

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Respondent	Section of Document Responded To		Response ID	Response	Agree? Disagree? Comment?	Mineral Planning Authority Comment
Stephen Bowley Planning Consultancy	2	Introduction	DMSP56	RBMR would ask that a policy be included providing a permissive approach towards site extensions.	Comment	Your comment is noted, however strategic issues such as this should have been dealt with in the 2014 Minerals Strategy and not in a site allocation document.
South Gloucestershire Council	2	Introduction	DMSP853	Thank you for consulting South Gloucestershire Council on the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Draft Mineral Sites Plan & Draft Waste Plan. Apologies for the delay in responding. The Council has no comments to make at this stage.	Comment	Your response is noted.
Highways England	2	Introduction	DMSP567	<p>Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Draft Mineral Sites Plan. We are responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the Strategic Road Network (SRN), which in the Plan area comprises short sections of the A303(T) in the north and the A31(T) and A35(T) in the south. It is on the basis of these responsibilities that the comments that follow in this letter have been made.</p> <p>We have previously provided comments in the relation to the emerging Mineral Sites Plan, which should be read in conjunction with this letter. We made numerous site specific comments relating the previous consultation, which where the sites remain in the plan are still applicable. We are generally concerned that potential traffic impacts of the proposals coming forward through the minerals plan should be fully assessed during the plan-making stage. It is imperative to identify these impacts at this early stage as set out in Circular 02/2013. Paragraph 15 states that: In order to develop a robust transport evidence base [for local plans] , the Agency ( now Highways England ) will work with the local authority to understand the transport implications of development options. This will include assessing the cumulative and individual impacts of the Local Plan proposals upon the ability of the road links and junctions affected to accommodate the forecast traffic flows in terms of capacity and safety.</p> <p>Paragraph 18 states that Capacity enhancements and infrastructure required to deliver strategic growth should be identified at the Local Plan stage, which provides the best opportunity to consider development aspirations alongside the associated strategic infrastructure needs. Enhancements should not normally be considered as fresh proposals at the planning application stage. The Highways Agency (now Highways England) will work with strategic delivery bodies to identify infrastructure and access needs at the earliest possible opportunity in order to assess suitability, viability and deliverability of such proposals, including the identification of potential funding arrangements.</p> <p>Undertaking suitable assessment of transport impact at the plan-making stage avoids sites being chosen where: the traffic impact of the proposed development on the operation of nearby junctions is not known; or proposals for access or transport mitigation are untested and un-costed.</p> <p>Introduction Highways England understands the stage at which the Mineral Sites Plan is at and its role when adopted in superseding the saved policies of the 1999 Minerals and Waste Plan. We understand that after the previous consultation between December 2013 and February 2014 that the nominated sites have undergone further assessment, including taking on board previous comments. This document therefore indicates the sites which the Mineral Planning Authority currently proposes for future development. ....</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Highways England on the Minerals Sites plan. You will note that that DfT Circular 02/2013, which sets out our involvement in spatial planning matters, emphasises that transport impacts and potential mitigation needs to be understood and agreed at the plan making stage. Whilst some limited information has been provided on estimated traffic generation per day from many of the site nominations, no data are provided on the distribution, assignment of these trips onto the road network, peak time traffic, nor the impact the sites would have on the safe and efficient operation of specific trunk road junctions. I trust that you are able to take these comments into account but please get in touch if you wish to discuss matters further.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted. Further assessment studies are being undertaken, and additional work will be carried out.</p> <p>Highways England will be invited to comment on/contribute to this additional work.</p>

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Campaign to Protect Rural England	2	Introduction	DMSP756	<p><b>ROADS</b> Mineral extractions of all sorts inevitably generate a good deal of extra traffic and especially HGVs. This increase in heavy traffic is usually quite the biggest effect on the local householders and others travelling through the area. This is especially important in rural parts of the County with narrow and twisting roads which are very much unsuited to these large vehicles.</p> <p>We suggest that more attention (much more attention) should be given to selecting which of the many sites described in the Plan are better served by the existing road network and trying not to allocate those rural sites which are more poorly served.</p>		Your comment is noted, and is taken into consideration by the Mineral Planning Authority. However, there are many other factors affecting the choice of a potential site allocation, all of which must be taken into consideration
Environment Agency	2	Introduction	DMSP657	<p><b>Requirements for each site</b> We note in the Sustainability Appraisal that some of the following points have been included and mitigation given. However, if not already included as part of the text for each of the sites, we would recommend the following issues are referenced in the sites plan for each of the minerals proposals. (These are probably more relevant to sand and gravel and ball clay sites, due to the sites most likely being located near to watercourses or other water features.)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposals should maximise the wetland restoration opportunities at each site including the multiple benefits that may be achieved, such as water quality improvement, enhancing nature conservation value, etc. Water Framework Assessments (WFD) should be carried out as necessary and proposals should contribute to the relevant River Basin Plan objectives.</li> <li>2. Proposals should maximise the overall wetland gains.</li> <li>3. Proposals should incorporate gain of wetland features which will contribute to the aspirations of the England Biodiversity Strategy.</li> </ol> <p><b>Flood Risk:</b> Surface water drainage - the Minerals Planning Authority is reminded that for planning applications the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), which will be either Dorset County Council, Borough of Poole, or Bournemouth Borough Council, are now the consultee on matters related to surface water drainage. We no longer provide a consultation response on the surface water drainage arrangements for development proposals through our planning consultation role.</p> <p><b>Dewatering</b> We consider the following additional information should be included in the plan. Mineral extraction involves dewatering and other potential discharges to watercourses. There is a requirement for an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency for any such discharges. There is a risk of increased sedimentation on receiving watercourses from dewatering. There should be no detriment to the Water Framework Directive (WFD) ecological status of these watercourses. Any development should seek ways to enhance WFD ecological status. Some sites already holding Environmental permits for discharges may need to vary permits or apply for additional permits. Within the lifetime of the document it is likely that quarry dewatering will become licensable and thus water resource impacts of development may be subject to increased regulation. Currently abstractions for dewatering do not need an abstraction licence, but the Water Act 2003 ended this exemption.”</p> <p>We are waiting for government direction, but it is anticipated that this change will come into force over the next few years. The minerals industry will be made aware of the timeline when the consultation is published (date TBC). Changes to information Designations may change over the lifetime of the document (and new groundwater Source Protection Zones may be developed) so our comments made for this consultation are based on current conditions - which may change in time.</p>	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be complied with. The Mineral Sites Plan will be amended as suggested.
Wessex Water	2	Introduction	DMSP779	<p>The proposals set out the resources required over the plan period with assessment of existing sites and the preferred sites allocated to meet future demand. The site allocations are noted, however we have serious concerns over allocations at PK-08 Quarr Farm and the inclusion of PK-21 Gallows Gore.</p> <p>We have previously advised that Wessex Water has critical infrastructure at this location, which serves local communities with public water supplies. The proposed allocations indicate areas immediately adjacent existing Wessex Water site boundaries with storage reservoir and trunk mains directly affected from quarry operations. The addition of the new allocation at Gallows Gore introduces the prospect of stranded assets with quarry activity providing no local routes for existing trunk mains.</p> <p>Wessex Water has a statutory duty to maintain and repair these assets and we believe that our statutory obligations and operations will be injuriously affected by this development. In the circumstances we believe that this matter represents a material consideration and we lodge a formal objection to both of these site allocations.</p>		Your comments are noted. The Mineral Planning Authority will discuss this potential site allocation further with Wessex Water and if necessary further information will be sought from the site nominee.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

				<p>If these sites are to proceed we request that further detailed information with robust assessments are provided that will satisfy the concerns of the water undertaker. Insufficient information is available to provide any detailed comment at this stage. We request further discussion with the minerals planning authority to review these proposals and clarify our position. We will be seeking assurances that our assets can be safeguarded with any appropriate measures before the planning authority proceeds with these particular allocations.</p>		
<p>Cranborne Chase &amp; West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</p>	2	Introduction	DMSP914	<p>Thank you for consulting the AONB on your draft Mineral Sites Plan. The Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB has been established under the 1949 National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act to conserve and enhance the outstanding natural beauty of this area which straddles three County, one Unitary and five District councils. It is clear from the Act, subsequent government sponsored reports, and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 that natural beauty includes wildlife, scientific, and cultural heritage. It is also recognised that in relation to their landscape characteristics and quality, National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are equally important aspects of the nation's heritage assets and environmental capital.</p> <p>The AONB Management Plan is a statutory document that is approved by the Secretary of State and is adopted by the constituent councils. It sets out the Local Authorities Objectives and Policies for this nationally important area. The national Planning Practice Guidance [Natural Environment paragraph 004] confirms that the AONB and its Management Plan are material considerations in planning. The National Planning Policy Framework states (paragraph 109) that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes which include AONBs. Furthermore it should be recognised that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not automatically apply within AONBs, as confirmed by paragraph 14 footnote 9, due to other policies relating to AONBs elsewhere within the Framework. It also states (paragraph 115) that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in these areas. More detailed information in connection with AONB matters can be found on the AONB web site where there is not only the adopted AONB Management Plan but also Position Statements and Good Practice Notes (Planning Related Publications).</p> <p>In particular when considering construction within the AONB I would draw attention to our Good Practice Note on Colour in the Countryside As I am confident you will be aware the AONB Management Plan has been adopted by your Authority and is a material planning consideration. I note that only a few mineral sites are either close to or within this AONB. However, the potential loss of tranquillity, a key attribute of this AONB, is a great concern. Transportation of minerals through this AONB is a cause of considerable concern to a number of communities as well as the AONB Partnership. I note that transportation of minerals does not appear to have been addressed specifically in your draft Mineral Sites Plan. As this is a key issue in relation to the extraction and utilisation of minerals this seems to be a serious shortcoming. In connection with this AONB, mineral lorries transporting various aggregates, stone and recycled materials, should firstly be routed to the nearest A class road and then restricted to major and A class roads for distribution. The AONB would be extremely concerned if there were to be any indication that any of the existing or proposed sites would lead to increased HGV use of lower class and unclassified road and thereby impacting adversely on the tranquillity of this AONB and its communities. Adopting the Work Related Road Risk (WRRR) Code in relation to construction industry HGVs could be a way of restricting the routes used. As a general point I would observe that the comments in relation to the restoration of the substantial extensions being proposed to existing sites, as well as for the restoration proposals for the extensive areas apparently currently being mined, are far too vague.</p>	Comment	Your comment is noted.
<p>Imerys Minerals Ltd</p>	2	Introduction	DMSP694	<p>The representations submitted on 21/09/15 have been made to draw Imerys concerns to the attention of the Mineral Planning Authority and its Officers. There are fundamental issues which need to be considered further and Imerys would welcome an opportunity to discuss the content of these representations with Officers as soon as possible.</p>	Comment	Your comment is noted.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Dorset Local Access Forum	2	Introduction	DMSP868	<p>I am responding to the consultation on the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole draft Mineral Sites Plan and the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole draft Waste Plan, on behalf of the Dorset Local Access Forum.</p> <p>We are an independent statutory body, created under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, with a remit to promote public access to and usage of the countryside. We also have a statutory duty to offer advice to the public bodies listed in S94 of the Act, which includes the three Authorities sponsoring your Plan.</p> <p>The LAF is pleased to note the removal from the updated version of your Mineral Sites Plan of a number of sites of access and recreational importance, particularly Gore Heath. We also note that all proposed sites will be subject to the normal planning process in due course, and may wish to comment further at that stage.</p> <p>There are some general points which apply to all or most of the proposed sites:- Some of the proposed sites intersect PROWs which will need to be subject to a formal diversion process. We would hope that these diversions [whether permanent or temporary] can be carried out in ways that improves usability by the public. If that is not physically possible then they must be rendered no less useable than at present. Whilst in respect of some sites it is stated that restoration should include 'public access uses' this formalism is not used consistently. We would prefer to see consistent incorporation of words stating that any public access provided as a result of restoration of a site should aspire to show an improvement over what may have existed prior to the site coming in to use.</p> <p>The matter of HGVs using country roads to access new sites is mentioned to the extent that transport assessments are generally required as part of the application process. In some cases, where existing roads are particularly narrow, specific statements have been made as to the routing of quarry traffic. Whilst we support this, we would also expect that in the case of new operations it should be a condition that all HGVs visiting the site comply with the most up to date safety specification, and thence provide maximum protection to cyclists. [This would go further than the recommendation of employing good practice in Appendix A p62, para 5].</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted, and a form of words will be considered.</p> <p>The Mineral Planning Authority also note your comment re lorry safety, but the Mineral Sites Plan is not the document to set out such requirements.</p>
Gillingham Town Council	2	Introduction	DMSP746	I can confirm that the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Sites Plan was considered by Gillingham Town Council at a meeting on 14th September 2015. The Town Council agreed to support the draft document.	Comment	Your support is noted.
Sherborne Town Council	2	Introduction	DMSP543	Sherborne Town Councils working group formed to consider both the Mineral and Waste Plans have now done so with the outcome that Sherborne Town Council does not wish to make any comments in relation to either document.	Comment	Your comment is noted.
North Dorset District Council	2	Introduction	DMSP544	Members of the North Dorset Planning Policy Panel considered their responses to the consultation on the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Mineral Sites Plan at their meeting on 9 September 2015. I hope that these comments [Questions 1 - 9) are helpful to you. Should you require further detail relating to these comments then the report presented to the Planning Policy Panel may be viewed at: <a href="https://www.dorsetforyou.com/media/207804/20150909---Full-Agenda/pdf/20150909_-_Full_Agenda.pdf">https://www.dorsetforyou.com/media/207804/20150909---Full-Agenda/pdf/20150909_-_Full_Agenda.pdf</a>	Comment	Your input is noted.
East Dorset Friends Of The Earth	2	Introduction	DMSP790	Strongly recommend that where the application is for the extension of an existing operation, the allocation should not be made until the operator has successfully remediated part of the existing works to the satisfaction of the relevant local authority.	Disagree	Your comment is noted. This is normal practice.
Resident	2	Introduction	DMSP580	What are 'Sustainability objectives'?	Comment	Your comment is noted. The Glossary will include a reference to this term

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

<p>Ramblers Association - Dorset Area</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Introduction</p>	<p>DMSP749</p> <p>I am responding to the above consultation on behalf of the Ramblers, Dorset Area, having viewed the documents on-line, and some as hard copies. I also attended one of the public exhibitions that were held throughout the County. I do not have expertise in any technical or strategic fields in association with either of these consultations, therefore my comments will relate solely to issues concerning public rights of way and access, and matters connected with those. I will therefore not be commenting on the scope or period of the Plans.</p> <p>The objectives of the Ramblers are: To promote and encourage the provision and protection of footpaths and other ways over which the public have a right of way or access on foot, including the prevention of obstruction of public rights of way. To protect and enhance the beauty of the countryside and other areas, including the provision, preservation and extension of public access to land on foot. To advance the education of the public in subjects relating to access to, and the preservation and conservation of, the countryside and of the health benefits of outdoor recreational pursuits.</p> <p>We also acknowledge the ongoing requirement for mineral extraction to provide the essential materials for the industry, and sites for waste disposal/recycling. That having been said, these processes should involve local communities and recreational user groups, to ensure adequate countryside protection. Wherever there are public rights of way (PROW) directly or indirectly affected by any of the proposals, due legal process must be followed if there is any likelihood that operations will prevent use of these by the public. This also applies to Open Access Land.</p> <p>Draft Mineral Sites Plan There are specific sites that are shown to have PROW in the vicinity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PK02: Blacklands Quarry Extension. It is noted that the Priests Way (SE16/20) to the north has been recognised as a consideration, which is welcomed.</li> <li>• PK17: Home Field. The same bridleway is affected by this site, in close proximity to the above.</li> <li>• PK19: Broadmead Field. Footpath S29/9 runs north/south along the western edge of this site, which in turn links with the aforementioned Priests Way (now SE29/10) via SE29/24.</li> <li>• BS-04: Frogden Quarry, Osborne. This is in the vicinity of bridleway N7/17 to the west and the UCR Underdown Lane to the east.</li> </ul> <p>Of those sites listed as either potential or not allocated, of particular interest are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PK16: Swanworth Quarry extension. The Purbeck Way (SE11/83 SE29/19) runs roughly north/south alongside this potential extension (as it does the existing quarry). We support its exclusion, but should it become viable, then consideration will need to be given to this PROW.</li> <li>• AS08: Horton Heath, Three Legged Cross. As this site is yet to be assessed, I would wish to bring to your attention that there are several PROW within the locality of both identified sites. That to the north-west has a bridleway through the centre (E59/15), a bridleway to the east (E59/29) and a footpath to the south (E59/33). The site to the south-east has two bridleways forming the V shape; E46/30 and E46/32. All of these and their onward links will need to be taken into consideration.</li> </ul> <p>I do have one comment to make about the individual site descriptions and associated maps: on many the grid references do not agree, or are totally incorrect. For example, BS-04 where the grid reference on page 108 is given as ST649 183 and the map as SY646 118.</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Further consideration will be given to these sites and potential impacts (and their mitigation) on PROW.</p>
<p>Resident</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Introduction</p>	<p>DMSP890</p> <p>Having lived through more than 60 years of Mining in the Avon Valley north of Ringwood, I know what a problem it is to find new mineral sites. In view of the issues that have arisen here such as paths promised to local people that in fact become permissive paths only open for a few months each year because we might disturb ducks. In another case a 151 page Section 106 Agreement and Legal Agreement for conservation lakes has proved to be unenforceable by Hampshire County Council Solicitors due to the poor wording. Bunds around the flooded pits that increase local flooding. I urge you to make sure every word of the planning and landscape agreements is in order.</p> <p>One other point is about the site Avon Common by the spur road. I think I am correct in stating that Tarmac have mothballed the site in order to concentrate work at Plumley Quarry, Ringwood Forest. Also there is no access road planned to be put in place during the current road works on the Spur Road.</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

