the commencement of any part of the development, a Dust Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter only be implemented including at all times during its construction and operation, in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: To ensure that satisfactory measures are implemented to regulate the impact of dust.

11. The maximum total tonnage of waste imported on to the site in any calendar year including the energy recovery facility and the existing waste management facilities hereby permitted shall not exceed 341,000 tonnes. For the avoidance of doubt a calendar year shall comprise the period between January 1 and December 31. Notwithstanding this, the maximum tonnage of waste processed by the Energy Recovery Facility in any calendar year shall not exceed 60,000 tonnes. The site operator shall at all times keep and maintain a record that includes details of:

(i) the tonnage of waste delivered to the site per day and in each successive calendar year,

(ii) the numbers of HGVs delivering waste on a daily basis;

(iii) the number of HGVs exporting any waste or other material from the site on daily basis together with their destinations; and

(iv) the amount of daily waste processed by the Energy Recovery Facility.

The record shall be made available to the local planning authority upon prior written request within 72 hours of any request being delivered to the application site including any building within it or such other locations as have otherwise been agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the local area and ecological habitats of nearby habitat sites.

12. No wastes other than those specified in Table 3.1 of Section 3 (Proposed Development) of the Environmental Statement shall be imported to the site. The figures in Table 3.1 shall be taken as maximum tonnages that can be imported onto site for each individual waste stream as detailed. All biodegradable and inert waste imported to the site should be suitable for recycling and/or recovery. Any waste that falls outside of the above description shall be removed and stored in a designated container prior to removal from site. Any hazardous waste imported to the site shall be suitable for recovery and/or recycling in the road sweepings and gully waste plant. The annual throughput of hazardous waste shall not exceed 2,000 tonnes each year. The site operator shall maintain records of the throughput of all waste streams imported to the facility and shall make these available to the local planning authority within 72 hours of a written request being delivered to the application site or any building within it or such other locations as have otherwise been agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the local area and ecological habitats of nearby habitat sites.

13. The Energy Recovery Facility hereby approved shall only be operational for 25 years from the date the Energy Recovery Facility first comes into operation (the Decommissioning date). The Energy Recovery Facility shall only be brought into operation if prior to this date, there has been submitted to and confirmed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the date when the operation will commence, and substantial completion will occur. Within one calendar year of the Decommissioning Date, the site of the Energy Recovery Facility building, and associated infrastructure including the stack shall be returned to a condition as set out in the Decommissioning Plan as required by condition 14.

Reason: To protect the openness of the green belt and the landscape character.

14. Prior to the Decommissioning Date of the Energy Recovery Facility as set out in Condition 13, a Decommissioning Plan for the demolition and removal of the Energy Recovery Facility and its associated infrastructure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include: (i) details of all structures and buildings which are to be demolished; (ii) details of the means of removal of materials resulting from the demolition and methods for the control of dust and noise; (iii) the phasing and timetable for demolition and removal; (iv) details of the restoration works; and v) the phasing and timetable for the restoration works. The demolition and removal of the Energy Recovery Facility (which shall include all buildings, structures, plant, equipment, areas of hardstanding and access roads) and subsequent restoration of the site shall thereafter be undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme and timetable.

15. Within 12 months of the site ceasing to be used for the purposes detailed on approved drawing 1416-PL101 A ('Proposed Site Masterplan'), with the exception of the Energy Recovery Building and its associated infrastructure, a scheme for the demolition and removal of the development from the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include: (i)

details of all structures and buildings which are to be demolished; (ii) details of the means of removal of materials resulting from the demolition and methods for the control of dust and noise; (iii) the phasing and timetable for demolition and removal; (iv) details of the restoration works; and v) the phasing and timetable for the demolition and restoration works. The demolition and removal of the development (which shall include all buildings, structures, plant, equipment, areas of hardstanding and access roads) and subsequent restoration of the site shall thereafter be undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme and timetable.

Reason: To protect the openness of the green belt and the landscape character.

16. Prior to the commencement of development hereby permitted a Site Commercial Waste Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include details of the location of lockable waste containers suitable for the containment of the waste generated by the specific business activity and identify the licensed waste collection provider and the frequency of service. Development must be carried out in accordance with the approved details during both the construction of the development hereby permitted and the operation lifetime of the development on site.

Reason: To protect the amenity of the site and locality.

17. Notwithstanding the submitted lighting strategy, prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a lighting scheme shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted scheme shall include the following details:

i. hours of use of external lighting and internal lighting that would be visible externally;
ii. the exact location and specification of any external lighting;
iii. the specification including height for any fixed or mobile structures;
iv. the intensity of the lights;
v. the identification of areas to be illuminated and any measures to prevent light spilling on to areas outside the site;
vi. measures such as shrouding to minimise disturbance through glare;
vii. measures to minimise disturbance to bats from lighting;
viii. details about any translucent parts of the buildings external fabric or cladding, including the degree of transparency of materials, and any measures to minimise light spillage;
ix. a baseline night-time assessment for the vicinity of the site.