East Dorset Friends Of The Earth	2	Introduction	DMSP1199	There is no information in this document about oil and gas proposals other than safeguarding. Is this no longer a local responsibility? Are the Councils' agreed policies in the Minerals Strategy for this matter enforceable or will they still inform and influence government decisions on Oil and Gas in Dorset?	Comment	There are no specific oil and gas proposals. Hydrocarbon exploration and development is covered in the Minerals Strategy.
Purbeck District Council	2	Introduction	DMSP1304	The first mention of green belt appears to be on page 28, but many of the sites listed on page 17 are also in the green belt. Purbeck District Council believes it should be mentioned on page 17, MS-1 (sand and gravel sites), MS-4 (ball clay sites) and the relevant appendix maps. It may be worth focussing a bit more on the green belt generally, at the very least mentioning paragraph 90 of the National Planning Policy Framework's requirements for openness.	Comment	Thank you for your comment. We will give further consideration to whether a specific mention to Green Belt issues is required in this Plan.
Purbeck District Council	2	Introduction	DMSP1308	There is little, if any, mention of archaeology. This is particularly relevant in areas, such as Worth Matravers. Purbeck District Council believes archaeology should feature more strongly in the document, not only in policies, but also in appendix 1.		Your comment is noted. The importance of archaeology generally is covered in the 2014 Minerals Strategy, including a specific policy. Where there a relevant and specific archaeology issues affecting a particular site, these are generally mentioned in the emerging MSP.
Purbeck District Council	2	Introduction	DMSP1309	<p><b>Noise.</b> A scheme of noise and vibration assessment and control must be provided to inform the design of the site at the planning application stage. The scheme must identify any potential noise or vibration impacts and demonstrate how, so far as is possible, these impacts will be eliminated, mitigated or controlled. A scheme shall, as a minimum, contain information and assessment as outlined in Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework and take into account any changes in national guidance, European guidance and scientific or technical knowledge that exist at the time the application and assessment is undertaken.</p> <p>The site will need to be worked in a sensitive and phased manner with consideration given to: ∅ The location of plant and machinery to utilise natural and operational features to provide effective screening from the closest noise sensitive receptors; ∅ Utilising appropriately designed acoustic screening, baffle mounds and where appropriate, reasonable and practicable locating any unavoidable noise or vibration generating activities away from sensitive receptors.</p> <p><b>Blasting.</b> Blasting is often a major cause of concern to residents close to mineral workings. Disturbance is dependent on the quantity of explosive used, the distance to the receptor, the geology of the site and atmospheric conditions. Measures to reduce the impact of blasting at mineral extraction sites could include planning operations so that blasting does not take place during unsociable hours, notifying residents in advance, the use of correct stemming, avoiding the use of surface detonation cord where possible, avoiding secondary blasting and the use of screen nets.</p> <p><b>Air Quality (dust).</b> A robust Dust Management Plan (DMP) will need to be provided to support any subsequent planning application process. This DMP must demonstrate that dust emissions are identified and that any potential health or nuisance impacts are eliminated or mitigated so far as is possible. The DMP shall, as a minimum, contain information and assessment as outlined in Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework and take into account any changes in national guidance, European guidance and scientific or technical knowledge that exist at the time the application and assessment is undertaken. Where appropriate, reasonable and practicable, dust generating activities should be located away from dust sensitive receptors. An air quality assessment shall be provided to support any subsequent planning application process. This should, as a minimum, incorporate an assessment of nitrogen dioxide and particulate emissions from the operation of the site and associated on and off site vehicle movements. The assessment must identify so far as is possible any possible health or environmental impacts and demonstrate how these may be eliminated or mitigated.</p>	Comment	Your comment is noted. These are relevant points to be considered in minerals applications, but do not necessarily need to be set out in the Mineral Sites Plan itself.
Resident.	3	Vision, Objectives and Strategy	DMSP1027	It not our vision, just greed.	Disagree	Your comment is noted.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Dorset Local Access Forum	3	Vision, Objectives and Strategy	DMSP872	Chapter 3 on the 'Vision, Objectives & Strategy' should be strengthened to include a paragraph about improvements to public access in general, both during the development and exploitation of sites and subsequently as part of their restoration. In addition it should also confirm that full public consultation will be carried out on all detailed applications for sites.	Comment	General comments on access improvements are included in the 2014 Minerals Strategy. It is a legal requirement that consult is carried out on all planning applications.
Resident.	3	Vision, Objectives and Strategy	DMSP581	3. Vision, Objectives and Strategy 3.1 provide a level of certainty to local residents. Our house prices will have fallen anyway and this certainty will assist this. 4.5 This will also mean we will have to battle with planning permission for 15 years to come. Question 1 - Why should be extra 4 years matter for us? Damage would be done already.	Comment	Your comment is noted.
Bournemouth Water	4	Existing and Proposed Mineral Sites	DMSP5	Dear Sir/Madam Thank you for providing the above Mineral Sites plan strategy for comment. From the information provided on the Dorset for you web portal and from our initial responses I can confirm it appears that within the plan there are areas in our supply region that could be affected, I have copied these areas below.  In particular we have strategically important water mains within the vicinity of Roeshot in Christchurch. It is vitally important that you liaise further with us should you consider proceeding with any activity within this allocated site. Please be aware that there may be private water pipes that exist within the boundary of the highlighted sites which we do not own and care should be taken when undertaking any excavation work. This pipework and its maintenance is the responsibility of the site owners who should be contacted separately for their comments.  Protection/diversion works to our distribution pipe network can only be confirmed once we have received formal applications and plans of the highlighted areas below, this will allow us to make a judgement on any works required. For your information I enclose a plan showing the extent of our area of supply. If you have any query or require more information, please contact me. Kind regards Andy Andrew Thunder Network Developer Services Supervisor Network Operations Bournemouth Water  <b>Sand and Gravel:</b> Hurn Court Farm Quarry, Hurn - approximately 600,000 tonnes (Inset Map AS-09) Roeshot, Christchurch - approximately 3.5 million tonnes (Inset Map AS-13) Land at Horton Heath (Inset Map AS-08)  <b>Recycled Aggregate:</b> Canford Recycled Aggregates Washing Plant, Canford, Poole Whites Pit Landfill Recycling Site, Canford, Poole (Inset Map RA-01)	Comment	Your comment is noted. The presence of water mains will be noted against the relevant proposed site allocations.
Resident.	4	Existing and Proposed Mineral Sites	DMSP4	Having trouble understanding information given, too much to print off can you send a hard copy. Very interested in any development along Bere Road, Wareham, both Waste Landfill and Mineral Extraction. I feel that we suffer enough with the Landfill lorries as it is. Together with the fires and smells from Trigon Landfill and the extra traffic along an unsuitable road - Bere Road is not even on the Snow Clearing route. It is a residential area with THREE holiday caravan parks plus one residential park.	Comment	Your comment is noted. Should any sites be allocated in this area, the existing development will be taken into consideration.
Highways England	4	Existing and Proposed Mineral Sites	DMSP569	Highways England welcomes the statement making it clear that planning consent for allocated sites will still need to be secured. This of course will need to be supported by a robust transport evidence base.  We consider the Development Considerations information provided with each site to be useful, and note that issues identified for each site will be addressed, and impacts mitigated, although no detail is able to be provided at this stage on how this will be done.	Comment	Your comment is noted.
Somerset County Council	4	Existing and Proposed Mineral Sites	DMSP724	We support the Dorset Minerals Sites Plan 2015 and have only one comment to make at this stage. In paragraph 4.8 a list of sites is included for the sand and gravel sites with planning permission. It is unclear why the Chard Junction site has not been included in this list. Whilst the site may not have plans for extension, nonetheless it contributes towards current supply and thus presumably should be included.	Comment	This site was omitted in error, and will be included in the Submission Draft.

East Stoke Parish Council	4	Existing and Proposed Mineral Sites	DMSP865	<p>East Stoke has numerous sites that have been shortlisted within the plan. The Parish Council is aware that there is an acute shortage of minerals and it is essential that they are extracted. But, consideration must be taken into account the amount of excessive overdevelopment that has either taken place or is at the planning stage within the Parish to the north of the A352.</p> <p>The urbanisation includes a solar farm and one that has just submitted planning permission, wind turbines that have had the planning approved as well as these two potential mineral sites at Binnegar and Hethfelton Woods. With these proposed plans the area will irrevocably change from a rural agricultural landscape to an industrialised zone. This will not only impact East Stoke but the blot on the landscape would destroy the panoramic view from the Purbeck Hills, which is greatly admired by both locals and visitors alike.</p> <p><b>Hethfelton Woods (The Great Plantation)</b></p> <p>It is difficult for the Parish Council to comment on this site as the size of the proposed land has not yet been formally agreed by Dorset CC as discussions with the relevant parties have not taken place yet. The Parish Council agrees with Natural England that the original proposal is too large. The Magic Map that is managed by Natural England shows that it contains three SSSIs which is part of the larger Stokeford Heath SSSI and four ancient monuments which includes a section of the Battery Bank and two bowl barrow sites.</p> <p>The bowl barrows date from the Late Neolithic period to the Late Bronze Age and Battery bank is likely to be of Romano-British or Dark Age date. Stokeford Heaths is one of a collection of sites which together comprise the Dorset heathlands. Although these heathlands have declined dramatically and now only make up 14% of their original area they show a high degree of ecological cohesion and clear ecological trends and patterns. This complex is one of the major lowland heathland areas in Britain and is of international importance for its plant and animal communities. The site supports important populations of two endangered and protected reptiles; sand lizard <i>Lacerta agilis</i> which like isolated sites within conifer plantations and smooth snake <i>Coronella austriaca</i>. Within the Stokeford Heath as a whole it supports 3 to 4% of the national population of sand lizards. It is an important breeding ground for nightjars and other rare birds as well as a proliferation of butterflies.</p> <p>As a whole Dorset has a large number of visitors, especially during the summer months. Hethfelton Wood is a rare area in Dorset which even in the height of the holiday season is a tranquil location which provides a valued amenity for the discerning visitor. The preservation of such a location is vital so it maintains an ideal habitat for these rare species. Due to the dispersed locations of both the ecological and historical sites, it would be impossible to excavate without damaging these protected areas. Also, the works carried out would include removal of trees this would potentially increase the already high level of flooding, a recurrent problem along the A352. The Parish Council are not confident that a satisfactory restoration will take place in the future even with conditions being imposed. After the excavation work there will be huge voids in the ground where it was once previously flat and it would be impractical to fill them back in.</p> <p><b>Binnegar Quarry</b></p> <p>The area suffers from a high risk of flooding due to various springs located to the north of the A352. It is felt that the extraction would aggravate the problems even with the proposed creation of a natural valley with two gullies to transport the water. The biodiversity of the land is extremely varied, including nightjars, woodlarks and ten species of bats. There is an ephemeral pool which is dominated by the perennial herb pennyroyal (<i>Mentha pulegium</i>). This is a very rare plant which in 1999 was only considered to still be present in 12 hectares of land within the UK. It is classified as Endangered in the IUCN UK Red List and is a UK Biodiversity Action Plan priority Species. It is also fully protected under Schedule 8 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act. Due to the large presence of pennyroyal the Ecological Assessment states that it "qualifies the site for notification as a Site of Special Scientific Interest and therefore this feature is of national significance". If the application goes ahead, then the tree density will need to be sufficient enough to act as a visual barrier in the winter months when viewed from the A352.</p>	Disagree	Your comments are noted, and have been included in the specific comments associated with the proposed allocation.
Resident.	4	Existing and Proposed Mineral Sites	DMSP582	4 Existing and Proposed Mineral Sites 4.2 Highlighting the Puddletown Policy area as an area where extraction will be encouraged is unnecessary and does not help the residents. It may help the Council but not their tax payers. 4.5 Did you consult with the local community before you invented the Puddletown Road Policy area?	Comment	The recent consultation was a consult with the public and the local community



Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Resident.	4	Existing and Proposed Mineral Sites	DMSP889	<p>I object vehemently to these proposed quarry sites. I am part of the equine world which use these beautiful forests and surrounding areas and cannot contemplate the disaster these sites would bring. The loss of the landscape, the wild life and the ensuing destruction of farm land which will never recover, is simply mindless butchery. And for what ?? It's serves no one, but the landowner, who will be gleefully lining his pockets, whilst his own remaining acres, go untouched. It's beyond my comprehension that the council are even allowing this to be proposed.</p>	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Highways England	4.1	Sand and Gravel	DMSP571	<p>Highways England notes that Policy ASI of the Minerals Strategy provides that the supply of locally extracted sand and gravel will be sourced from existing permitted sites, new sites identified in the Minerals Sites Plan and new sites not yet identified but that meet certain criteria.</p> <p>Sites allocated through MS-I Sites for the provision of Sand and Gravel as either new sites or extensions to existing: Binnegar Quarry AS01 Great Plantation AS06 Hurn Court Farm Quarry, Hurn AS09 Roeshot, Christchurch AS13 Tatchells Quarry, Wareham AS15 Woodford Quarry, Woodsford AS19 Trigon Hill Extension AS22 Station Road, Moreton AS25 Hurst Farm, Moreton AS26 Sites AS1, 6, 9, 19 and 22 as stated in previous representations are adjacent to existing operations.</p> <p>We note from previous evidence that operational workings won't take place until adjacent workings cease. Whilst this offers some comfort, depending on the traffic impact there may need to be policy clauses or planning conditions ensuring that this is the case.</p> <p>Sites AS25 and AS26, both in Moreton have the potential to impact on the A35, however no trip information, distribution, or assessment of potential impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) has been done, so other than identify potential concerns Highways England is unable to comment further.</p> <p>With regard to sites AS13 we would have some concerns due to its proximity (3,1 miles from the A31(T)) and would need to see more information relating to trip generation and distribution, particularly at Townsend Roundabout. We note that Horton Heath has only just been resubmitted as a possible site so possible impacts have not yet been considered, and its inclusion is for information only. Before we can comment specifically on this we would need an indication as to the trip generation and distribution.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>It will be a requirement that site extensions are not begun until existing sites are completed.</p> <p>Work on impacts assessment on the Moreton sites is currently being commissioned.</p> <p>Site AS13, if it is ultimately worked, will be a follow on from the Hampshire side of the site. The issues of traffic impacts will be addressed as part of that application.</p>
The Crown Estate	4.1	Sand and Gravel	DMSP646	<p>The National and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005-2020 prepared by the Department for Communities &amp; Local Government (DCLG) (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7763/aggregatesprovision2020.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7763/aggregatesprovision2020.pdf</a>) includes figures which have increased the assumptions made for the contribution of marine supply over the 2005-2020 period by 14%, from 14mt per annum to 16mt.</p> <p>This signals the increasing role government expects marine supplies to play going forwards over the plan period and beyond, subject to market conditions. We note that the adopted Minerals Strategy makes reference to the contribution that cross boundary mineral movements make to a sustainable supply, including marine dredged sand and gravel. Although external to the plan area, we feel it may be helpful for this Sites Plan to make reference to this cross boundary supply, as it provides important context in terms of overall supply. We see that reference to the significance of marine-won materials in Dorset to complement the land-won material, would better help to reflect and deliver the direction of the overarching Minerals Core Strategy. In addition, we take this opportunity to note that there is no reference made to beach nourishment in terms of the supply of suitable material in this Plan.</p>	Comment	Your comments are noted. It is considered that the most appropriate place for comment on the importance of marine aggregate supply is the Minerals Strategy and no further comment is required in the Mineral Sites Plan, which primarily focusses on site allocation.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Crossways Parish Council	4.1	Sand and Gravel	DMSP962	<p><b>Background:</b> A Consultation has emerged on the mineral sites plan. The mineral plan includes preferred sites for mineral extraction, an area in search of sand and gravel and further guidance on mineral sites safeguarding. According to the draft plan, the combined reserves of the following sites with planning permissions are estimated at 12 million tons in April 2015. Binnegar Quarry Dorey's Pit Hines Pit Hyde Pit Masters' North and South Trigon Hill Warmwell Quarry This is based on an estimated demand, situated around 1.56 million tonnes per year. As part of a 10 year plan, meeting the provisions of sand and gravel demands between 2017 and 2028, an additional 5.2 million tonnes will have to be provided through new allocations. In the case of a 15 years plan, meeting the same provisions will require an additional 11.4 million tonnes through new allocations. (ref: Draft MSP part 1 p16).</p> <p>The following sites have been allocated and are estimated to be able to supply 17 million tonnes: Binnegar Quarry, Binnegar - approximately 4.8 million tonnes (Inset Map AS-01) Great Plantation - extraction area and volume of mineral to be extracted subject to further assessment (Inset Map AS-06). Development of this site to be considered in conjunction with other permitted but un-worked aggregate reserves in the vicinity. Hurn Court Farm Quarry, Hurn - approximately 600,000 tonnes (Inset Map AS-09) Roeshot, Christchurch - approximately 3.5 million tonnes (Inset Map AS-13) Tatchells Quarry, Wareham - approximately 380,000 tonnes (Inset Map AS-15) Woodsford Quarry, Woodsford - approximately 2.1 million tonnes (Inset Map AS-19) Trigon Hill Extension - approximately 600,000 tonnes (Inset Map AS-22) Station Road, Moreton - approximately 2.4 million tonnes (Inset Map AS-25) Hurst Farm, Moreton - approximately 2.6 million tonnes (Inset map AS-26)</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>It is appropriate to raise concerns but a balance must be struck between the identification and supply of aggregate.</p> <p>All sites will have some level of impact, and the Mineral Planning Authority will consider at the plan preparation whether it is likely that impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.</p> <p>At the planning application this will be tested and assessed in detail and if it is found that the impacts cannot be mitigate the site will not be developed.</p>
Purbeck District Council	4.1	Sand and Gravel	DMSP1303	Figure 1: the West Dorset boundary is not shown on the map.	Comment	Your comment is noted, the Draft Plan will be amended.
Highways England	4.3	Recycled Aggregate	DMSP574	We note that no new sites additional to those with existing planning permission are proposed to be allocated through the Minerals Sites Plan. We do however note the wording of Policy MS-3, whereby White s Pit in Poole may be developed for the production of recycled aggregates whether through the consolidation of existing operations or by other means. We are encouraged by the requirements to mitigate all adverse impacts to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority. If this was to include potential impacts on the SRN we would wish to be kept informed of this.	Comment	Your comments are noted and the Mineral Planning Authority will continue to liaise with Highways England.
Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	4.3	Recycled Aggregate	DMSP916	In the section relating to Recycled Aggregates, Down End Farm to the north of Blandford, which is within this AONB, is identified. The AONB is concerned that landscape conditions in relation to previous planning permissions have not been implemented within the defined timescales and a number of extensions of time have been sought. This appears to indicate that the scale of activities is, in reality, somewhat less than envisaged by the mineral planning authority. The AONB would, therefore, be very concerned about any extension of activity there, above and beyond those that actually occur. Furthermore, the HGV use of this site, within an AONB renowned for its tranquillity, is a particular negative factor. As I have already mentioned HGVs should be directed to the shortest route to major and A class roads when utilising the site.	Comment	This site is not proposed for development.
Halletec Environmental Ltd	4.3	Recycled Aggregate	DMSP1035	While there is no requirement for a specific landbank, it would be prudent for the Mineral Sites Plan to acknowledge the shortfalls in recycled inert aggregate facilities and potential quarry landfill space noted in the Draft Waste Plan. It is not feasible to provide a landbank for recycled aggregates because the market is entirely driven by circumstances outside the control of the inert waste recycling industry. The market is driven by the volume of construction activity and furthermore, the character of the waste generated by that activity. For example major redevelopment of urban areas is more likely to generate large volumes of potentially recyclable inert waste than will a large civil engineering or road-building project.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Highways England	4.4	Ball Clay	DMSP575	Policy MS4 identifies one existing site at Trigon Hill that will contribute to the supply of ball clay. We note that the site must demonstrate that impacts resulting from its development and/or restoration can be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority which we would assume would include possible traffic impacts on the Strategic Road Network (SRN). We look forward to seeing the results of the Transport Assessment work to ensure that there are no severe impacts on the SRN.	Comment	Your comments are noted and the Mineral Planning Authority will continue to liaise with Highways England.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

RSPB, South West Regional Office	4.4	Ball Clay	DMSP1005	It would be useful in addition to highlighting the development considerations for each allocation that they have also been subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment. This could also be mentioned in paragraph 4.5 following the comment about EIA.	Comment	Your comments are noted and reference to the HRA will be made.
Highways England	4.5	Purbeck Stone	DMSP576	Policy MS-5 lists the new sites and extensions to existing sites allocated to contribute to the adequate and steady supply of Purbeck Stone as follows: Blacklands quarry Extension, Langton Matravers Quarr Farm, Harmans Cross Southard Quarry, Swanage Downs Quarry Extension, Langton Matravers Home Field, Acton Quarry 4 Extension, Acton Broadmead Field, Langton Matravers Gallows Gore, Harmans Cross Given the distance of the sites and or the relatively small scale and therefore traffic generation, Highways England has no comment to make at this stage.	Comment	Noted.
Corfe Castle Parish Council	4.5	Purbeck Stone	DMSP434	Members of Corfe castle Parish Council attended one of the Councils recent presentations and met a planning officer to particularly discuss proposed new quarries and extension quarries in Purbeck. We do appreciate the importance quarries have to the area, particularly to employment and their historic significance. Unfortunately, there is only one main road leading to the quarry locations and this passes through Corfe Castle with its significant population, large numbers of year round tourists and busy traffic, including the movements from and to the quarries .In addition the road is particularly narrow in the centre of the village.. In adopting any new Minerals Plan, we do urge the County Council to reflect on these issues and impose conditions in any planning approvals which ensure there is no increase to the existing traffic burden of quarry traffic.	Comment	Your comments are noted. Most of the proposed sites on the Purbeck Plateau are extensions and will not be worked until the current quarries are completed. If new sites are developed, the issue of cumulative traffic impacts will be carefully considered.
Resident.	4.5	Purbeck Stone	DMSP946	Sensitive Human Receptor' i.e. residential property i.e. people living in close proximity to quarrying/open cast mining. The existing working quarries have actively moved nearer to residential properties. The top end of Haycrafts Lane is now an actual settlement on a small scale, which if you look at map from an aerial view, once can see will be completely surrounded by quarries, if either Quarr Farm PK08 or Gallows Gore PK21 is allowed. Residents continue to cooperate with the existing workings at Landers and Lovell's Quarries. However we are still in the process of trying to get a bund to the north of properties Wagtail Cottage and Jestys which is a condition of the latest application of Landers Quarry granted July 2015. This indicative of the problems, where there appears to be no effective monitoring or policing / enforcement of conditions. The earth bund at Lovell's quarry to the west has lessened the impact for us. Issues of noise and dust pollution do not appear to be addressed comprehensively in the plan. Screening on its own will not be effective - this is known from personal experience Further quarrying so close to existing workings that are not restored and are ongoing will result in impact on quality of life and affect property values. All in Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Comment	Your comments are noted and have been added to the comments on these specific site allocations.
East Dorset Friends Of The Earth	4.5	Purbeck Stone	DMSP763	The Minerals Strategy discourages new surface quarries on Portland and encourages mining of Portland Stone. In Portland in addition to the quarries there are three underground mines . . . Should underground mining be considered for the extraction of Purbeck Stone ?	Comment	Your comments are noted. Mining of Purbeck Stone used to be practiced but is not considered appropriate now.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Resident.	4.5	Purbeck Stone	DMSP629	<p>The reasons for this objection are as follows. Your notice says you have a need to identify enough sites to provide sufficient resources for the plan period up to 2032 but does not say why, or justify why, this massive increase in quarrying area is required.</p> <p>The new sites to be looked at represent a significant increase in what is already a huge area of quarrying. Sites are all over these hills and while I accept this could be considered a traditional industrial use of the land it still contravenes, and flies in the face of, everything in the Purbeck local plan aimed at protecting the intrinsic natural beauty and wildlife of the area. This proposal further increases the unacceptable scale of quarrying in this area changing it from regular blots on the landscape to something that completely overpowers and degrades the intrinsic wholesomeness of the area. This area is an AONB and its exposed elevations and proximity to tourist honey pots such as the priests way (recently recovered at significant expense to the tax payer) and Jurassic Coast world heritage site, will be plagued and overpowered by these new quarries. The existing quarries are not conforming with planning conditions and are being run in a poor and untidy fashion (see photographs attached taken from the Priests Way) with the introduction of shabby steel containers for lock ups without planning consent, portable toilets, dumps of old equipment, heaps of old tyres and rubbish that are easily visible from public areas and footpaths. If they are not willing to be sensitive to the beauty of this area, and act in an appropriate fashion given their fortunate position of being allowed to carry on works that otherwise contravene the local plan now, what hope is there in the future?</p> <p>To avoid any confusion the plan lists the sites as PK02 Blacklands, PK17 Home Field and PK18 Quarry for extension and the photographs were taken in that area. Swanworth Quarry is already a massive and disproportionate scar on the Purbeck landscape. It is more reminiscent of open cast mining for bauxite in Australia not quarrying in Purbeck. More stone means more lorry movements on small country roads and through villages, more noise, more pollution, more industrialisation, more loss of amenity value of the landscape to locals and tourists and greater adverse impacts on wildlife and climate change. The loss in tourist income due to a degrading of reputation for the area away from a lovely place to walk and enjoy the natural beauty, tranquillity and wildlife will be significant to everyone in the area. The linking of the exercise as minerals and waste is deeply worrying. Can any assurances be made that these quarries would not become landfill sites of the future?</p> <p>These site are on or close to sites of antiquity that shall be destroyed or adversely effected by this proposal. The proposed sites are within a single field of residential houses threatening residents peaceful enjoyment of their property. Questions have been asked of the effects quarrying so close to properties might have on health, air and water quality. For these reasons I believe the suggestion to expand these quarries in this fashion should be thrown out.</p>	Disagree	<p>Your comments are noted. Purbeck Stone quarrying is a traditional land use and employment in this area and the Mineral Planning Authority seeks to ensure that it can continue in a way that minimises impacts.</p> <p>If any of the sites are ultimately included as allocations these issues will be addressed in detail and if impacts cannot be mitigated the sites will not be developed.</p> <p>There is no landfill of household waste proposed in this Plan, or in this area.</p>
Resident.	4.5	Purbeck Stone	DMSP766	<p>We would like to endorse many of the comments made by Worth Matravers PC. In principle we support responsible quarrying in the area. However, we are concerned that this consultation has not correctly labelled the location of PK08, PK15, PK19, and PK21, all of which lie in Worth Matravers Parish, and are adjacent to the Gallows Gore settlement.</p> <p>We concur with Worth Matravers PC that the cumulative effect of quarrying these sites on residential properties should prevent concurrent approval being granted to them. We also believe that no valid consultation on PK08 and PK21 can take place until a precise access route has been proposed. 4.61 rules out Haycrafts Lane and suggests that 'The preferred access route is from Gallows Gore across adjoining land to connect directly with the B3069 Kingston Road'.</p> <p>This vague statement has led Worth Matravers PC mistakenly to conclude that the track beside Annsfield is being considered as an access route. As the land owners we'd like to clarify that no permission for this has been sought from us, and none would be granted if we were ever asked. If the planning authority does believe it has a viable alternative access route then this should be clearly identified in the consultation so that those affected have the opportunity to comment.</p>	Disagree	<p>Your comments are noted</p> <p>Cumulative impacts will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>The alternative access to the Gallows Gore site is not intended to be over the existing track – this will be clarified, if necessary, in subsequent drafts of the Plan.</p>
Purbeck District Council	4.5	Purbeck Stone	DMSP1305	<p>Paragraph 4.53: there is no mention of conservation areas, e.g. Acton, whose setting could be affected by minerals development.</p>		<p>Your comment is noted - further consideration will be given and the presence of the Conservation Area referred to as may be necessary</p>

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Highways England	4.6	Portland Stone	DMSP577	<p>Policy MS-6 identifies Bowers Mine Extension, St George s Road, as an extension to the current mine. Given its distance from the Strategic Road Netowrk (SRN) and that it is thought no intensification of the current use is expected, we do not at this stage have concerns as to the site in terms of its impact on the SRN.</p>	Comment	Your comment is noted.
Highways England	4.7	Other Building Stone	DMSP578	<p>Policy MS-7 allocates 3 extensions as follows for the supply of building stone providing they satisfy all relevant development considerations Marnhull Quarry, Marnhull; Frogden Quarry, Osborne; and Whithill Quarry, Lillington.</p> <p>At this stage we note that they are all some distance from the Strategic Road Network (SRN). We note the requirement for an assessment of transport/access impacts of all three sites and would wish to be kept informed of this as the process develops.</p> <p>As with Horton Heath, we note that Redlands Quarry, Todber has only just been submitted as a possible site so possible impacts have not yet been considered, and its inclusion is for information only. Before we were able to comment specifically on this we would need an indication as to the trip generation and distribution.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>The Mineral Planning Authority will continue to liaise with the Highways Agency as the Plan is developed.</p>
Environment Agency	4.7	Other Building Stone	DMSP655	<p>No comment, other than Whithill Quarry lies in groundwater Source Protection Zone 2 (SPZ 2), which would need to be taken into account in the proposals for this site.</p>	Comment	Your comment is noted, reference will be made in the Draft Plan.
Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	4.7	Other Building Stone	DMSP917	<p>In the section on Other Building Stone I note that Manor Farm quarry Melbury Abbas has been identified. I also note that an extension of the site has been withdrawn. The AONB recognises the importance of local stone for conservation work and to enable extensions to existing structures to blend with the landscape. The AONB was very closely involved with the consideration of the current mineral planning permission and would be concerned about activities on a larger scale. As I have already mentioned the AONB strongly recommends that HGVs utilising sites such as this should be directed to the closest major or A class road and directed to use such arterial routes.</p>	Comment	Your comment is noted.
RSPB, South West Regional Office	5	Puddletown Road Area Policy	DMSP1018	<p><b>Puddletown Road Area Policy</b></p> <p>The RSPB welcome the inclusion of this chapter of the MSP. The chapter is well drafted and introduces the opportunities and benefits presented by a partnership approach to extraction, management and restoration of this area very well, and correctly identifies the significant wildlife and community benefits that could follow more integrated activity. It is also well supported by the Puddletown Road Background Paper. Consequently, we strongly support the inclusion of Policy MS-8.</p> <p>We would suggest the policy is re-worded to be more inclusive in terms of stakeholders interested in the progression of the policy. There appears to be a typographical error within bullet (ii).</p>	Agree	<p>Your support is noted.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to the suggested changes</p>
Resident.	5	Puddletown Road Area Policy	DMSP583	<p>Puddletown Road Area Policy MS-8: I want to see some restored heathland and acid grassland before any more excavation takes place. (Glossary - Restoration = The return of land to its former use or another suitable and beneficial new use, once mineral extraction from the land has been completed). Can heathland really thrive in a 30 meters deep hole? Perhaps you should show residents the restoration that has been completed to give them confidence and I see none to date that is significant. What is the timescale as this is not mentioned anywhere?</p> <p>(Site ref PD001, PD 003, PD004) I am unclear how the management of larger blocks of heathland would help the traffic management. Residents are not mentioned. Transport department/traffic management links within DCC are not mentioned. The numbers of vehicles using these roads are not mentioned. What is adverse transport? Have you linked with the proposed Waste Plan usage and road movements in this area too? Hydrology and hydrogeology are not mentioned but are significant in this area.</p> <p>Question 8 No. The boundary is ad-hoc. It includes residential homes and you have not consulted directly with individual house holders. Have you walked this site? How did you draw it up? It goes along the railway, south of the railway. There is no consideration to historic buildings in this policy. They are part of Dorset's heritage/visitor attraction and you seem to ignore them!</p>	Comment	<p>The Puddletown Road Area Policy encourages management and restoration at a larger scale than individual sites. There are no individual timescales. There are examples of restoration, and this policy seeks to improve restoration opportunities/work. Transport mitigation and management, along with heritage issues such as listed buildings, is covered in the 2014 Minerals Strategy and where relevant referred to for specific proposed allocations and in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The recent consultation was to give residents within the Puddletown Road Area Policy an opportunity to comment on the proposals. The boundary will be reviewed to make it follow features on the ground where possible.</p>

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Albion Stone PLC	6	Safeguarding	DMSP438	I am concerned that your mineral safeguarding is too focused on the existing sites and allocated sites within the limits of your plan. Mineral Safeguarding needs to safeguard nationally and internationally important mineral for future generations, not for the next few years. The Safeguarding policy needs to identify all important mineral reserves and safeguard them for future generations.	Comment	Your comment is noted. The 2014 Minerals Strategy establishes the principle of safeguarding and identifies the mineral reserve to be safeguarded. Safeguarding in the Draft Mineral Sites Plan refines this approach and seeks to offer greater protection to mineral sites.
RSPB, South West Regional Office	6	Safeguarding	DMSP1020	The appropriate buffer is likely to be dependent on the nature of the mineral activity. However for active minerals with heathland restoration potential, a buffer of a minimum 400m would be appropriate, given the understanding of urban effects on heathlands sites.	Comment	Your comment is noted. The 400m is possibly more relevant to protecting from residential development, which will not be the issue in every case.
Resident	6	Safeguarding	DMSP584	Safeguarding Where are the rail links, wharfage and associated storage that you mention? This is relevant for traffic movement and to residents. What happens at the Wool aggregate railhead currently? (PD 032 approx 100,000tpa). How many traffic movements supply this and where do they travel from? This is mentioned in the Waste management document but not here. Question 9 Buffer zone 250 meters or more. How does this affect the Puddletown Road Policy area houses?	Comment	Your comments are noted. Given the detailed nature of these comments, a specific meeting would be more appropriate to provide answers to these questions.
Chairman, East Dorset Environment Partnership	7	Sites Not Being Progressed	DMSP732	Sites not being progressed Section 7 and Appendix D p132 We welcome the exclusion of site AS-24 Purple Haze (South) Verwood for the reasons given and as expressed in our response to the Dec 2013 consultation. Although not in our area, we also support the exclusion of Moreton (AS-10) and Gore (AS-23) as this correctly applies the policy requirements of recognising the nature conservation constraints on these sites. Rejection of these 3 sites is fundamental to the soundness of the Plan.	Comment	Your comments are noted
Resident	7	Sites Not Being Progressed	DMSP614	The decision not to progress with Moreton, Gore or Purple Haze is supported as these three sites comprise lowland heathland or afforested lowland heath which could easily be restored by simple tree removal. Pursuing these sites would have resulted in the loss of internationally important habitat and species and/or the readily available opportunity to restore them. However the decision not to include Great Plantation in this deleted list is inconsistent and unacceptable. The exact same nature conservation constraints exist here as in the three sites above. Great Plantation should also appear as a site not to be progressed. Similarly Horton Heath should be a site not to be progressed rather than being registered as a recent site nomination.	Comment	Your comments are noted. Further consideration will be given to the Great Plantation and Horton Heath sites.
Resident	7	Sites Not Being Progressed	DMSP585	Sites not being progressed Because they are difficult and uneconomically viable for the commercial companies. Hydrology/hydrogeology issues.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	8	Implementation and Monitoring	DMSP605	We support the collection of annual production statistics but we are not convinced that all mineral operators will release accurate information which they may regard as sensitive or commercially confidential. A proper systematic collection process is needed here.	Disagree	
Resident	8	Implementation and Monitoring	DMSP586	Implementation and Monitoring: Implementation - again residents are not mentioned but their house prices have been affected. I am amazed that data collection is on an ad hoc basis. Annual production figures are essential. Roads - The waste Plan mentions the Dorset Strategic road network and primary routes. This is totally missing in this document. DCC transport department needs to be more involved with this industry than appears in this document.	Comment	Your comments are noted. Strategic transport issues are covered in the 2014 Minerals Strategy.
Land & Mineral Management Ltd	Figure 12	Safeguarded Mineral Sites and Infrastructure	DMSP63	Safeguarding Figure 12 - it appears that the Whites Pit inert recycling operation is safeguarded as it is noted as an Allocated site, but there is no marker shown on the plan indicating that it is an existing recycling site, nor is the existing inert recycling at the Site Control Centre shown. An objection is therefore made to the omission of both these operational aggregate recycling facilities from figure 12.	Disagree	Your comments are noted – this will be reviewed and amended as appropriate in the next draft of the Draft plan.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Historic England	Policy MS-1: Sites for the provision of sand and gravel		<p>All proposals for the development of these allocations will quantify the extent of all relevant development considerations, including those set out in Appendix A, and demonstrate that any adverse impacts will be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority. The evidence base highlights the sensitivity of these sites in relation to historic landscapes and individual heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>This policy test in Policy MS1 does not appear to reflect the adopted Minerals Strategy or national policy, guidance or legislation. Perhaps the policy might refer to other relevant considerations to be observed in the Dorset Minerals Strategy?</p> <p><i>'Sites will only be considered where it has been demonstrated that possible effects (including those related to hydrology, displacement of recreation, species, proximity, land management and restoration) that might arise from their development would not adversely affect the integrity of the Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Dorset Heathland Ramsar site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.'</i></p> <p>Policy MS1 refers to a limited number of factors to be considered to enable development to be permitted. It is unclear why this is the case and why only natural environment considerations are emphasised. As a consequence Policy MS1 fails to reflect the adopted Minerals Strategy and its agreed suite of Development Management policies - the criteria to be met to permit development.</p> <p>Historic England (formerly English Heritage) is anxious to ensure local and national policy is applied and legislative obligations are met.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Further consideration will be given to appropriate wording of this policy, and subsequent Drafts will reflect such changes.</p>
Chairman, East Dorset Environment Partnership	Policy MS-1: Sites for the provision of sand and gravel		<p>Policy MS-1.</p> <p>As we highlighted in our response to the previous Minerals Sites consultation, it is inappropriate to put forward afforested heathland functionally linked to the N2K Dorset Heaths. This functionality would be lost for the duration of the extraction and restoration periods and for decades after restoration. Heathland restoration is not simply a matter of re-seeding with Erica and Calluna species. It takes a long time for the heathland communities to establish. The Heathlands DPD recognises that mineral working destroys heathland habitat and disrupts hydrology. A requirement of the Bern Convention Recommendation No 67 (1998) of the Conservation of Heathlands in Dorset (para 10) is Ensure that mineral extraction does not take place on heathland.</p> <p>Recommendation: This principle should be established firmly and the commitment to the precautionary approach advocated in para 7.44 of the Minerals Strategy should be upheld.</p> <p>Thus, although not within the East Dorset area, we object strongly to the inclusion of (ii) Great Plantation (Inset Map AS-06). This proposed allocation includes open heathland as well as afforested heathland. The adverse cumulative impact of mineral extraction on the international nature conservation interests of the area would outweigh the benefits of obtaining the mineral resource from this location. Inclusion of this site in the proposals conflicts with the final paragraph of this policy. To allow it here would set an unacceptable precedent which could have long term consequences for the whole county and would render the plan unsound.</p> <p>Recommendation: Potential allocation AS-06 should be removed from the Plan.</p> <p>It is disappointing that the mapping in this latest consultation is far less detailed than in the Dec. 2013 document and excludes all designations and constraints. This is a retrograde step.</p> <p>Recommendation: The earlier detailed mapping of all sites should be included in the final document so that nothing is overlooked if and when planning proposals are put forward.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Further consideration will be given to the points you raise, including the inclusion or otherwise of Great Plantation.</p> <p>The final form of the mapping in the draft Plan will also be considered.</p>
Environment Agency	Policy MS-1: Sites for the provision of sand and gravel		<p>The last paragraph in this policy specifically considers impacts to Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Dorset Heathland Ramsar sites. We consider other designations, water features and potential environmental impacts, such as flood risk, should also be referred to in this paragraph.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Further consideration will be given to appropriate wording of this policy, and subsequent Drafts will reflect such changes.</p>

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Resident	Policy MS-1: Sites for the provision of sand and gravel	DMSP713	<p>I have 2 major concerns regarding this section.</p> <p>The current timeframe for the Minerals Plan is until 2028 and as clearly stated the estimated additional gravel and sand required is 5.2 million tonnes. However, this section details potential applications for up to 17 million tonnes. This is over 3.5 times the current estimated need. The extension of the plan until 2032 - that has not been agreed - is used to justify the number of potential sites. It appears that the timeframe of the plan is being arbitrarily adjusted to justify the number of planning applications. Therefore the whole of this section is redundant until (or if) it is agreed to extend the timeframe of the plan.</p> <p>My second concern is the piecemeal approach of considering the planning applications as individual applications without considering the interaction of the plans where there are several applications in close proximity. This is particularly true for the plans in Woodsford, Hurst Farm and Trigon Hill (<i>Station Road??</i>). These 3 applications effectively form a single continuous quarry yet by considering them as individual applications, the additive effect of these quarries is not considered. The effect on the local environment caused by these 3 applications - noise, dust, pollution, lorry movements - must be considered as a totality and not as individual applications. The effect of up to 300 lorry movements a day on the local roads will be considerable yet the current assessments do not consider the additive effects.</p>	Disagree	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>It is not just about identifying enough sites to cover the shortfall – it is also necessary to meet the annual provision requirement of aggregate, which is what the Draft Mineral Sites Plan is seeking to do.</p> <p>Cumulative effects of these three sites are being considered, and are referred to in the Sustainability Appraisal. A study looking at cumulative impacts of traffic is about to be commissioned.</p>
Affpuddle and Turnerspuddle Parish Council	Policy MS-1: Sites for the provision of sand and gravel	DMSP708	<p>Affpuddle and Turnerspuddle Parish Council is concerned that the sites in the vicinity of Moreton have been appraised in isolation.</p> <p>AS19/AS25 and AS26, also including the current Woodsford site and the remnants of Warmwell and Redbridge will considerably increase the cumulative impact of issues. Of particular relevance to the parish of Affpuddle and Turnerspuddle will be the impact upon highways. The B3390 is inadequate as the primary access route for the number of HGVs envisaged. Consideration should also be given to the emerging Strategic Housing and Land Availability Assessment of the Purbeck Local Plan where two areas of land have been put forward to develop up to 1300 dwellings in the parish of Moreton. If one also takes in to account the Silverlake development at Crossways the increase in traffic density levels will be unsustainable for the highway infrastructure. It appears that an integrated traffic plan for the area will be required to cater for these developments, either individually but especially cumulatively, with legal agreements for highways improvements.</p> <p>The council continues to press for improvements to both Waddock Cross and Hurst Bridge, which it considers is necessary with current traffic levels. These improvements will become immediate if mineral extraction permissions are granted. Further concerns relate to the restrictions in carriageway width and bends in Affpuddle which under current traffic levels are considered dangerous. The B3390 is used as a pedestrian, equestrian and cycle route between the very closely associated settlements of Affpuddle and Briantspuddle which share common public facilities. An increase in HGV movement along this route would exacerbate the safety issues on this road.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to the cumulative impact of landscape degradation of AS19 and AS26. The area is renowned for tourist attractions associated with landscape quality, protection of this should be paramount in the decision process. Unlike the cumulative impact of mineral extraction sites along the Puddletown Road, the Moreton area has a higher residential density and the B3390 is a major North/South route for locals and visitors. As such, the inclusion of so many sites around Moreton is unlikely to fit as well as it does along the Puddletown Road where the road principally serves the quarries.</p> <p>With regard to Policy MS2 that unallocated sites should not add unacceptable cumulative impacts to the development of allocated and permitted sites, this statement should also apply to the consideration of all sites before allocation to this plan.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Cumulative effects of these three sites are being considered, and are referred to in the Sustainability Appraisal. A study looking at cumulative impacts of traffic is about to be commissioned, taking into consideration the proposed increases in housing numbers as well.</p> <p>AS19 and As26 are both private agricultural land and are not tourist attractions or open to public access. Potential impacts on their surroundings, as with all proposed allocations will not be included in the Draft Plan unless potential impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated.</p>