No aviation warning or safety light shall be fitted to the chimney stack unless details of the proposed lighting have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The lighting scheme, along with any aviation warning or safety lights, shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained throughout the period of operation of the Energy Recovery Facility and until all its associated infrastructure including the stack has been demolished.

Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the locality from light pollution and to minimise the impact on bats and birds.

18. Prior to first operation and use of the Energy Recovery Facility or administration building, a Surface Water Management Strategy must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Strategy must include details of all pipes to convey surface water runoff and the treatment techniques to ensure that discharges to the Moors River are within consented limits. Details of the consented discharge limits must also be included. Development must be carried out in accordance with the approved details and therefore retained during both construction

and the operational phase of the development and until all development has been removed from site

Reason: To prevent surface water flooding on the site or the surrounding area

19. Prior to first operation and use of the Energy Recovery Facility or administration building, details of the grey water recycling and water recycling for the administration building and Energy Recovery Facility shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to first operation and use of the Energy Recovery Facility or administration building.

Reason: In order to secure water and energy efficiency measures.

20. The buildings, tanks and infrastructure hereby permitted shall be constructed entirely of the materials details of which are shown on the approved elevation plans

1416_PL300 ERF Elevations
1416_PL301 ERF Elevations
1416_PL302 Admin Elevations
1416_PL303 Fire Tank Pump House Plans Elevations
1416_PL304 Gatehouse Plans Elevations
1416_PL305 A Amended Cycle Store Plans Elevations
1416_PL307 Bin Store Plans Elevations
1416_PL308 AD Reception Elevations
1416_PL309 AD Drying Plan Elevations
1416_PL310 AD Drying Plan Elevations

Reason: This is required to ensure the satisfactory visual relationship of the new development to the existing.

21. (a) The Energy Recovery Facility, Anaerobic digestor (AD) facility and Biomass CHP plant shall be entitled to operate for 24 hours a day and seven days a week including during bank and public holidays under the terms of this permission. No vehicles importing or exporting waste from these three facilities should be permitted to access or leave the application site other than between 07:00 to 19:00 hours Monday to Friday and 07:00 to 15:00 hours on Saturdays and public holidays.

(b) With the exception of those operations identified in paragraph (a) above:

(i) no other activities shall be carried out on any other part of the application site between the hours of 07:00 to 19:00 Monday to Friday; 07:00 to 15:00 on Saturdays and public holidays; and there shall be no other activities on Sundays or Christmas Day; and

(ii) save as provided for in paragraph (a) above, no vehicle carrying or exporting waste for use in any of the operations on the application site shall be allowed on site other than between the hours of 07:00 to 19:00 Monday to Friday; 07:00 to 15:00 on Saturdays and public holidays; and not at any time on Sundays or Christmas Day.

Reason: To protect the amenities of the local residents and area.

22. The construction phase of the development including the relocation of the waste streams within the site hereby approved shall only take place between the hours of 7.00 and 19.00 Monday to Friday and 07.00 to 15.00 on Saturdays No construction work associated with the development hereby permitted shall take place at any time on a Sunday or a public holiday.

Reason: To protect residential amenities

23. Before the development hereby approved is occupied or utilised all works required to widen Chapel Lane to 6.8m carriageway as specified on drawing number 101129-01 Rev H must have been completed in accordance with details that have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: These specified works are seen as a pre-requisite for allowing the development to proceed, providing the necessary highway infrastructure improvements to mitigate the likely impact of the proposal.

24. Before the development is occupied or utilised the areas shown on the submitted plans for the manoeuvring, parking, loading and unloading of vehicles shall have been surfaced, marked out and made available for these purposes. Thereafter, these areas must be maintained in a condition such that they are capable of being used for the purposes specified, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

Reason: To ensure the proper and appropriate development of the site and to ensure that highway safety is not adversely impacted upon.

25. Before the development is occupied or utilised the cycle parking facilities shown on hereby approved plan 1416_PL305A must have been constructed. Thereafter, these must be maintained in a condition such that they are capable of being used for the purposes specified, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

Reason: To ensure the proper construction of the parking facilities and to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes.

26. Before the development hereby approved is occupied or utilised, a Travel Strategy must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The strategy will show measures to reduce the need to travel to and from the site by private transport and the timing of such measures. The development hereby permitted shall only operate whilst all the requirements of the approved strategy are being accorded with and no vehicle shall be allowed to access or depart from the application site other than in accordance with the approved strategy.

Reason: In order to reduce or mitigate the impacts of the development upon the local highway network and surrounding neighbourhood by reducing reliance on the private car for journeys to and from the site.

27. The Electric Vehicle Charging Points and associated infrastructure details forming part of the planning application submission and indicated on the approved plan 1416-PL103A shall be implemented and brought into operation prior to the operation or use of the development hereby approved. Thereafter the Electric Vehicle Charging Points shall be permanently retained available for use at all times.

Reason: To ensure the proper construction of the parking facilities and to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes.

28. Before the development hereby approved is occupied or utilised visibility splays must be provided at the HGV main access from a driver position of 2.40 metres and a stopping sight distance (SSD) of 33 metres in each direction along the carriageway in accordance with details that have previously been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the visibility splay area must be maintained and kept free from obstruction. All land within the area of any visibility splay must be cleared/excavated to a level not exceeding 0.60 metres above the relative level of the adjacent carriageway.