<p>Crossways Parish Council</p>	<p>Policy MS-1: Sites for the provision of sand and gravel</p>	<p>DMSP963</p> <p>Crossways Parish Council discussed the Minerals Sites plan in a meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> September 2015 and it has made the following comments.</p> <p><b>Location:</b> 40% of the additional supplies defined in the plan have been allocated to 3 sites situated in close proximity of the parish. Crossways Parish Council strongly objects to such a concentration of quarrying, which would have a devastating impact on the landscape. Parish Councillors discussed the issue that, in spite of regeneration clauses that are attached to planning permission, the landscape never fully recovers its original beauty. This, in turn, will have a strong influence on local tourism and employment within the tourism industry. Such concentrated quarrying will also affect the agricultural industry with unquantifiable effects on the eco-system (loss of wildlife, plants) that could lead to loss of employment.</p> <p><b>Environment:</b> Dust, fumes and noise Quarrying is associated with the use of heavy machinery. These machineries generate high levels of noise, dust and fumes that will heavily pollute the nearby eco-system and the village. The Parish Council is aware that the industries are taking measures to alleviate some of the pollution through the erection of banks. However these measures have limited success for the internal machinery and no effect on the trucks coming in and out of the sites. With a potential increase of 400 trucks movements per day, 1 every 4 minutes, on the B3390, the level of NOx from diesel fumes, dust and noise pollution could potentially have effect on the life and health of the residents.</p> <p><b>Hydrology</b> The Woodsford (North East Extension) AS19 and Hurst Farm AS26 proposed quarries would partly operate in areas near the river where the water table is only about a metre below the surface. Concerns have been raised towards an increase in risk of a chemical pollution into the Poole basin as well as an increase of flooding.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure:</b> Crossways transport is serviced by 2 main roadways: the B3390 and link road to Dorchester and the railway through Moreton Station. Moreton Station is a small, automatic and unmanned station that can only be accessible on foot by a small proportion of the village; this means that the main communication line through the village is the B3390 and roadway to Dorchester. In the future, the already heavy traffic on these roads will not only be increased by 400mvt/day already mentioned, but also the movements created by the housing development planned for the Crossways parish e.g 500 houses proposed in the West Dorset Local Plan and the 900 houses for the Moreton Parish recently sent out for consultation as part of the review of the Purbeck Local Plan. Concerns about the safety with such an amount of traffic have been raised by the Council and the community police in attendance: Inappropriate speed limits through the village, lack of protected crossings in areas heavily used by pedestrians e.g. Co-op Car Park) and extremely narrow sections e.g. Bridges toward Bere Regis and Warmwell. Additional concerns have been raised regarding the increasing size of the quarry trucks (40+ tonnes) that have an extremely adverse effect on tarmac and embankments. Heavily damaged tarmac: pot-holes, hidden dips, will render this road unsafe for bicycles and motorbikes in most weather conditions as well as for small vehicles in poor weather conditions. It is also notable that as a main axis, any interruption of traffic on these roads resulting from an accident will considerably disturb the already inappropriate bus system servicing Crossways and villages in the surrounding areas. The increase in traffic will make the timely intervention of ambulances and fire services far more difficult in the case of a major incident within the community.</p> <p><b>Conclusions:</b> Therefore, for the reasons given above, Crossways Parish Council strongly objects to the proposed quarrying sites located at Woodsford Quarry (inset map AS-19), Station Road Moreton (Inset map AS-26) and Hurst Farm Moreton (Inset Map AS-25).</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>There will always be impacts from quarry development. Provided the Mineral Planning Authority is satisfied that no 'showstopper' impacts will result, sites can be allocated in the Draft Mineral Sites Plan.</p> <p>If at planning application stage, when EIA is carried out, impacts that cannot be mitigated are found, the site will not be developed.</p> <p>It is unclear where the figure of 400 vehicle movements per day is from – the real figure is expected to be less.</p> <p>Cumulative effects of these three sites are being considered, and are referred to in the Sustainability Appraisal. A study looking at cumulative impacts of traffic is about to be commissioned, taking into consideration the proposed increases in housing numbers as well.</p> <p>The Environment Agency will advise the Mineral Planning Authority on hydrological/hydrogeological issues.</p>
---------------------------------	--	--	----------------	---

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

<p>Knightsford Parish Council</p>	<p>Policy MS-1: Sites for the provision of sand and gravel</p>	<p>DMSPI228</p>	<p>This commented is submitted on behalf of Knightsford Parish Council (KPC).          KPC contend there is no need for further Gravel Site allocation. Based on figures in the Local Aggregate Assessment there is currently a 14 year landbank of River Terrace Gravel. We contend that the county does not need to allocate further River Terrace sites and that sites AS19, 25 &amp;26 should be withdrawn due to this lack of requirement and the cumulative impact on the area.          Gravel Demand and Landbanks Paragraph 10 of the minerals section of the NPPF states that site selection ' take into account the need for the specific material' . This requirement is recognised in many parts of the Minerals Strategy &amp; Local Aggregates Assessment. For example, see the MS Key Issue 2, Objective 5, and Policy AS2. There are also numerous sections in the MS and the LAA where the permitted reserves, annual demand and landbank of River Terrace gravel and Poole Formation sand are differentiated and quoted. For example, see paragraphs 7.51-54 of the MS and paragraphs 1.63 &amp; 1.64 of the LAA.          Paragraph 1.64 of the 2014 LAA concludes that in 2013 there are; "Landbanks of around 14.7 years for River Terrace sand and gravel and 8.3 years for Poole". This means that at current demand rates in 2015 there are land banks of about 13.7 and 6.3 years respectively. When it comes to the Draft Mineral Site Plan however, the requirement to differentiate specific materials appears to have been completely overlooked. Paragraphs 4.10 to 4.16 only mention the combined annual demand of 1.56MT/ year. The document does not differentiate clearly on whether the proposed sites are meeting River Terrace Gravel or Poole Formation sand demand. But based on their location and the very brief descriptions it appears that the roughly 24MT nominated is split roughly 45:55 which translates approximately to a further 22 years of RT gravel and 13 years of Poole Formation sand. Again further aggravating the imbalance between gravel and sand landbanks. If the proposed sites are adopted there will be a landbank of over 25 years of gravel.          As stated earlier we dispute the need to add more gravel sites, request that this draft document is revised to reflect the different demands for River Terrace gravel and Poole formation sand, and that sites AS19, AS25 &amp; AS26 are withdrawn from the plan due their cumulative impact on Knightsford Parishes</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>Your comments are noted.          The key policy of the Minerals Strategy regarding aggregate provision is AS1, which states 'An adequate and steady supply of locally extracted sand and gravel will be provided by maintaining a landbank of permitted sand and gravel reserves equivalent to at least 7 years of supply...'          Without AS19, 25 and 26 the Mineral Planning Authority do not consider that this policy requirement can be met.          AS2 commits to maintaining <b>at least</b> a 7 year landbank of River Terrace and Poole Formation aggregate, to seek to maintain supply of the different types of aggregate.          The River Terrace on its own may be well in excess of 7 years but this does not obviate the need to meet the requirements of Policy AS1.</p>
<p>Friends of the Earth</p>	<p>Policy MS-1: Sites for the provision of sand and gravel</p>	<p>DMSPI248</p>	<p>Dr Keith Corbett is a well respected herpetologist in this area. For some reason, he doesn't seem to have responded to the document this year but his comments in 2014 still carry weight and should be re-visited.          To his comments that relocation of reptiles doesn't work without extensive preparation, I would add that relocation into existing occupied sites would simply result in the new arrivals being expelled from favourable places to be exposed and eaten by predators or simply to starve. It simply can't be done on the cheap and anyway, it takes a long time for plant and prey species to get stably established.          Dr Corbett's suggestion of 2 years should probably read 5, although he's the expert, not me. To be effective for our rare species, a heathland site should be managed to maintain a mosaic of micro-habitats. It should not be uniform, trees should be present but controlled, and lazy methods of maintenance that reduce biodiversity such as grazing by goats or cattle should be avoided.          However, remediation where bits of the original habitat are left to recolonise the restored areas might just work, with judicious planting. The operator would need to retain enough sand to restore workings to sandy heath, where relevant. I've followed several restorations to heathland over the years and most have failed and are still species-poor (with many species now locally extinct), although I'm told it can be done well.</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Your comments are noted.</p>

Land & Mineral Management Ltd	Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search	DMSP59	<p><b>Area of Search</b></p> <p>W H White Ltd support Policy MS-2 and the associated Figure 3 and Policies Map confirming the extent of the Area of Search. However it is felt that the wording of Policy MS-2 would benefit from additional precision. An objection is therefore made to the wording of this Policy to the effect that it is imprecise and sets unattainable criteria.</p> <p>It is suggested that an alternative wording for part iii (a) is needed such as that highlighted below. The wording on MS-2 should also be amended as highlighted below to reflect the difference in reasons for windfall sites being brought forward and to ensure consistency with Policy AS1 iii b from the Minerals Core Strategy,</p> <p><b>Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search</b> An Area of Search, as shown in Figure 3 and on the Policies Map, is designated with the intention of facilitating the development of sand and gravel sites and maintaining appropriate levels of supply. Proposals for the development of unallocated sites from within the Area of Search will be permitted if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. there is a demonstrable shortfall in the supply of sand and gravel, or</li> <li>ii. the development of an unallocated site offers net environmental benefits that would justify its development</li> <li>iii. the proposed development is for the prior extraction of aggregate in advance of non-minerals development, and</li> <li>iv. in the case of i. and ii. above,             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. they would not delay or otherwise prejudice the development of allocated site(s), which have the potential to produce the same specific type of sand and gravel and which would serve the same geographic market. and</li> <li>b. they would not add unacceptable cumulative impacts to the development of allocated or permitted sites.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Applications for the development of non-allocated sites within the designated Area of Search must demonstrate that the proposals quantify the extent of all relevant development considerations and that any adverse impacts will be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority.</p> <p>Sites will only be considered where it has been demonstrated that possible effects (including those related to hydrology, displacement of recreation, species, proximity, land management and restoration) that might arise from their development would not adversely affect the integrity of the Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Dorset Heathland Ramsar site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects ."</p>	Disagree	Your comments are noted. The suggested changes will be taken into consideration.
Environment Agency	Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search	DMSP653	The last paragraph in this policy specifically considers impacts to Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Dorset Heathland Ramsar sites. We consider other designations, water features and potential environmental impacts, such as flood risk, should also be referred to in this paragraph.	Comment	Your comments are noted. Further consideration will be given to this policy covering the issues such as you suggest.
RSPB, South West Regional Office	Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search	DMSP1016	A sand and gravel area of search (AoS) We do not consider that as drafted paragraph 4.22 and 4.23 correctly explain the treatment of environmental constraints within the AoS. Figure 3 presents a misleading AoS larger than that strictly available and is at odds with paragraph 4.23. Additionally, paragraph 4.23 needs to identify as well as demonstrating a shortfall the unallocated site would need to accord with the other policies of the plan (and Minerals Strategy). This could equally be added to the bullets within paragraph 4.26.	Comment	Your comments are noted. The suggested amendments will be considered. The aggregates area of search within the Draft Mineral Sites Plan will be amended.
Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search	DMSP915	In connection with sand and gravel I note that a major area of search is in the Stour Valley to the south east of Blandford. This abuts the boundary of this AONB and is, therefore, in the setting of this AONB. The potential impact on the landscape of the river valley and the adverse impacts on the adjoining AONB are likely to be substantial. Clearly paragraph 116 and 115 of the NPPF are particularly significant in this situation. The AONB has not been consulted on this potential proposal and had it been consulted prior to the publication of this draft document it would have advised most strongly against the potential development. The AONB does, therefore, OBJECT to this area search that is clearly within the setting of this AONB.	Disagree	Your comments are noted. Potential impacts on the setting of the AONB will be considered further.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Resident.	Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search		DMSP714	<p>The current timeframe for the plan identifies the need for 5.2 million tonnes of sand and gravel. However the proposed planning applications detail up to 17 million tonnes of sand and gravel. This is 3.5 times the identified requirement and is partly justified by extending the plan period to 2032 (that has not been agreed). However even allowing for the - as yet not agreed - extended timeframe, this would only require a total of 11.4 million tonnes. The proposed plans therefore provide nearly 6 million tonnes of excess gravel and sand. Given the very large excess of estimated reserves it appears that looking for additional resources is un-necessary. The need therefore to search for additional resources appears to be completely superfluous.</p>	Disagree	<p>Your comments are noted. It is not just about identifying enough sites to cover the shortfall – it is also necessary to meet the annual provision requirement of aggregate, which is what the Draft Mineral Sites Plan is seeking to do.</p>
New Milton Sand & Ballast	Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search		DMSP696	<p>There is a growing demand for soft sand to be produced from Dorset as sand supplies in other counties are reducing. Dorset's soft sand has a regional market and is used for asphalt and other specialist uses as well as for general building purposes locally.</p> <p>The proposed Area of Search between Dorchester and Wareham contains a high proportion of soft sand which will provide for the region's needs for many years. The area also contains river terrace and plateau sands and gravels. Consequently, it is correct to identify the whole of the mineral resource as an Area of Search. In particular, sand must be provided to replace that lost by Modification Order when 9 million tonnes of sand reserve was removed from Master's Pit and the county's landbank.</p> <p>Within the Dorchester to Wareham Area of Search, two sites are proposed for mineral (soft sand) working during the plan period. Site A at Gallows Hill, south of Puddletown Road, and Site B, north of Puddletown Road. These sites are shown on the attached plan.</p> <p><b>Site A</b> This site is 8.1 hectares and contains 1 million tonnes of soft sand. It was partially worked in the middle to late 1980s when the overlying sharp sand and gravel was removed. It has not been possible to identify whether any extant minerals permissions still remain for this site and therefore it is intended to make a new planning application in early 2016 to take the soft sand.</p> <p><b>Key Planning issues</b> The two main issues to be considered in the planning application will be ecological and restoration. The ecology will have to be researched with reference to the use of the site for reptiles straying from the adjoining heathland. The pond on site is believed not to contain great crested newts, but may have to be subject to a full assessment which could not commence until Spring 2016. The restoration configuration would have to be considered whether there will be a permanent void or if the site can be fully or partially infilled. Dry heathland for sand lizard habitat on the south facing slopes could be provided. Other operational and environmental issues</p> <p><b>Strategy:</b> the sand would be used to maintain production as reserves at Masters Pit North become depleted. Phased working and progressive restoration would be proposed, potentially working west to east towards the access. Extraction could be 100,000 to 150,000 tonnes per year.</p> <p><b>Processing Plant:</b> it would not be necessary to construct a static processing plant on site. The sand could be dry screened on site or washed at Holme Mineral Processing Plant in Master's North pit.</p> <p><b>Traffic:</b> an existing access at the eastern end of the site would be used.</p> <p><b>Hydrology:</b> water table is known to be at considerable depth and extraction would not be intended to breach the water table.</p> <p><b>Site B</b> Geological and environmental research would be undertaken during the currency of extraction from Site A to identify land within Area B which would be suitable for the provision of soft sand on completion of Site A.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted, along with the nomination of an additional proposed site allocation. The proposed allocation will be considered further for inclusion in the Draft Mineral Sites Plan.</p>
Dorset Local Access Forum	Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search		DMSP873	<p>Policy MS-2 (Sand and Gravel Area of search) should make specific references to opportunities to improve access that might arise as a result of the process.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted. General references to improving access are covered in the 2014 Minerals Strategy. In the Draft Mineral Sites Plan some specific proposed allocations refer to improved access.</p>
East Dorset Friends Of The Earth	Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search		DMSP615	<p>This policy is based upon predict and provide thinking; past demand is used as the key indicator of future supply needs. This is incompatible with sustainable development as defined in the Glossary of the Minerals Strategy and discussed in section 16.2. There should be some indication as to how development will be reduced over the planning period. This is so that supply can be met by other means (e.g. greater use of recycled aggregates) going forward, preferably before 2028.</p>	Disagree	<p>Your comments are noted. The level of supply is established in the 2014 Minerals Strategy and in national mineral planning policy/guidance.</p>

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Christchurch & East Dorset Councils	Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search		<p>DMSP561</p> <p>Both Councils consider that Policy MS-2 and the associated Figure 3 relating to a Sand and Gravel Area of Search, is confusing and effectively permits promotion and consideration of sites which are specifically not being progressed in the plan. This would include the two sites listed in comments 4 and 5 above, and other sites not yet identified in the plan.</p> <p>Whilst the Councils accept that it is appropriate to identify further areas of potential for sand and gravel (and other minerals), this should be in the form of a safeguarding policy which resists development likely to compromise future consideration of these areas. Policy MS-2 goes beyond this in potentially allowing these rejected and unidentified sites to be developed. The Councils consider that, where a shortfall in supply of sand and gravel has been identified, the plan should be reviewed to allow a proper reassessment of additional site options, rather than using an existing policy to allow individual planning applications for sites to come forward on an ad-hoc basis.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>If there was a significant shortfall in supply it is likely that the Minerals Strategy would be reviewed.</p> <p>The Minerals Strategy does safeguard the undeveloped mineral resource.</p> <p>Policy MS2 encourages the development of sites within the area of search provided certain criteria are met. It is intended to demonstrate a positive approach to the Inspector at Examination that Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole can meet the supply of aggregates.</p>
Resident.	Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search		<p>DMSP630</p> <p>AS-08 Horton Heath</p> <p>Whilst this site (in 2 parts) was a late submission, and is therefore not formally proposed, the on-going process described by DCC ("The nomination will be re-assessed and the Mineral Planning Authority will come to a decision regarding whether it is suitable for inclusion in the Mineral Sites Plan") implies that further consultation will not take place. Further consultation should be undertaken if the site is deemed suitable.</p> <p>On that basis, initial comments are as follows:</p> <p>None of the surrounding roads - wherever the site access roads meet the 'main' roads - is suitable. This includes C roads (e.g. C2), B roads (e.g. B3081, B3078) and A roads (e.g. A31). The whole of this road network suffers from one or more of: insufficient capacity; insufficient width; adverse geometry; poor drainage; poor condition.</p> <p>The DCC comments (dated 17 October 2013) mis-represent and understate the usage of the land in question, and thus the potential impact. Use by motorcycles - whether informal or formal - is negligible, and has been for years. However, there is regular, frequent use for walking, horse-riding, cycling, clay shooting, 4x4 events .... all of which would be adversely impacted.</p>	Disagree	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>If the site nomination remains as an allocation, there will be further opportunities for public comment/involvement.</p> <p>Specific site-related comments will be cross-referenced to the site itself.</p>

<p>Mark Whittingham Associates Ltd</p>	<p>Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search</p>	<p>DMSPI 138</p> <p>Section 4.23 refers to Policy MS-2 which relates to the Area of Search presented in Fig 3. Policy MS-2 proposes:  Proposals for the development of unallocated from within the Area of Search will be permitted if: b. they would not add unacceptable impacts to the development of allocated or permitted sites. This is consistent with Policy DM1j in the Minerals Strategy, whereby all proposals for mineral development must demonstrate avoidance of cumulative impacts resulting from minerals or other development, whether current or proposed. The scale of the Area of Search indicated within the valley of the River Frome is such that cumulative impacts are inevitable and will clearly not be avoided as Policy DM1j requires.</p> <p>The designation of the Area of Search stems from Policy SS2 of the Minerals Strategy, which states: Specific sites will be where viable mineral resources are known to exist, where landowners are supportive of mineral development and where any planning applications made are likely to be acceptable in planning terms. The Area of Search in Fig 3 has not been carefully drawn to exclude areas of the river itself and immediately adjacent land protected under Policy DM3c of the Minerals Strategy and in compliance with The Water Framework Directive. Neither have adequate or indeed any buffer zones been shown to protect the amenity of residents, and other sensitive sites. In this respect the plan does not accurately indicate an area where any planning applications made are likely to be acceptable.</p> <p>There is also no evidence in the Draft Plan that sites of poorer agricultural quality have been given greater priority when drafting the Area of Search, as is required for compliance with national Planning Policy as follows:</p> <p>a) National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 143: which states in preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should: put in place policies to ensure worked land is reclaimed at the earliest opportunity, taking account of aviation safety, and that high quality restoration and aftercare of mineral sites take place, including for agriculture (safeguarding the long term potential of best and most versatile agricultural land and conserving soil resources), geodiversity, biodiversity, native woodland, the historic environment and recreation.</p> <p>b) National Planning Policy Guidance Paragraph: 026 Reference ID: 8-026-20140306 The National Planning Policy Framework expects local planning authorities to take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. This is particularly important in plan making when decisions are made on which land should be allocated for development. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality. The Agricultural Land Classification provides a method for assessing the quality of farmland to enable informed choices to be made about its future use within the planning system.</p> <p>c) National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 112 Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality.</p> <p>The low rate of demand at present is evidenced by the much slower rate of extraction from the existing Woodsford site than was envisaged when the site was consented. The rate of working at Woodsford is further diminished by the fact that the principal demand for gravel within Dorset originates from the Poole-Bournemouth conurbation, for which the pits at Ringwood are more convenient and sustainable in terms of reduced transportation time and cost. The promoter also projected that 50% of the extracted minerals at Woodsford would be sand, for which little demand exists, as previously noted.</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>As you note, there is a policy requirement and numerous other references to avoidance of cumulative impacts in the Minerals Strategy. The size of the area of search does not in itself contribute to cumulative impacts – it is the location of potential sites and their individual impacts interacting that may cause cumulative impacts. The area of search has been drawn to exclude environmentally sensitive land and the wording of the policy is intended to protect other interests in the vicinity of any site coming forward under this policy.</p> <p>There are a number of references in the Minerals Strategy designed to protect agricultural land, including BMV land, and soils.</p> <p>The NPPG notes: - <i>Where working is proposed on the <a href="#">best and most versatile agricultural land</a> the outline strategy should show, where practicable, how the methods used in the restoration and aftercare enable the land to retain its longer term capability, though the proposed after-use need not always be for agriculture.</i></p>
--	--	---	----------------	---

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Knightsford parish Council	Policy MS-2: Sand and Gravel Area of Search		DMSP123 1	<p>This comment is submitted on behalf of Knightsford Parish Council (KPC)</p> <p>KPC have very serious concerns regarding paragraph 4.27 of the draft MSP. Which states; " All sites within the AOS or Resource Blocks proposed for development will be required to go through the process of submission of a planning application, with all the associated detailed assessments." Knightsford Parish Council have recently been the subject of a planning application for an 'unallocated' gravel site which is an extension of the existing Woodsford quarry site. We were only given 24 days to respond even though the site; was for 400,000 tonnes of sand &amp; gravel; included an application to increase the noise level at the closest property to above National Planning Policy Framework &amp; Planning Practice Guidance; included applications by the operator to change other planning conditions that had been disregarded for years; and, included adding a bagging plant for which no noise assessment was included.</p> <p>This proposal for adoption of unallocated sites, which could be substantial in size and impact, simply does not allow local communities time to study them, discuss them at Parish Councils, and if necessary seek expert advice to counter the operators frequently biased and inaccurate planning application supporting documentation.</p>	Disagree	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>The Mineral Planning Authority will observe national requirements for consultation of planning applications.</p> <p>Respondents can in many cases request an extension of time.</p>
Land & Mineral Management Ltd	Policy MS-3: Site for the provision of recycled aggregates		DMSP61	<p>Recycled Aggregates W H White support the inclusion of Policy MS-3 and Inset Map RA-01.</p>	Agree	<p>Your support is noted.</p>
Councillor.	Policy MS-3: Site for the provision of recycled aggregates		DMSP213	<p>The proposed site is immediately adjacent to Canford Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and RAMSAR site. A temporary permission granted for the processing of inert waste to produce soils for capping the nearby landfill site expired in 2010. In 2014, permission was granted for an Inert Recycling Facility on the site to generate aggregates and soils and for the installation of a washing plant (APP/14/00120/Y). It was granted in the face of much opposition from local residents as well as Natural England, not merely because it was inappropriate development in the Green Belt, but because it prevented appropriate restoration of the Canford Heath SSSI and the enhancement of features for which Canford Heath has been protected. In consequence that permission is conditional upon all use and activities ceasing and all infrastructure and earth mounds or bunds being removed from the site on or before 1 August 2022 whereafter the site is to be landscaped.</p> <p>It is difficult to relate all this to the site assessment pro-forma on biodiversity which states that using this site for the additional processing of bulky waste would have 'no significant impact'. Another objection to the use of this site for bulky waste is that it can only be transported to and from the site via the A341. The road is single lane in each direction and is already at saturation point. Measures to preserve the residential amenity of those living along the Magna Road/Queen Anne Drive have been removed or varied over the last few years to the extent that complaints about traffic nuisance have increased exponentially.</p>	Disagree	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Potential traffic impacts will be considered carefully, prior to any further decision being made.</p>
East Dorset Friends Of The Earth	Policy MS-3: Site for the provision of recycled aggregates		DMSP695	<p>While supporting the "steady, annual increase in the production of recycled aggregate", it is a pity that no site no other than this one in a sensitive location in the Green Belt has been identified to facilitate this.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p>

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Wareham St Martin Parish Council	Policy MS-4: Sites for the provision of ball clay		DMSP67	Whilst understanding the need to ensure a supply of ball clay which is a finite material, there are some serious issues to be considered first. Full public consultation is necessary if there is to be an increase in traffic on the rural roads through Cold Harbour and North Trigon. The community already has traffic from the existing ball clay site, landfill and sand/gravel mining. Traffic should be encouraged to go north to the A35 rather than through Sandford and equally use the A35 to gain access to North Trigon. Apart from land designations, there are also heritage monuments that require protection, water courses to be kept clear for Morden Bog as well as re-establishing heathland.	Comment	Your comments are noted. No increase in traffic is expected – it is expected that the existing Trigon site will be completed before the extension is begun.
Historic England	Policy MS-4: Sites for the provision of ball clay		DMSP384	This policy test in Policy MS4 does not appear to reflect the adopted Minerals Strategy or national policy, guidance or legislation. Perhaps the policy might refer to other relevant considerations to be observed in the Dorset Minerals Strategy? Policy MS4 refers to a limited number of factors to be considered to enable development to be permitted. It is unclear why this is the case and why only natural environment considerations are emphasised. The evidence base highlights the sensitivity of these sites in relation to historic landscapes and individual heritage assets and their settings. As a consequence Policy MS4 fails to reflect the adopted Minerals Strategy and its agreed suite of Development Management policies - the criteria to be met to permit development. Historic England (formerly English Heritage) is anxious to ensure local and national policy is applied and legislative obligations are met.	Comment	Your comments are noted. Further consideration will be given to appropriate wording of this policy, and subsequent Drafts will reflect such changes.
Environment Agency	Policy MS-4: Sites for the provision of ball clay		DMSP654	The last paragraph in this policy specifically considers impacts to Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Dorset Heathland Ramsar sites. We consider other designations, water features and potential environmental impacts, such as flood risk, should also be referred to in this paragraph.	Comment	Your comments are noted. Further consideration will be given to appropriate wording of this policy, and subsequent Drafts will reflect such changes.
RSPB, South West Regional Office	Policy MS-4: Sites for the provision of ball clay		DMSP1017	Policy MS-4 Sites for the provision of ball clay Relating to Trigon Hill Extension, Wareham, our comments as for AS-6 apply.	Comment	Your comments are noted
Imerys Minerals Ltd	Policy MS-4: Sites for the provision of ball clay		DMSP680	Although Imerys welcomes this policy and allocation it is disappointing to note that following the Public Inquiry and subsequent adoption of the Mineral Core Strategy (MCS) that the Mineral Planning Authority has chosen to copy only part of criteria (d) of Policy BCI- Provision of Ball Clay into this new policy for Trigon. Imerys OBJECTS to the omission of the words ...unless in exceptional circumstances the provisions of Article 6(4) of the Habitats Directive are met.	Comment	Your comments are noted. Further consideration will be given to the wording of this Policy in the Draft Mineral Sites Plan and whether amendment is required.
East Dorset Friends Of The Earth	Policy MS-4: Sites for the provision of ball clay		DMSP764	Appreciating the importance and high value of Ball Clay we would not oppose the extension at Trigon Hill. If the hydrology permits we would want higher wetland features, e.g. bog, wet heathland, to be considered in the restoration plan for the site.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Langton Matravers Parish Council	Policy MS-5: Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone		DMSP124	PK15, 08, 21, 19, 18,02, 17 Councillors were happy with all proposed sites listed above.	Agree	Your comments are noted.



Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Historic England	Policy MS-5: Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone	DMSP386	<p>All proposals for the development of these allocations will quantify the extent of all relevant development considerations, including those set out in Appendix A, and demonstrate that any adverse impacts will be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority.</p> <p>This policy test in Policy MS5 does not appear to reflect the adopted Minerals Strategy or national policy, guidance or legislation. Perhaps the policy might refer to other relevant considerations to be observed in the Dorset Minerals Strategy? Policy MS5 refers to a limited number of factors to be considered to enable development to be permitted. It is unclear why this is the case and why only natural environment considerations are emphasised.</p> <p>The evidence base highlights the sensitivity of these sites in relation to historic landscapes and individual heritage assets and their settings. As a consequence Policy MS5 fails to reflect the adopted Minerals Strategy and its agreed suite of Development Management policies - the criteria to be met to permit development. Historic England (formerly English Heritage) is anxious to ensure local and national policy is applied and legislative obligations are met.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Further consideration will be given to appropriate wording of this policy, and subsequent Drafts will reflect such changes.</p>
Historic England	Policy MS-5: Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone	DMSP387	<p>All proposed Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone: The Site Assessments and Sustainability Appraisal highlight the critical heritage considerations to be met to satisfy the Minerals Strategy and its development management policies. Could these matters be préciséd and their source cross referenced in the Development Considerations section in the Appendix?</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Further consideration will be given to appropriate wording of this policy, and subsequent Drafts will reflect such changes.</p>
Worth Matravers Parish Council	Policy MS-5: Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone	DMSP468	<p>The Parish Council would respond with new comments and reinforce the comments it did previously make to DCC on the previous editions of the DCC Minerals Policy and Sites Plan as follows</p> <p>1.0 In Worth Matravers there are concerns that DCC is acting as a Minerals Sites Licensing Authority rather than fulfilling its responsibility as a Planning Authority for controlling proposed development in the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The AONB covers all the proposed extraction sites in the Worth Matravers parish. At every stage of the DCCMP process managing and controlling the various impacts of proposals for prospective stone extraction sites have to date been given insufficient priority. This is in an area where officially the highest level of protection against development outside the National Parks should be given by all Planning Authorities.</p> <p>1.1 There have been substantial changes in the impact on the environment of the current minerals extraction methods compared with historic underground Purbeck Stone and other mining operations in Worth Matravers which are Prayed in Aid of the new industrial operations. The current and proposed Open Cast mining methods using noisy and major machine operation techniques have previously blighted many other sites in the UK and across the world and are much more rigorously controlled elsewhere . Constant complaints are raised with the PC that DCC does not implement the level of control and enforcement which operators of minerals extraction sites have acknowledged they have faced across the rest of the UK.</p> <p>1.2 The PC is concerned about the quality of the consultation and would first request a consistency and accuracy of labelling of proposed extraction sites which are physically located in the WM parish. There are four proposed Purbeck Stone extraction sites PK08, PK15, PK 19 and PK 21 all of which are located in WM in the Gallows Gore vicinity .The PC would ask that all are accurately labelled firstly as in Worth Matravers PC and the location accurately described as Gallows Gore . At present they are labelled in the DCC document as either PK 08 Quarr Farm, Harmans Cross(WMPC ) PK15 Downs Quarry, Langton Matravers (WMPC) PK 19 Broadmead Field, Langton Matravers (WMPC ) PK 21 Gallows Gore Harmans Cross ( Langton Matravers PC) .</p> <p>1.3 This is especially important as accurately recognising the locality of the proposed sites would confirm that the Planning Authority, DCC, may appreciate there are potential issues of cumulative impact on the Gallows Gore area residents in the vicinity of the proposed sites . This should presume against approval or consent for concurrent operations on any of the existing and PK 08, PK 15, PK 19 and PK21 sites in this plan period.</p> <p>1.4 The PC is aware that employment issues can have a priority as well as the need for sufficient stone to be available for industry and commercial needs. It supports responsible quarrying operations which do not</p>	Disagree	<p>Your comments are noted and the Mineral Planning Authority is grateful for the level of input.</p> <p>As the Draft Mineral Sites Plan continues to emerge, all these comments will be taken into consideration and where appropriate the Plan will be amended.</p>

			<p>impact adversely on local residents or on the wider AONB. The existing character and appearance of the AONB to visitors underpins the local Purbeck economy through its attraction for access by tourists and visitors to the Isle of Purbeck peninsula. The PC does not recognise the current Plan as providing a mutually consistent approach. Residents have for example raised issues with the PC about the actual rather than claimed level of current employment at the local Swanworth Quarry.</p> <p>1.5 The PC has raised previously issues of unacceptable proposals for highway access to proposed sites providing photographs illustrating the massive size of the existing operational mining vehicles. The PC is concerned that its previous representations on the adverse effect of such an access on Haycrafts lane to residents on the lane, cyclists, the many walkers that use the lane as well as cars and other larger access vehicles has not been accepted. The site of PK21 is still shown as potentially accessible off Haycrafts lane or potentially southwards possibly from the minor overgrown and very narrow private track immediately adjacent to residential property at Annesfield. Neither proposal for access is acceptable to the PC.</p> <p>1.6 Residents are concerned that many issues arising from quarrying may be being trivialised as part of the current DCC Plan process. The PC has previously and continues to make representations that the environmental safeguards for local residents and the AONB generally have been successively watered down and minimised as part of the Minerals Plan process to date. This was as set out in detail in the previous WMPC representations and no satisfactory response given by DCC.</p> <p>1.7 Recording and appreciation of potential individual site or cumulative existing or proposed site excavation impacts on residents from noise, pollution, dust, visual and traffic impact and disturbance need to feature as a priority in this document and as part of the DCC considerations. Necessary planning impact safeguards need to be reinstated and explicitly set out in detail for the benefit of residents and future mining operators.</p> <p>1.8 Overall the visual impact of each proposed site has been minimised starting from an original and unacceptable predisposition by DCC to downplay the importance of the north facing slopes of the AONB in Worth Matravers parish. This approach is still unacceptable to the PC as individually and cumulatively existing extraction and servicing sites in WM have considerable adverse impact on the AONB especially as viewed from the Gallows Gore, Haycrafts Lane and Harmans Cross directions. This impact will be seriously exacerbated by any additional individual or combined proposals in the Minerals Site Plan for excavation in the Gallows Gore area.</p>	
Worth Matravers Parish Council	Question 4	DMSP469	<p>1.9 The impact of the proposals at Swanworth Quarry on the AONB is similarly serious both in terms of visual impact across the rolling uplands to the skyline and cumulative impact from a quarry which was scheduled for closure and reinstatement many years ago. The provision of a sustainable supply of crushed rock from a site which is not unique does not outweigh presumption against location within the AONB.</p> <p>1.10 The proposed Swanworth Quarry development lies within the Heritage Coast area, and, unlike the present quarry, would be highly visible in the landscape, having a negative impact not only for residents to the north and to the east along the ridge, but for traffic including visitors using the B3069 and road from Worth to Kingston. The DoE dismissed a similar application in 1968, on the grounds that the quarry would become a scar on the hillside. The 1988 application was also refused. With increased visitor numbers and HC and AONB designations, the PC considers protection of the visual amenity of such hillsides in Purbeck becomes even more important. Development of PK16 risks permanent loss of archaeological evidence of the overall context of the monuments.</p> <p>1.11 Concerns are expressed about the Bronze and Iron Age land systems across Worth Matravers which require protection and preservation before any further excavation takes place. In many areas the PC understands financial contributions towards preservation and protection of such historic features has been sought from developers.</p> <p>1.12 Any additional heavy goods vehicle movements generated by the development would put additional strain on already inadequate and well trafficked local road network, particularly through Corfe Castle and Sandford.</p>	Disagree

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Worth Matravers Parish Council	Policy MS-5: Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone		<p>DMSP470</p> <p>I.13 The PC continues to be concerned that reinstatement of excavations is, So as to speak , continuously kicked by the Operators and DCC into the long grass. Some recent timescales on planning applications for continuing excavation have been extended from the original 2013 completion by ten or twenty years with no certainty of that completion date. Even when reinstatement takes place it is perfunctory grassing over of the remaining ground contours after stone removal rather than filling in the void from excavation with excess local overburden or extraction from the local area. This latter technique was uniquely and successfully provided at one WM site by a responsible local Operator and there seems no reason with the vast high piles of overburden existing and created in the area why this should not form the DCC policy for reinstating excavation works.</p> <p>I.14 The PC does not accept that there is an overriding commercial need to create a vast quarrying area around Gallows Gore surrounding some residential properties on all sides with activity for many years in to the future. It considers the number of sites should be restricted and thereafter responsible selective and phased quarrying on those sites as proposed on the PK19 Broadmead site and originally in early editions of the DCC Minerals Stes Policy should be adopted. This will help to ensure new quarries are not opened until existing or new ones in whole or part are exhausted and reinstated.</p> <p>I.15 The PC is concerned that the current plan proposals individually or in total do not represent a sustainable and controlled planning process by DCC for Purbeck Stone or other mineral extraction in the parish within the proposed plan period. The current proposals risk a worst case scenario of a long term industry led piecemeal demand and sale price determined extraction period using open cast methods operating cumulatively and concurrently across a number of sites in the parish . This will seriously affect local residents and will blight an area of outstanding natural beauty to the detriment of the local resident community, visitors, and employment generally on which the Isle of Purbeck depends.</p>	Disagree	
East Dorset Friends Of The Earth	Policy MS-5: Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone		<p>DMSP761</p> <p>Disagree to further allocations for Purbeck Stone quarrying as this adds to the cumulative adverse effect of quarrying on the AONB. This cumulative adverse effect is because "Management of the existing sites is insensitive to the beauty of this area and it is not a good advertisement for further development.", " that reinstatement of excavations is, So as to speak , continuously kicked by the Operators and DCC into the long grass.", Even a cursory inspection of the area would show that "existing quarries are being run badly, already scarring the landscape . . . and rubbish that are easily visible from public areas and footpaths."</p>	Disagree	Your comments are noted.
Resident.	Policy MS-5: Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone		<p>DMSP726</p> <p>I am writing to you to OBJECT to the proposed expansion of quarrying in Purbeck. The reasons for this objection are as follows.</p> <p>This area is an AONB. It is very close and would spoil tourist destinations such as the Priests Way, which was recently recovered at significant expense to the tax payer.</p> <p>The new sites being considered represent a significant increase in what is already a very large area of quarrying. While quarrying may be considered traditional industrial use of the land, nevertheless it is not consistent with the Purbeck local plan, which is aimed at protecting the natural beauty and wildlife of the area. While your notice suggests a need to identify enough sites to provide sufficient resources for the plan period up to 2032 it fails to explain the reasons for the scale of the increased quarrying areas.</p> <p>The existing quarries are being run badly, already scarring the landscape with shabby steel containers for lock ups without planning consent, portable toilets, dumps of old equipment, heaps of old tyres and rubbish that are easily visible from public areas and footpaths. Management of the existing sites is insensitive to the beauty of this area and it is not a good advertisement for further development.</p> <p>It is completely unacceptable to consider more lorry movements on small country roads and through villages, more noise, more pollution, more industrialisation, more loss of amenity value of the landscape to locals and tourists and greater adverse impacts on wildlife. The tourist industry is of vital importance to Purbeck. Loss in tourist income due to a degrading of reputation for the area away from a lovely place to walk and enjoy the natural beauty, tranquillity and wildlife will be significant to everyone in the area.</p> <p>The linking of the exercise as minerals and waste is deeply worrying. Can any assurances be made that these quarries would not become landfill sites of the future?</p> <p>These site are on or close to sites of antiquity that shall be destroyed or adversely effected by this proposal. The proposed sites are within a single field of residential houses threatening residents peaceful</p>	Disagree	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Most of the proposed allocations are extensions to existing quarries and will not be developed until the current workings are completed.</p> <p>All potential impacts will be considered and mitigated to a satisfactory extent.</p> <p>Purbeck stone quarrying in a traditional aspect of the landscape in Purbeck and an important employer.</p> <p>No landfill with household waste will take place, although inert material may be used in some cases in restoration.</p>