Reason: To ensure that a vehicle can see or be seen when exiting the access.

29. Prior to the commencement of any part of the development hereby permitted, a Noise Management Plan should be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local

Planning Authority. The Plan must detail how the applicants will prevent HGVs arriving at or departing the application site between the hours of 19:00 and 07:00 and also detail how HGVs coming to the application site will be prevented from parking on the site access road, Chapel Lane, any public roads nearby where, with their engines idling. The development hereby permitted shall only operate whilst all the requirements of the approved Noise Management Plan are being accorded with and no vehicle shall be allowed to access or depart from the application site other than in accordance with the approved strategy.

Reason: To protect the amenity of local residents from noise disturbance created by HGVs.

30. Tree protection measures shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans titled Soft Landscape Proposal (sheets 1-5), by Red Bay Design dated 22 September 2021, For the duration of the construction phase and during relocation of the waste streams on site.

Reason: To ensure the implementation of the scheme is carried out in accordance with approved plans.

31. No development approved by this planning permission shall commence until a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. This strategy will include the following components:

1. A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:

- all previous uses;

- potential contaminants associated with those uses;

- a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors including details of the underlying landfill construction; and

- potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.

2. A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off site.

3. The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.

4. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action. Any changes to these components require the written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution.

32. Prior to any part of the permitted development being occupied a verification report demonstrating the completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.

Reasons To ensure that the site does not pose any further risk to human health or the water environment by demonstrating that the requirements of the approved verification plan have been met and that remediation of the site is complete.

33. If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

Reasons: To ensure that the development does not contribute to, or is not put at unacceptable risk from, or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site

34. Piling using penetrative methods in connection with construction of any part of the development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than with the written consent of the local planning authority The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason To ensure that the proposed development does not harm groundwater quality or resources.

35. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification, no change of use nor any other permitted development including but not limited to the erection, extension, installation or replacement of any fixed plant or machinery, building, structures, erections, private ways or hardstandings shall be undertaken within the application site without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interest of the amenity, landscape quality, the openness of South East Dorset Green Belt and ensuring good quality design.

36. The maximum height of any compost windrow shall not exceed 4 metres above the upper surface of the concrete slab on which the composting takes place. Height boards suitable for identifying the height of all compost windrows shall be maintained for the duration of the development hereby approved.

Reason: In the interest of the amenity and landscape quality

37. Save for soil stockpiles, unless otherwise previously agreed in writing by the local planning authority, the maximum height of any stockpiles of any waste and/or product (including aggregates, timer and any other material) shall not exceed 5 metres above the upper surface of the concrete slab on which it is deposited. The maximum height of any soil stockpiles shall not exceed 7 metres above the upper surface of the concrete slab on which it is deposited. Height boards suitable for identifying the height of all stockpiles above 4 metres in height shall be maintained for the duration of the development hereby approved. No stockpiles of soil or any water and/or product shall be deposited on any surface other than a concrete slab.

Reason: In the interest of the amenity and landscape quality

38. In circumstances that the flaring of biogas continues for a period of more than 24 hours or is expected to so do, waste input into the anaerobic digestion facility shall be reduced to a maintenance level until the need for the flaring has been rectified.

Reason: To safeguard air quality and the adjacent ecologically sensitive habitats

39. No incineration of waste shall take place at the Energy Recovery Facility apart from during commissioning until a grid connection to the Chapel Lane substation has been installed and is capable of transmitting electricity generated by the Energy Recovery

Facility. No waste may then be incinerated at the Energy Recovery Facility unless electricity is also being generated by the Energy Recovery Facility and is being transmitted to the national grid, except during periods of maintenance, inspection or repair, or at the direction of the holder of a licence under s.6(1)(b) or (c) of the Electricity Act 1989 (as amended), who is entitled to give such direction in relation to transmission of electricity from the Energy Recovery Facility to the national grid.

Reason: To ensure the energy recovered is utilised

40. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the Bird and Pest Management Plan dated October 2020. Any variation must first be approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to minimise activity of birds as they pose an aviation safeguarding concerns for the nearby Bournemouth Airport.

Informatives

1. This grant of permission is to be read in conjunction with the s106 Agreement dated (to be added when s106 complete).

2. We recommend that developers should: 1. Follow the risk management framework provided in Land Contamination: Risk Management page on GOV.UK (replaces CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, when dealing with land affected by contamination. 2. Refer to the Environment Agency Guiding principles for land contamination for the type of information that we require in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site. The Local Authority can advise on risk to other receptors, such as human health. 3. Consider using the National Quality Mark Scheme for Land Contamination Management which involves the use of competent persons to ensure that land contamination risks are appropriately managed. 4. Refer to the contaminated land pages on GOV.UK for more information.

Background Documents:

41. Documents uploaded to that part of the Council's website that is publicly accessible and specifically relates to the application the subject of this report including all related consultation responses, representations and documents submitted by the applicant in respect of the application.
42. This excludes all documents which are considered to contain exempt information for the purposes of Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972. Reference to published works is not included.