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

				<p>enjoyment of their property. Questions have been asked of the effects quarrying so close to properties might have on health, air and water quality. For these reasons I believe the suggestion to expand these quarries in this fashion should be REFUSED.</p>		
Dorset AONB Team	Policy MS-5: Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone		DMSP784	<p>The Countryside &amp; Rights of Ways Act 2000 confirms that the purpose of designating Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) is the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the areas. NPPF section 115 states that: Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty...</p> <p>Dorset AONB Team considers that sites PK-08 (Quarr Farm) &amp; PK-21 (Gallows Gore) are likely to produce adverse effects of on the natural beauty of the AONB. Despite our general support of the on-going supply of local building stone, these sites would be unlikely to comply with a number of policies within the Dorset AONB Management Plan, principally due to their exposed locations.</p> <p>There will be some scope for mitigation through design and operation, such as a phased approach to extraction and restoration, as well as restricting stockpiling and buildings. However, there is concern that the residual impacts could be significantly harmful, due to the visibility of the sites along and across the Corfe Valley and from the Purbeck Ridge. This is principally because development within these two sites would extend a pattern of Purbeck Stone quarries onto the northward facing upper slopes of the Corfe Valley.</p> <p>There would be a cumulative effect should these sites be developed. The contribution of these sites to such cumulative effects is foreseeably substantial, as they would be likely to extend and notably increase the landscape and visual impacts produced by the nearby stone quarries. Overall, these two sites are much more visually exposed in comparison with the relatively foreshortened appearance of the nearby existing sites that are located on the cusp of the transition from the Corfe valley to the Purbeck plateau.</p>	Disagree	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as further consideration is given to the choice of proposed allocations for inclusion in the Final Draft of the MSP.
Purbeck District Council	Policy MS-5: Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone		DMSP1306	<p>MS-5 (Purbeck stone): in terms of plain English, it is unclear what is meant by all proposals for the development of these allocations will quantify the extent of all relevant development considerations.</p>	Comment	Your comments are noted. This wording will be reviewed and clarified as required.
Purbeck District Council	Policy MS-5: Sites for the provision of Purbeck Stone		DMSP1307	<p>MS-5 and related appendices: Purbeck District Council believes these should specifically mention landscape constraints.</p>		Your comments are noted. This wording will be reviewed and clarified as required.
Albion Stone PLC	Policy MS-6: Site for the provision of Portland Stone		DMSP267	<p>The Bowers Mine Extension seems to be a well-considered logical step that will provide further reserves of Portland Stone with minimal disturbance and impact.</p>	Agree	Your comments are noted.
Historic England	Policy MS-6: Site for the provision of Portland Stone		DMSP395	<p>Policy MS-6: any adverse impacts will be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority</p> <p>This test in Policy MS6 does not appear to reflect the adopted Minerals Strategy or national policy, guidance or legislation. Historic England (formerly English Heritage) is anxious to ensure local and national policy is applied and legislative obligations are met. Perhaps the policy might refer to other relevant considerations to be observed in the Dorset Minerals Strategy?</p>	Comment	Your comments are noted. This wording will be reviewed and clarified as appropriate.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Historic England	Policy MS-7: Sites for the provision of other building stone (excluding Portland and Purbeck Stone)		DMSP397	<p>Policy MS-7: Sites for the provision of other building stone (excluding Portland and Purbeck Stone): provided that the proposals quantify the extent of all relevant development considerations, including those set out in Appendix A, and demonstrate that any adverse impacts will be mitigated to the satisfaction of the Mineral Planning Authority.</p> <p>This test in Policy MS7 does not appear to reflect the adopted Minerals Strategy or national policy, guidance or legislation. Historic England (formerly English Heritage) is anxious to ensure local and national policy is applied and legislative obligations are met. Text perhaps needs to be more precise. Perhaps the policy might refer to other relevant considerations to be observed in the Dorset Minerals Strategy?</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>This wording will be reviewed and clarified as appropriate.</p>
Amphibian & Reptile Conservation	Policy MS-8: Puddletown Road Area Policy		DMSP255	<p>Amphibian &amp; Reptile Conservation support the strategy for a coordinated and consistent approach for the development, working, restoration of habitats and management objectives of heath and forest mosaic within the Puddletown Road Area.</p>	Agree	<p>Your comments are noted.</p>
Environment Agency	Policy MS-8: Puddletown Road Area Policy		DMSP656	<p>The southern boundary of the area appears to come close to the River Frome, it is vital that any proposals do not impact the integrity of the River Frome SSSI and its floodplain.</p> <p>Proposals should also take into account the objectives of the Frome Restoration Plan and any other plans relevant to this area.</p> <p>The north eastern boundary runs along the River Piddle. Any proposals should also not impact on this watercourse and its associated floodplain and habitats. The Frome Restoration Plan and any other relevant plans for this area should also be referred to in Policy MS-8.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to the suggested wording changes, and making reference to The Frome Restoration Plan.</p>
Historic England	Policy MS-8: Puddletown Road Area Policy		DMSP400	<p>This policy test in Policy MS8 does not appear to accord with the adopted Minerals Strategy or national policy, guidance or legislation. It is unclear why only natural environment considerations are emphasised.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>This wording will be reviewed and clarified as appropriate.</p>
Dorset Local Access Forum	Policy MS-8: Puddletown Road Area Policy		DMSP874	<p>Policy MS-2 (Sand and Gravel Area of search) should make specific references to opportunities to improve access that might arise as a result of the process. Policy MS-8 (Puddletown Road Area) should be similarly enhanced.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Reference to improved access is made in the Minerals Strategy, and is less well suited to a sites document.</p>
Resident.	Policy MS-8: Puddletown Road Area Policy		DMSP813	<p>Whilst I do not disagree with the policy being implemented in relevant areas, I do not believe that residential areas are relevant, and I can see no reason why the policy should extend to the south of the A352.</p> <p>It is difficult to see how mineral site development could take place in this area due primarily to lack of safe access, as well the impact of excavation on areas of outstanding natural beauty.</p> <p>The provisional southern boundary as shown, near to its western end, loops to include Hethfelton Hollow - a group of 8 residences including my own, and I object to the un-necessary inclusion of Hethfelton Hollow in this policy plan.</p>	Disagree	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to amending the area along the lines suggested.</p>
Land & Mineral Management Ltd	Policy MS-9: Safeguarding Minerals Sites and Infrastructure		DMSP64	<p>Policy MS-9 W H White Ltd considers that Policy MS-9 should include reference to safeguarding of minerals which are also identified in the Area of Search set out in Policy MS-2.</p> <p>Minerals can only be worked where they lie and if those which lie within the Area of Search and are, as yet, unallocated, are sterilised by other forms of development, they will be lost to Dorset in perpetuity.</p> <p>It is not clear from the adopted Policies Map, Fig 30 in the Minerals Strategy whether the Minerals Safeguarding area or the Minerals Consultation area covers the same boundaries as the Area of Search.</p> <p>To avoid any uncertainty on this point it is suggested that Policy MS-9 is amended to reference</p>	Disagree	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Safeguarding of the undeveloped mineral resource is covered in the Minerals Strategy, and it is not considered appropriate or necessary to revisit that issue in the Draft Mineral Sites Plan. The latter Plan seeks to build on existing safeguarding approaches and strengthen them by focussing on sites</p>

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

				safeguarding If land within the Area of Search.		specifically.
Imerys Minerals Ltd	Policy MS-9: Safeguarding Minerals Sites and Infrastructure		DMSP682	Imerys welcomes this policy.	Agree	Your support is welcomed.
Halletec Environmental Ltd	Policy MS-9: Safeguarding Minerals Sites and Infrastructure		DMSP1036	<p>Many of the sites covered by this policy will already require local planning authorities to consult the mineral planning authority (MPA) according to Policies SG1 and SG2 of the Mineral Strategy due to their location within Mineral Consultation Areas.</p> <p>Perhaps Policy MS-9 could be re-worded to clarify this and include the notion in Policy SG3 that non-minerals development within the buffer will be resisted by the MPA. Minerals can only be worked where they lie. Mineral safeguard areas should be based upon published BGS mapping. Through the BGS the UK has a rich resource of sophisticated geological mapping, which should enable MPAs to identify mapped mineral resources and thereby ensure future built development does not risk sterilising these.</p> <p>Some minerals such as silica sand and ball clay are identified as nationally important mineral resources, which should be safeguarded. Where development proposals encroach upon MSA areas the applicant should be required to demonstrate the underlying minerals are either not present or not capable of economic working.</p>	Disagree	Your comments are noted. Further consideration will be given to cross-referencing between the two Plans/policies.
East Dorset Friends Of The Earth	Policy MS-9: Safeguarding Minerals Sites and Infrastructure		DMSP1147	<p>Support safeguarding of mineral resources, sites and infrastructure, on the basis of the following assumption.</p> <p>The assumption is that new or updated environmental designations can be given to areas independently of there being safeguarded resources within those areas, even if the designation of the area means that the safeguarded resource is sterilized from future extraction.</p>	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Stephen Bowley Planning Consultancy	Question 1		DMSP51	RBMR support the longer end date until 2028 since it will provide a more robust approach for maintaining an adequate supply of aggregates into the future.		Your comments are noted
	Question 1		DMSP71	In total agreement with the plan.	Agree	Your comments are noted.
Albion Stone PLC	Question 1		DMSP437	I agree that it should be extended, but I think that there should be further consideration into extending it to 2042 due to the vast expenditure and the time it takes to bring a new site into production.	Agree	Your comments are noted.
Highways England	Question 1		DMSP568	Highways England does not have any specific comment to make on this, other than to say that the plan period should conform with guidance set out in the NPPF.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Chairman, East Dorset Environment Partnership	Question 1		DMSP727	Only if the same criteria are applied. It is essential that in the 2028-32 period there is no possibility of developers being able to bring forward sites and granted planning consent (either by the LPA or on appeal) on the grounds that there is no Minerals Plan in place. If that cannot be assured absolutely then the Minerals Sites Plan should have a cut-off date of 2028.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 1		DMSP565	This sounds reasonable and the 2014 Minerals Strategy is unlikely to be subject to big changes in Policy between 2028 and 2032.	Agree	Your comments are noted.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

RSPB, South West Regional Office	Question 1		DMSP1004	It is clearly desirable to have a 15 year term for the draft MSP, to 2032, it is imperative however that the adopted Minerals Strategy (currently expiring in 2028) is reviewed before expiry to ensure there is no policy gap, which might permit potentially damaging proposals to come forward in a strategy free climate.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Imerys Minerals Ltd	Question 1		DMSP662	Imerys agrees with the proposed end date for the Mineral Sites Plan (MSP) of 2032.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Resident.	Question 1		DMSP711	The Minerals Strategy covers the period up to and including 2028 as stated clearly in section 2.15. Section 4.12 identifies the need for 5.2 million tonnes of aggregate for the period covered by the plan. The seemingly arbitrary extension of the plan to 2032 appears to be simply to justify the need for additional extraction (up to 11.4 million tonnes - over 200% increase). Estimating the demand for aggregate over 13 years in the future is highly likely to be inaccurate (either high or low) and therefore revisiting the plan at a later date to assess the need for aggregate beyond 2028 makes sense. Recycled aggregate, the amount of building occurring in the UK, the economic cycle, etc. are all highly variable and any forecast even 5 years in advance - let alone 17 years in advance - must by definition be highly erroneous. At present the extension of the timeframe of the plan (from 2028 to 2032) appears to look like moving the "goal posts" in order to justify the (potential) granting of licenses to gravel extraction companies. Without a robust justification for extending the timeframe of the Minerals Strategy, any change in the timeframe is unjustified. Therefore I disagree entirely with this suggestion.	Disagree	Your comments are noted. Identification of more or less reserves is not the reason for choosing the end date of the Plan.
D.K. Symes Associates	Question 1		DMSP642	Yes	Comment	Your comments are noted.
West Parley Parish Council	Question 1		DMSP782	I can confirm that West Parley Parish Council have reviewed both plans and wish to make no comment on either plan.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Resident.	Question 1		DMSP1026	i do not want this in my back yard	Disagree	Your comments are noted.
Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 1		DMSP419	It is considered that the Plan should run to 2031 so that it runs in unison with the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plans. This will enable the area to be looked at strategically as a whole rather than piecemeal.	Disagree	Your comments are noted.
North Dorset District Council	Question 1		DMSP545	1. The Council agrees that the MSP should have an end date of 2032 rather than 2028.	Agree	Your comments are noted.
East Dorset Friends Of The Earth	Question 1		DMSP745	The Minerals Strategy is for the period to 2028. The period beyond 2028 should be covered by a fully consulted, updated strategy before the Mineral Sites Plan beyond 2028 is developed.	Disagree	Your comments are noted.
Affpuddle and Turnerspuddle Parish Council	Question 1		DMSP707	Affpuddle and Turnerspuddle Parish Council considers that the plan should run for 15 years (until 2032) to ensure an adequate managed supply therefore allowing for possible delays in the preparation and completion of emerging strategy and mineral sites plans at this time.	Agree	Your comments are noted.
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Question 1		DMSP768	Agree - it makes sense for the plan to cover the whole 15 year period provided that the same criteria are applied throughout the entire period. Presumably the Minerals Strategy will be reviewed and updated before the end of 2028 allowing continuity, but it is essential that in the 2028-32 period there is no possibility of developers bringing forward sites and being granted planning consent on the grounds that there is no Minerals Strategy in place.	Agree	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration.
Hampshire County Council	Question 1		DMSP809	The Minerals sites plan should show how the strategy is going to be delivered. As long as this is clear in the plan, there should not be an issue with different ends dates. It may be worth seeking advice from PINS on this issue.	Comment	Your comments are noted

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Moreton Parish Council	Question 1		DMSP1291	Referring to the entire Moreton Parish Council submission for the Draft Mineral Sites Plan consultation: 1. The spreadsheets and associated graphs in: section 4 - construction of charts and graphs, and section 5 - quantitative analysis of quarry substitution both clearly show that even with all the allocated quarries not starting until 2025, the total output drops below 1.56mtpa before 2028, let alone 2032. 2. It would be impractical to have a Mineral Sites Plan which will not produce 1.56mtpa after 2028. 3. The end date for the Mineral Sites Plan should be 2028.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Purbeck District Council	Question 1		DMSP1298	Purbeck District Council is considering a plan period for the Partial Review of the Purbeck Local Plan Part 1 to 2031, so an end date of 2032 for the mineral sites plan will be appropriate from our point of view. Although the minerals strategy only covers to 2028, strategies should be subject to review, so it would be appropriate to extend it to 2032 or beyond, if needed.	Comment	Your comments are noted
Stephen Bowley Planning Consultancy	Question 2		DMSP52	RBMR support the Plan format with Site Allocations in an Appendix. It works well.		Your comments are noted.
Resident.	Question 2		DMSP325	It is important to remember that those parts of the County that are designated as AONB are also areas in which people live, work and raise families. It cannot be the intention that any areas of the United Kingdom are preserved in aspic merely as places that are visited and admired by persons who live remote from Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Swanworth Quarry has been in operation for many years within what is now an AONB. It follows that nothing that the quarriers have done in the past has in any way detracted from the integrity of the AONB. There is no suggestion that those whose livelihood depends on the continued operation of the quarry would do anything to jeopardise the continuation of their license to operate.		Your comments are noted.
Highways England	Question 2		DMSP570	This approach to setting out the Plan reduces the size of the main document whilst providing an easy reference point for more details information contained within the appendix.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 2		DMSP566	Probably. We have to read this rather lengthy section of the Plan in conjunction with the Minerals Strategy to find out what Policies are being adopted, then look at the detailed map and other information for each site. I find that this works quite well.	Agree	Your comments are noted.
Environment Agency	Question 2		DMSP648	The document was easy to read in its current form, but we would not be adverse to the plans and policies being joined together.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
RSPB, South West Regional Office	Question 2		DMSP1006	The current approach is appropriate. Adequate signposting is provided in paragraph 4.4 to the details on each allocation.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Resident.	Question 2		DMSP712	Although putting the individual plans into different appendices makes the document easier to read, it means that the potential interaction between the different planning applications is lost. The different planning applications at Woodsford, Pallington Lakes, and Crossways need to be considered in relation to each other. These different plans effectively comprise a single continuous extraction site. Although each plan details the number of movements of lorries required to remove the gravel from the individual sites, there does not appear to be any consideration of the cumulative effect of all these lorry movements. Furthermore the cumulative effect of these different applications on the local environment is not considered. Therefore it is necessary to consider these (and other) applications in relation to each other and therefore an additional section is required in the document to consider the additive interactions of the multiple planning applications	Disagree	Your comments are noted. Cumulative issues have already been taken into consideration, and further work will be done, including work on cumulative traffic impacts.
D.K. Symes Associates	Question 2		DMSP643	Plan layout is supported.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Resident.	Question 2		DMSP1028	there is no to care for the local community, why don't you donate money to build the village hall if you that caring	Disagree	Your comments are noted.



Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 2		DMSP420	It is considered easier to work with when a policy contains the map and considerations it is referring to within it, rather than separate appendices.	Disagree	Your comments are noted.
North Dorset District Council	Question 2		DMSP546	The Council would prefer to see the location maps placed next to the appropriate policies rather than in Appendix A with the details of the sites remaining in the Appendix.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
East Dorset Friends Of The Earth	Question 2		DMSP619	In general the layout of the report works well. However, the remediation of the sites is addressed for the individual sites in the appendices. There should be a statement in the body of the document that, for planning permission to be granted to any site, a specific management plan for phased remediation should be in place as in Policy RSI and a specific development management plan as in Policy DMI. Remediation should be carried out while the site is being operated and not at the end of extraction. The developer must provide funding for remediation in advance and this should be evidenced before planning permission is granted.	Comment	Your comments are noted. Restoration/remediation is covered in the Minerals Strategy; specific reference is made to it where relevant in various proposed allocations. Sites are often worked using rolling extraction and restoration, not waiting until the whole site is dug. However, this approach does not work for all minerals, e.g. ball clay, Purbeck Stone, need to have access to all parts of the site during working.
East Dorset Friends Of The Earth	Question 2		DMSP616	In general the structure of the report works well. However, remediation of the sites is addressed for individual sites. It should be stated in the body of the Mineral Sites Plan that planning permission for each site should be subject to a specific plan for phased remediation in each case as in Policy RSI. Remediation should be done while the site is being operated not at the end of extraction. The remediation should be funded in advance by the developer and permission should be dependent on evidence of this management fund being in place.	Comment	Your comments are noted. Restoration/remediation is covered in the Minerals Strategy; specific reference is made to it where relevant in various proposed allocations. Sites are often worked using rolling extraction and restoration, not waiting until the whole site is dug. However, this approach does not work for all minerals, e.g. ball clay, Purbeck Stone, need to have access to all parts of the site during working.
	Question 2		DMSP597	Question 2 The maps may be easy to read if you have young eyes. Fonts should be 12 or over not as they are here after downloading. The information that you made available on your exhibition stands was different from that in this document. Font sizes must be increased. I noted that; 1.8 The largest amount of the expected 17.2 million tons will be coming from the Puddletown Road quarries i.e. Binnegar Quarry - 4.8 million tons. This is without the Great Plantation extension where no figure is given. This is without unallocated sites which may also come forward in due time.(4.19)	Comment	Your comments are noted. Issues of readability/accessibility of the document will be considered. All Dorset County Council document can be provided in larger font if requested.
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Question 2		DMSP769	Agree - the document is easier to read this way, and finding all maps together in Appendix is clearer	Agree	Your comments are noted.
Hampshire County Council	Question 2		DMSP810	Agree with the layout of the Plan.	Comment	Your comments are noted
East Dorset Friends Of The Earth	Question 2		DMSP1198	Would recommend the creation and dynamic maintenance of an on-line appendix to the Mineral Sites plan of all sites, including disused, working and proposed sites. This will keep interested parties informed about the status of site management and remediation in each quarry / mine. This complements Policy DM11 - Review of Old Planning Permissions and Policy MON1 - Plan, Monitor and Manage. The appendix could be interactive so that stakeholders could be more involved.	Comment	Your comments are noted. The Mineral Planning Authority have considered creating a similar database for monitoring purposes.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

East Dorset Friends Of The Earth	Question 2		DMSP1247	<p><b>Site Maps</b> These are good but can you please include environmentally protected areas? They may not need to be separately distinguished.</p> <p><b>Online appendix</b> The online dynamic appendix to the final Mineral Sites Plan that Clifford Morse suggested could have an introductory section with the latest developments, new planning consents, new proposals, sites declined by the Minerals Planning Authority, etc. It could then be in the form of a table, maybe like that on pages 121-128. You may wish to include an online comments section just like the current one, with you as gatekeepers; this may help operators to be more sensitive to the needs of other stakeholders and to be better understood by the public. Some of the operators' comments have shown wisdom. If they see a benefit in this, the bigger operators may wish to co-operate in its production or to financially support it. An interactive map with a zoom facility would be very useful as part of this appendix. See below. Active map in online appendix You already have these maps on the Dorset CC Geographical information systems - e.g. the Dorset Explorer map at <a href="http://explorer.geowessex.com/">http://explorer.geowessex.com/</a> .</p> <p>I guess you could use a bespoke map from them but you could just give them a mineral sites layer, link your appendix to their map and update your layer regularly. This layer would need to be easy to find when navigating the map; at present, some layers are hard to find. You could perhaps use the following site categories: working, permitted, permitted (but not currently worked), proposed, disallowed, restored, awaiting restoration, abandoned without restoration, historic. Maybe something simpler. To show these categories, the vertically striped red colouration for allocated mineral sites and the blue diagonally striped colouration for sites with existing planning permission work well and should be the model for the other categories you choose. Woodland should stay green (and green belt could be green stripes); yellow is too pale but this still leaves other colours: orange, purple, grey, brown, pink, etc, all with stripes.</p> <p>The colourations used in the Waste Plan are a start but need improving. The Dorset Explorer maps already have click-on overlays ; you can include areas of search, areas of environmental protection ((Natura 2000 sites (SACs, SPAs, MPAs), RAMSAR, SSSI and SNCl)), heritage sites, AONBs, built up areas, Green Belt, flood zones, etc. Public rights of way and geology are already overlays on the Dorset Explorer maps. It would be useful to extend the map 10 or so miles past the Dorset boundary. Such a map would satisfy those who want you to show where collections of workings are close together.</p>	Comment	Your comments are helpful, and are noted.
Moreton Parish Council	Question 2		DMSP1292	I agree with the approach of separating the allocation policies from the associated Inset Maps and Development Considerations. Having Site Pro-Forma and Development Considerations entirely separate does require the reader to keep cross checking. I think it would be very helpful if the Development Considerations and the Inset Maps were attached to the site Pro-Forma since the Development Considerations appear to build on the ratings in the Pro Forma. Then all the information about a site would be together.	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be considered.
Wareham St Martin Parish Council	Question 3		DMSP42	<p>Do not believe there is sufficient safeguard in the criteria laid down; can understand the reason why unallocated sites might be necessary considering the length of the period of the Plan and the unforeseen demand for these materials.</p> <p>However, traffic generated also has impact on the integrity of the heaths and designated area; also has impact on local communities. There would need to be full public consultation on each and every unallocated site being put forward with sufficient detail to ensure full understanding of the reason why a site has been promoted, impact on environment and communities, length of time site is to be used, etc.</p> <p>Putting in a planning application will not be sufficient consultation. Parish and town councils should be encouraged to hold a public consultation in their area for county council officers to give a presentation and answer questions before an application is submitted.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Any site coming forward as planning application through this policy would have to undergo normal full public consultation.</p> <p>The Mineral Planning Authority will carry out statutory/required public consultation. Parish/town Councils are encouraged to publicise the applications as well.</p>
Stephen Bowley Planning Consultancy	Question 3		DMSP53	RBMR support the approach to the development of unallocated sites within the Area of Search. The approach needs to embrace applications for the extension of existing quarries.	Agree	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>The issue of quarry extensions has already been noted as being more appropriate to the level of the Minerals Strategy as opposed to the Mineral Sites Plan.</p>

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Historic England	Question 3	DMSP381	<p>Question 3: Are the proposed safeguards for allocated sites adequate?</p> <p>This policy test in Policy MS2 does not appear to reflect the adopted Minerals Strategy or national policy, guidance or legislation. Perhaps the policy might refer to other relevant considerations to be observed in the Dorset Minerals Strategy?</p> <p>Policy MS2 also refers to a limited number of factors to be considered to enable development to be permitted. It is unclear why this is the case and why only natural environment considerations are emphasised.</p> <p>The evidence base highlights the sensitivity of these sites in relation to historic landscapes and individual heritage assets and their settings. As a consequence Policy MS2 fails to reflect the adopted Minerals Strategy and its agreed suite of Development Management policies - the criteria to be met to permit development. Historic England (formerly English Heritage) is anxious to ensure local and national policy is applied and legislative obligations are met.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to appropriate changes to be made to the text.</p>
Chairman, East Dorset Environment Partnership	Question 3	DMSP730	<p>Sand and Gravel Area of Search para 4.21- 4.27, Policy MS2, Question 3 and Fig.3 EDEP objects strongly to the inclusion of a map (Figure 3) which claims in the text to exclude designated areas of ecological and landscape importance. It does not and is grossly misleading. Were this to be submitted in a final document submitted to EiP it would be found Unsound. This needs reviewing as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>Until a correct and detailed large scale map is produced, we do not consider it appropriate to comment further on this section of the document, including MS2 and Question 3 - it would be signing a blank cheque. It is disappointing that despite being assured by MWDF that they would send EDEP a revised map with overlays showing the designated areas, no such revision or explanation have been provided.</p> <p>Recommendation: Figure 3 should be corrected so that all designated areas of ecological and landscape importance are excluded from the potential area of search.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted and the map will be amended.</p>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 3	DMSP572	<p>Great care will be necessary to assess the REAL need for such sites together with all the necessary Environmental Impact Assessments and so forth.</p>	Agree	<p>Your comments are noted.</p>
Environment Agency	Question 3	DMSP649	<p>We would be satisfied for unallocated sites to be allowed provided the safeguards listed in this policy can be met.</p> <p>However, the safeguards in the last paragraph of Policy MS-2 should also include reference to other designations and water features. The unallocated sites would need to assess the environmental issues relevant to the site.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted and consideration will be given to appropriate amendments to the text.</p>
Imerys Minerals Ltd	Question 3	DMSP677	<p>Unallocated sites should be determined on their merits. Post adoption of the MSP it may be the case that some allocated sites cannot be developed due to unforeseen circumstances at this stage. Deliverability and flexibility of the Plan is essential to meet demand in any event.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p>
Resident.	Question 3	DMSP715	<p>The need to search for additional sources of sand and gravel when the current identified resources provide potentially 350% of the required demand (for the current plan timeframe of 2028) is unnecessary. Even allowing for an extended timeframe for the plan (that has not been agreed) until 2032, the current applications detailed in MS-1 provides an excess of over 6 million tonnes.</p> <p>Granting permission to search for further sand and gravel therefore appears to be granting permission for no reason. The need for additional sand and gravel is therefore un-necessary and therefore no search areas are required.</p>	Disagree	<p>Your comments are noted. It is not enough to just allocate the amount of additional aggregate require – the annual level of provision needs to be maintained as well.</p> <p>The area of search offers an option for maintaining production if there is a shortfall, particularly towards the end of the Plan period</p>
D.K. Symes Associates	Question 3	DMSP634	<p>This assumes that unallocated sites come forward on the primary ground of mineral production.</p> <p>The Plan / Policy should recognise that there could be developments where mineral production is not the primary purpose (e.g. reservoirs, marinas, lakes). These 'windfall' sites should not be determined against Policy MS-2 as mineral production is ancillary / incidental to the main purpose of the development.</p> <p>As there is no certainty that the allocated sites will come forward, or that there may be an unforeseen issue highlighted during the preparation of a detailed application, the determination of a non-allocated site should be judged on its merits and the position of the supply at the time of the application, with limited weight being given to the status of the allocated sites.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted and consideration will be given to appropriate amendments to the text.</p>

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 3		DMSP421	The Parish Council raised concerns that meeting criteria can be subjective. There has been experience in the past that the interpretation of criteria from the community has been different to the interpretation of criteria from the local authority.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Resident.	Question 3		DMSP536	"Hurst Farm, Moreton - a proposed quarry in agricultural land. It is adjacent to the Woodsford extension proposed site and development of this site would similarly provide the benefit of reducing flows of nitrate fertilisers into Poole Harbour, via the River Frome which is adjacent to the site" How would this be possible? Where are these nitrate fertilisers coming from currently and why can't they be reduced without this project?	Disagree	Your comments are noted. The fertilisers are applied to the land, and enter the ground and surface water. The Mineral Planning Authority accepts that it is not movement of nitrates off the site that is the issue. Rather it is the potential to use the restoration to significantly enhance the river by establishing a wetland that would remove nitrate, phosphate and silt.
North Dorset District Council	Question 3		DMSP547	The Council is in agreement with the grounds set out in the policy with the addition of reference to development management considerations.	Agree	Your comments are noted.
Resident.	Question 3		DMSP598	Question 3: If you want to provide certainty for local residents then unallocated sites should not be permitted in this timescale.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Affpuddle and Turnerspuddle Parish Council	Question 3		DMSP709	Should allocated sites that have not progressed be removed if a more suitable site is brought forward?	Comment	A site allocated in an adopted plan cannot be removed until the Plan is reviewed.
West Dorset & Weymouth & Portland Councils	Question 3		DMSP735	<p><b>Question 3:</b></p> <p>Policy MS-2, which sets out the circumstances where the extraction of sand and gravel from unallocated sites may be permitted, needs to be amended to ensure that the timely implementation of strategically important non-mineral development (in particular urban extensions) is not prejudiced. In West Dorset there is a particular concern that Policy MS-2 may potentially prejudice the bringing forward of non-mineral development at Crossways, which lies entirely within the sand and gravel area of search. In his report - <a href="https://www.dorsetforyou.com/InspectorsReport/West/Weymouth">https://www.dorsetforyou.com/InspectorsReport/West/Weymouth</a> - the Inspector for the West Dorset and Weymouth &amp; Portland Joint Local Plan identified Crossways as a sustainable location for growth. The current allocation in the Local Plan is centred on the site south of B3390 and will include 500 homes and 3.5 hectares of employment land. The Inspector requires an early review of the Local Plan, which will make provision for growth to 2036, to be in place by 2021. He recognised the potential for Crossways to accommodate further growth in addition to the allocated site both in West Dorset and in Purbeck, where further growth has been identified as an option in the Partial Review of the Purbeck Local Plan.</p> <p>The Inspector notes that prior extraction will be required on sites at Crossways to enable the sand and gravel to be extracted prior to non-mineral development taking place. This reflects the requirement of the supporting text to Policy SG1 in the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals Strategy (paragraph 14.13). The supporting text (paragraph 14.16) also indicates that in considering proposals for prior extraction, the scale and timescale of the proposed built development will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>The main concern with Policy MS-2 is that the circumstances in which the bringing forward of non-allocated sand and gravel would be permitted are too limited (i.e. to cases where: there is a demonstrable shortfall in the supply of sand and gravel: or the development of the unallocated site offers net environmental benefits). Since the benefits of bringing forward the allocation at Crossways (or further development in the area) would largely be of a social and economic rather than environmental nature, proposals for prior extraction on such sites could be considered to be contrary to Policy MS-2 unless there is a demonstrable shortfall in the supply of sand and gravel. It appears that under this policy, Unlike Policy SG1, the scale and timescale of the proposed built development will not be taken into consideration. Policy MS-2 could, therefore, potentially prejudice the timely implementation of strategically important non-mineral development (in particular urban extensions), even in circumstances where prior extraction in accordance with Policy SG1 of the Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Minerals Strategy would be acceptable.</p>	Comment	Your comments are noted. The Mineral Planning Authority will amend the Policy to reflect the second suggested remedy to this matter.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

			<p>There is also a concern that it may be something of a challenge to demonstrate a shortfall in the supply of sand and gravel in the Crossways area given that the anticipated yield of the proposed allocations at: Woodford Quarry (AS-19); Station Road, Moreton (AS-25); and Hurst Farm, Moreton (AS-26) is in the order of 7.1 million tonnes.</p> <p>There are two potential remedies to this problem: Firstly, the Sand and Gravel Area of Search could be amended to exclude: allocations for growth; sites with the potential for future growth (typically adjacent to existing urban areas, which may come forward through the review of local plans); key infrastructure; and important landscape / biodiversity sites; or Secondly, an additional criterion could be added to Policy MS-2 to indicate that proposals for the prior extraction of minerals to allow strategically important non-mineral development to come forward (in accordance with Policy SG1 of the Minerals Strategy) would be one of the circumstances where the bringing forward of an unallocated site within the Sand and Gravel Area of Search would be acceptable. Further detail on allocated and potential future development sites can be provided to inform the amendment of the area of search, if that is considered to be the most appropriate way forward.</p>		
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Question 3	DMSP770	<p>Policy MS-2 - Sand and Gravel Area of Search. 4.21- 4.27. Question 3</p> <p>Dorset Wildlife Trust believes that the map shown in Figure 3 is entirely misleading. The text within 4.22 states To reduce the likelihood that proposals for development within these areas will be subject to constraints and to give clearer guidance to developers, a landscape and ecological assessment of the Resource Blocks has been carried out to identify those areas within the designation where mineral development is less likely to be constrained and therefore more likely to be successfully developed.</p> <p>The map, however, covers large areas which have Local, National and International Conservation Designations and cover areas which this Sites Plan has already determined not to take forward because they are not appropriate for mineral development. It is true that hidden away on page 55 of the separate document, the Habitats Regulations Assessment, on the Sand and Gravel AoS is the statement: Although for the purposes of this study the area of search includes [these sites], it is on the understanding that development will not be permitted within these areas unless it meets the above criteria or, in the case of SNCIs and ancient woodland has been granted planning permission with a comprehensive mitigation and restoration plan.</p> <p>But this is not adequate for the purposes of this Draft Plan. It is essential that more detailed and larger scale maps are produced which exclude all of the designated sites to give a more realistic assessment of areas in which landowners and developers might consider putting forward potential unallocated sites in the future, should this be required and fit in with the criteria listed under Policy MS2. Otherwise a great deal of time and resources will be wasted in totally inappropriate sites having to be considered by the Minerals Authority and other organisations consulted.</p> <p>Even if the designated sites are removed from the Area of Search, this does not mean that remaining areas will necessarily be acceptable, and every application will have to be assessed.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>The map will be amended along the lines suggested.</p> <p>Every site coming forward through this Policy will be a full planning application, to be fully assessed as any planning application would be</p>
Natural England	Question 3	DMSP1265	<p>Is it appropriate to permit unallocated sites on these grounds? Are such unallocated sites likely to prejudice the development of sites allocated through this Plan? Are the proposed safeguards for allocated sites adequate?</p> <p>Natural England's view is that it is not appropriate to permit unallocated sites on these grounds and that safeguards are inadequate. The policy in its current form would be inconsistent with national planning policy, greatly weakening the protection given to biodiversity including to nationally designated sites. It would introduce inherent conflicts both within this plan and between this plan and the Minerals Core Strategy and as a consequence it would introduce uncertainty within the planning process, the reverse of one important purpose of a development plan. Both the Habitat Regulations assessment and the SEA of the policy are flawed.</p> <p>Given all of these circumstances, the approach to the issue of unallocated sites needs to be rethought. The policy would introduce a strong presumption in favour of development within the AoS (in the event that there is a demonstrable shortfall in supply) based on a number of factors within or omitted from the Plan. The policy is positively worded to favour development. There is no mention of any environmental constraints either in the policy or the accompanying text.</p> <p>The Sustainability appraisal/SEA concludes (Table 9) that the impact of the policy is Positive - the Area of</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>The Mineral Planning Authority would look to Natural England to advise on the changes to the area of search required to ensure it takes proper account of all relevant biodiversity and landscape issues.</p>

Search has been selected to minimise impacts on biodiversity . Environmental characteristics - biodiversity, landscape - within the AoS have been evaluated in a report (Proposed Sand and Gravel Area of search - Landscape and Ecological Impact Assessment) and as a result the area of the AoS has been refined with some areas omitted, so reinforcing the view that the coverage of the AoS has been subject to close scrutiny. In these circumstances, applications within the AoS would enjoy strong support from the plan.

Notwithstanding the conclusion of the SEA and the title of the impact assessment, the extent of the AoS has in fact been determined without due regard for biodiversity considerations. The above assessment report describes much of the huge biodiversity resource within the AoS. It includes parts of parts of five European sites and two Ramsar sites, 22 SSSIs, many SNCl s as well as protected species outside these areas. The sites and species remain within the AoS. For the internationally designated sites, the rider at the end of the proposed policy mentions three Dorset heathland sites (Dorset Heaths SAC, Dorset Heathlands SPA and Dorset Heathland Ramsar site). However, the AoS includes parts of four other internationally designated sites [Dorset Heaths (Purbeck and Wareham) and Studland Dunes SAC; Avon Valley SPA/Ramsar; River Avon SAC]. In addition, the New Forest SAC, SPA and Ramsar as well as Poole Harbour SPA/Ramsar could be affected by development within the AoS. None of these sites are mentioned within the HRA.

Clearly the policy is unsound at present in introducing a presumption in favour of development that may adversely affect these additional internationally designated sites. However, for SSSIs, SNCl and other biodiversity there is no such rider within the policy. The impact assessment concludes:- Although, for the purposes of this study, the area of search includes European and UK designated sites, County wildlife sites (SNCl s) and areas of ancient woodland, this is on the understanding that development will not be permitted within these areas unless it meets the above criteria or, in the case of SNCl s and ancient woodland has been granted planning permission with a comprehensive mitigation and restoration plan

However, no such understanding is expressed in any proposed policy, indeed the policy and text give a strong support for such development which would then potentially be in conflict with DM policies in the Core Strategy such as DM1c (and incidentally, relying on mitigation and restoration plan is not appropriate for ancient woodland). The broad brush approach of the AoS is also inconsistent with NPPF para 117 (identify and map local ecological networks and promote preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats and protection and recovery of protected species) and the general policy support for development within the AoS is in conflict with NPPF para 118. Since the AOS is meant to cater for a possible shortfall in supply, with sites there not going short cutting the plan led process of the Sites Plan, we would suggest that it is particularly important that the AoS takes full account of likely constraints and directs potential applicants to areas where conflict with other policy is unlikely.

We note that Proposed Sand and Gravel Area Page 3 of 7 of search - Landscape and Ecological Impact Assessment excludes 20 areas from the area first shown in the Core Strategy, using mainly landscape grounds and professional judgement although ecology is sometimes mentioned as a supporting reason. But clearly landscape is the overriding consideration in these judgements since far more important areas for ecology remain within the AoS. Clearly at present, different standards are being used for landscape and for ecology. As with the landscape assessment, it would not be sufficient to rely on designated sites to provide the necessary confidence. This would not capture the ways that development outside these sites might harm them and neither would it encompass the substantial biodiversity interest that is not covered by designations for example in the ecological networks mentioned in NPPF para 117 or the protected species (e.g. European Protected Species) that occur throughout the substantial heath/forest blocks. The flood plain of the River Frome SSSI is another example. A naturally functioning flood plain is an important part of the river ecology and allows space for the river to change course over time, another important aspect of the river ecology. Aggregate extraction in the flood plain would interfere with these functions.

Natural England would welcome the opportunity to assist the County Council in refining the AoS Landscape and Ecological Impact Assessment and the extent of the AoS itself so that it properly takes into account relevant biodiversity considerations.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Knightsford Parish Council	Question 3	DMSP1229	<p>This comment is submitted on behalf of Knightsford Parish Council (KPC) KPC have very serious concerns regarding paragraph 4.27 of the draft MSP. Which states; " All sites within the AOS or Resource Blocks proposed for development will be required to go through the process of submission of a planning application, with all the associated detailed assessments."</p> <p>Knightsford Parish Council have recently been the subject of a planning application for an 'unallocated' gravel site which is an extension of the existing Woodsford quarry site. We were only given 24 days to respond even though the site; was for 400,000 tonnes of sand &amp; gravel; included an application to increase the noise level at the closest property to above National Planning Policy Framework &amp; Planning Practice Guidance; included applications by the operator to change other planning conditions that had been disregarded for years; and, included adding a bagging plant for which no noise assessment was included. This proposal for adoption of unallocated sites, which could be substantial in size and impact, simply does not allow local communities time to study them, discuss them at Parish Councils, and if necessary seek expert advice to counter the operators frequently biased and inaccurate planning application supporting documentation.</p>	Disagree	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>The Mineral Planning Authority will observe national requirements for consultation of planning applications.</p> <p>Respondents can in many cases request an extension of time.</p>
Knightsford Parish Council	Question 3	DMSP1230	<p>This comment is submitted on behalf of Knightsford Parish Council (KPC) KPC have very serious concerns regarding paragraph 4.27 of the draft MSP. Which states; " All sites within the AOS or Resource Blocks proposed for development will be required to go through the process of submission of a planning application, with all the associated detailed assessments." Knightsford Parish Council have recently been the subject of a planning application for an 'unallocated' gravel site which is an extension of the existing Woodsford quarry site. We were only given 24 days to respond even though the site; was for 400,000 tonnes of sand &amp; gravel; included an application to increase the noise level at the closest property to above National Planning Policy Framework &amp; Planning Practice Guidance; included applications by the operator to change other planning conditions that had been disregarded for years; and, included adding a bagging plant for which no noise assessment was included. This proposal for adoption of unallocated sites, which could be substantial in size and impact, simply does not allow local communities time to study them, discuss them at Parish Councils, and if necessary seek expert advice to counter the operators frequently biased and inaccurate planning application supporting documentation.</p>	Disagree	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>The Mineral Planning Authority will observe national requirements for consultation of planning applications.</p> <p>Respondents can in many cases request an extension of time.</p>
Moreton Parish Council	Question 3	DMSP1293	<p>" Is it appropriate to permit unallocated sites on these grounds (ie Policy MS-2 - Sand and Gravel Area of Search) ?" Yes. "Are such unallocated sites likely to prejudice the development of sites allocated through this Plan? Are the proposed safeguards for allocated sites adequate?" The proposed substitutions in the Moreton Parish Council (MPC) response to the Mineral Sites Plan (MSP) basically follow Policy MS-2. The MPC analysis shows that there is likely to be a drop in the output of the allocated sites below 1.56mtpa before 2028. Without Policy MS-2, DCC would presumably have to go through another Mineral Sites Plan process in order to raise the available output back up to 1.56mtpa.</p> <p>It would appear that the MSP needs to have a much shorter period, say 5 years, to reflect the fact that a number of sites coming forward are small and therefore not in operation for very long. The West Dorset District and Purbeck District Councils have Local Plans up to about 2031 but are forced by land supply and the government to review their housing supply at 5 yearly intervals. Given that the days of the vast Warmwell type quarry are past, it may now be more appropriate, like the District Councils, to essentially always have a rolling programme of working towards the next 5 year Mineral Sites Plan publication date.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>The Mineral Sites Plan, after adoption, will need to be reviewed before the end date of the Plan.</p> <p>The area of search will be just one way of giving the Inspector comfort that the appropriate level of aggregate can be maintained during the life of the Plan.</p>
Purbeck District Council	Question 3	DMSP1299	<p>Purbeck District Council has concerns that it is not clear to what extent an area of search will sterilise other forms of development, e.g. from domestic extensions to strategic allocations / settlement extensions. It would be helpful if the plan could clarify the implications of areas of search. Purbeck District Council also considers that it would be worth separating out some of the possible effects. Factors like hydrology and recreation will apply to all sites and not just SACs, SPAs and Ramsars. (This relates to policies MS-1, MS-2 and MS-4)</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Text will be added to clarify and set out the implications of this policy on other development.</p>
Resident.	Question 4	DMSP6	<p>Have lived in Dorset for 40 years and have a son who has a family who works at Swanworth Quarry. The quarry has been there for a very long time and provides full time employment to a large number of people. It is not seasonal work e.g. tourist based. The quarry supplies most of its stone into the Poole and Bournemouth area and it would be crazy to have to haul it all from Portland or the Mendip quarries. The site is being well restored and any extension would be likewise, with minimal impact on the AONB. Overall the benefits far outweigh the visual impact. Please allow the extension which is beneficial to the</p>	Agree	<p>Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.</p>

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

				local economy and environment. Thank you		
Resident.	Question 4		DMSP31	As a sub-contractor working closely with Suttle stone quarries it's obvious to see the close connection they have with the local communities and employ many local people who would no doubt be affected by the extension not being granted . The majority of the crushed aggregates are used in the Bournemouth and Poole area and I can't see how hauling stone from Portland or the Mendips is a more viable option . You only need to look at the areas that have been restored to see how serious Suttle stone quarries take their responsibilities.	Agree	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
Albion Stone PLC	Question 4		DMSP269	The MPA are looking for continuing reductions to the aggregate reserves at the quarries on Portland through surrendering the old aggregate reserves to secure new dimension stone mining reserves. Albion Stone has surrendered all the reserves in Bowers, Independent and sections of Admiralty and Inmosthay. We assume this process will continue with the new mining application from Stone Firms, so this Purbeck extension becomes vital for Dorset's mineral reserves.	Agree	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
Historic England	Question 4		DMSP382	It is unclear why the impact on the AONB is the only question being asked. The evidence base highlights the sensitivity of the site in relation to the historic landscape and individual heritage assets and their settings. Historic England (formerly English Heritage) is anxious to ensure local and national policy is also applied and legislative obligations are met.	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
Portland Stone Ltd	Question 4		DMSP408	I am the owner of Portland Stone Ltd and am one of the two operators who produce aggregate on the Isle of Portland. I support an extension to Swanworth Quarry as it is sustainable; it is a lot closer to the largest market of Poole than the quarries on Portland and even further afield in the Mendips. It makes no environmental or financial sense to haul materials from Portland into Poole/Bournemouth; therefore, I have no interest in supplying stone from Portland into that market. On Portland, I do not produce the smallest sized aggregate, eg 6mm, 10mm and 20mm, in fact I often pass enquiries to Swanworth to supply these materials. I have seen the extension plans and believe the benefits far outweigh any impact over a relatively short term extension in an AONB.	Agree	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 4		DMSP600	The Swanworth Quarry has been in operation for many years, although it is a bit of an anomaly in the AONB. There have, generally, been rather few complaints from the local people, there has been limited damage to the surrounding countryside, and worked-out parts of the quarry have been nicely restored to fit in with the AONB. The proposed extension of the quarry will provide crushed rock, largely for local use, over the next twenty years. We believe that the benefits outweigh the impacts and we do not wish to oppose this development. It is, of course very important that the E I A s should be comprehensive and that there should be a robust plan of restoration	Agree	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
Environment Agency	Question 4		DMSP650	We consider the Dorset AONB team and Natural England should lead on this question. We therefore have no comments to make.	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 4		DMSP422	In any development, the harm to an AONB is a 'weighing-up' argument and should only be considered acceptable if there is an overriding need. The current Draft Mineral Sites Plan states that there is no anticipated shortage of supply of crushed rock during the plan period (para 4.33), therefore it does not, within this plan period, outweigh the harm to the AONB.	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.



Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

<p>Corfe Castle Parish Council</p>	<p>Question 4</p>	<p>DMSP535</p>	<p>Corfe Castle Parish Council supports quarrying in the Isle of Purbeck but agrees with the Dorset County Council proposal not to include the Swanworth Quarry extension in the new Minerals Plan for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Coombe Bottom forms a natural western boundary to Swanworth Quarry . The proposed extension brings quarrying into Corfe Castle Parish and the adjacent village of Kingston which is not a quarrying village. Tourism, another important business in these areas would be adversely affected by the extension.</li> <li>2. The historic Purbeck Way (footpath) runs through Coombe Bottom to the coast and the South West Footpath: a route frequented by walkers. A bridge over Coombe Bottom would completely ruin this small valley which lies adjacent to an Internationally Important Nature Conservation Site.</li> <li>3. The proposed extension would adversely impact and/or damage the historic landscape and protected archaeological features. The rolling character of the landscape could not hide an open cast operation from view.</li> <li>4. Extensions to Swanworth Quarry were considered by the Secretary of State for inclusion in the Minerals Plans of 1968 and 1988 and not approved. In our opinion nothing has changed.</li> <li>5. Unlike other Purbeck quarries, Swanworth Quarry predominantly supplies crushed stone.. This is low quality material met by Portland and various other quarries in the country already transporting crushed stone to the southern counties of England. The ultimate closing of Swanworth Quarry would have a limited impact on the supply of this material to the region.</li> <li>6. Kingston relies on a private water supply which we are fearful could be compromised if any quarrying operations were carried out nearby."</li> </ol>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.</p>
<p>Suttle Stone Quarries</p>	<p>Question 4</p>	<p>DMSP793</p>	<p>I am part of the latest generation of the Suttle family to quarry in Purbeck, I have lived in Purbeck all my life and walk in the AONB almost every day. I have worked at Swanworth for 7 years and I find some of the comments in disagreement range from a few reasonable concerns to factual inaccuracies that have occasionally bordered on libellous. I think it would be a shame for Quarrying at Swanworth to end as a result of local people and visitors being fed incorrect information. This is especially important since approximately 30 of our directly employed colleagues who work and live full time in the local area (unlike many of the commenters) may find themselves jobless, despite the real demand and need for the stone they help produce and distribute. To that end I have decided to counter some of the more regular concerns that have been brought up regarding the quarry s effect on the AONB, as typified a recent comment:</p> <p>1 Noise will affect the current tranquillity of the area. Neither the company, nor the local authority have had complaints of noise regarding the current quarry. Noise levels are strictly controlled by current planning permission conditions - these would continue. The proposed quarry would be screened in the same sensitive manner with the same expertise to limit the effect on the AONB</p> <p>2 There would be much more traffic, presumably large lorries going up and down Kingston Hill, which would be detrimental. To be clear, there will be NO increase in lorry size OR movements from the current level. The proposal is just for a continuation of the current quarry works, albeit slightly further to the North-West of the current quarry. Swanworth Quarry s current level of lorry movements, as set by planning permission conditions is currently 60 per day. Our actual movements vary from day to day but never exceed our limit and don t often come close. Why do people presume this will increase? The extension will just allow for the sustained supply of the current, real demand. Equally, it is not preferable to the AONB to import limestone from other regions (ie the Mendips/Portland). Quite apart from the embarrassment of importing incongruous, pink/dark grey limestone from the Mendips into an area that is internationally famous for its own limestone industry. It would not be sustainable and would mean greater emissions through the county, coupled with larger, articulated lorries coming through Corfe, and along the roads of Purbeck.</p> <p>3 The undeveloped nature of the area would for ever be damaged. Untrue, the land could be restored to agricultural land as it currently is. All quarries (including the current area of Swanworth Quarry) are rightly obliged to have a restoration plan. Swanworth Quarry is in process of being restored to excellent effect; with grasslands seeded from the neighbouring SSSI already attracting a wealth of wildlife that thrives even with nearby quarry operations. The extension would be restored with the same expertise. In any case, this</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.</p>

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

			<p>is not to mention the fact that Purbeck is inextricably linked to its quarrying past, the development and legacy of quarries over the area is just as much a part of the AONB as anything else.</p> <p>4 There would be disturbance to the water table by more mining and excavation and this could affect the local water supply to Kingston village. There is no evidence that this is the case, in fact the limestone for quarrying is all above the natural water table and won't affect water sources. This is supported by a detailed study in the 1990s which concluded that Tarmac's proposed extension in 1988 would have no discernible impact on water supply. Furthermore, the current proposal is approximately 1/4 the size of Tarmac's previous application.</p> <p>5 Local historic landmarks could be spoiled or even ruined. The barrows are being given even wider berth than the out of date plan shows on this dorsetforyou consultation portal. The drawing that dorsetforyou has uploaded to this document does not reflect the current proposal which shows the area around the Tumulus removed from our extension plan. The correct plan has been displayed by the Council during their roadshows around Dorset.</p> <p>6 The pleasure and character of an undisturbed dark night sky would be changed if the area became more commercial and industrial. I find this rather nonsensical, how would a further excavation, which requires no lighting, change the effect on the night sky?</p> <p>7 The landscape would be changed and an area of outstanding beauty would become an eyesore The current quarry has become part of the landscape over the last century. It is rarely noticed by visitors and we are, more often than not, at great pains to direct even local customers to the quarry because it is not easily noticed from the road. The extension proposal (which is really just a continuation of the current quarry) would be screened and operated using exactly the same expertise and infrastructure (plant, lorries and access roads) as currently. If it is not currently an eyesore (we have had no complaints to that effect) then why is there an assumption that we wouldn'tt be able to achieve the same (or better) with modern techniques? We are disappointed that, despite proactively seeking consultation with relevant local councils, some were not initially responsive. Perhaps this is part of the reason that a lack of information regarding this proposal has led some commenters to draw their own conclusions, which are in many cases wide of the mark. We continue to be in open consultation with the local councils and extend this invitation to anyone that questions our aims/methods or has an interest in the proposal; reasonable discussion is always welcome.</p>		
Poole Harbour Commissioners	Question 4	DMSP531	<p>Poole Harbour Commissioners (PHC) has been a regular user of material from Swanworth Quarry since 1972, as a succession of developments on Poole Harbour have taken place. PHC have recently developed a Port Master Plan which involves five major packages of work for continued development of the Port. This Master Plan is an important strand in the business case for the Local Enterprise Partnership to make major infrastructure improvements to the Poole/Bournemouth/Christchurch conurbation. Over the years the Port has taken over half a million tons of material from the quarry, and it is anticipated that similar volumes of material will be needed over the 30 year life of the Master Plan. PHC have commented on the Bournemouth, Dorset &amp; Poole Minerals Core Strategy, particularly in relation to protecting quays for the import of marine dredged aggregate. The procurement of stone to the conurbation is a totally different proposition in that, apart from the local quarry at Swanworth, material would probably have to be imported from either Portland, the Mendips, or by sea. PHC's reasons for seeing Swanworth maintained as a viable quarry are: The visual appearance of the stone from Swanworth is compatible with all other developments around the perimeter of Poole Harbour Our experience is that Swanworth is the most economic source of armour rock/roadstone Good access roads from Swanworth to the conurbation were established in the 1980s and are still efficient Stone supply from Portland involves a slow journey through Portland and Weymouth Transport from the Mendips adds unnecessary traffic to the inadequate north-south county road network Over many years PHC has been a trading partner with Suttle's, who are a well-run, efficient company. Not only would the closure of the quarry have a direct impact on the business of PHC, I believe over 30 jobs at Suttle's would be affected.</p>	Agree	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
North Dorset District Council	Question 4	DMSP548	The Council has no comment to make.	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

East Dorset Friends Of The Earth	Question 4		DMSP693	This development would add significantly to the cumulative effect of quarrying in this area of the Purbeck. It is difficult to understand how this is compatible with maintaining the AONB. While acknowledging the distributed supply and transport arguments consider that presumption against location within the AONB overweighs them.	Disagree	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
Natural England	Question 4		DMSP1266	<p>Could the development of an extension to this quarry be justified, particularly in terms of landscape impacts on the AONB? Does the issue of provision of a sustainable supply of crushed rock outweigh the presumption against location within the AONB? It is not possible to give an answer to the question without further information about the proposal.</p> <p>However, taking the second part of the question first, no the supply of crushed rock does not outweigh the presumption against an AONB location. But there are a number of factors that might affect the balance of these considerations particularly the degree of harm to the AONB and how this might be moderated. This could be through different working methods, for example involving progressive restoration, or through landscape enhancements elsewhere. We note that the site assessment is included for information only. However, although AONB issues are clearly key, biodiversity ones are also relevant (the site is close to South Dorset Coast SSSI) and are not included at present. In this respect, as well as potential harm, there would be opportunities for significant enhancements which could also affect the balance of considerations in evaluating the potential impact of this possible extension.</p>	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
Sherborne Castle Estates	Question 5		DMSP39	Sherborne Stone is extracted from Frogden Quarry which is the only source of this unique limestone. This stone is the principle natural building stone in Sherborne and is found in many notable and historic buildings. The quality and volume of the remaining stone in the unworked parts of the quarry, which have planning permission for extraction, is however unknown. It is therefore appropriate and necessary that a potential extension to the quarry is allocated, to ensure that a continued supply of this locally important stone can be maintained, should the permitted reserves be insufficient during the plan period.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 5		DMSP601	Not necessary. Other sites with Planning Permission are omitted from the Plan.	Disagree	Your comments are noted.
D.K. Symes Associates	Question 5		DMSP633	As it is now approved it should not be referred to in the Plan other than as an existing site.	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 5		DMSP425	It is meeting a provision and should be included to provide a full view of all sites.	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
North Dorset District Council	Question 5		DMSP549	The Council's view is that it is appropriate for references to Frogden Quarry and Whithill Quarry to remain in the MSP.	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
West Dorset & Weymouth & Portland Councils	Question 5		DMSP736	<p>Questions 5 &amp; 6: The full extents and estimated mineral resource of the Frogden and Whithill Quarries consented sites and proposed allocations should be shown in the Minerals Sites Plan.</p> <p>This not only gives certainty to local people and organisations about the scale and location of extraction that could take place over the plan period, it also provides greater certainty that future demand (which is difficult to predict) would be met and a more focused basis for safeguarding against non-minerals development.</p>	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Question 5		DMSP772	<p>4.70 Policy MS-7 Provision of other building stone Questions 5, 6 &amp; 7 No, it seems unnecessary to include these sites if the existing planning permissions extend beyond the life of this Plan, and in the case of Redlands Quarry, Todber, there is no new extension proposed.</p> <p>Dorset Wildlife Trust is particularly concerned about the proposed extension to BS05 Whithill Quarry, which received permission for an extension in 2014. The additional area proposed would bring the quarry nearer still to Honeycomb Wood which is an Ancient Woodland and a Site of Nature conservation Interest. (See more detailed comments under Proposed Site Nominations )</p>	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Sherborne Castle Estates	Question 6	DMSP40	<p>Whithill Quarry produces Forest Marble limestone for building in the Sherborne area. This stone is found in the Lillington area and is known for its hardness and strength and has been used locally for many hundreds of years. The stone from the quarry has a wide range of local uses including walling, rockery, paving stone and roofing tiles.</p> <p>Planning Permissions was first granted in 2006 for stone extraction until 2026. The quality of the stone was, however, highly variable and volumes were much lower than originally anticipated. As a result, planning permission was sought and granted for an extension to the quarry in 2014. Although stone extraction in this extension area has planning permissions until 2044, the quality and therefore volume of the reserves are unknown. It is therefore appropriate and necessary that a potential extension to the quarry is allocated, to ensure that a continued supply of this locally important stone can be maintained, should the permitted reserves be insufficient during the plan period.</p>	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 6	DMSP602	No, not necessary. The Developer got his desired extension by the usual Planning process. If he wants to make any further changes he can make another Planning application at any time.	Disagree	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
D.K. Symes Associates	Question 6	DMSP635	Similar comments to Q5, however the request seems unreasonable as the quality of the stone should have been established at the application stage.	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 6	DMSP427	As Question 5, the Plan should encompass all eventualities as far as possible.	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
North Dorset District Council	Question 6	DMSP550	The Council's view is that it is appropriate for references to Frogden Quarry and Whithill Quarry to remain in the MSP.	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
West Dorset & Weymouth & Portland Councils	Question 6	DMSP737	Questions 5 & 6: The full extents and estimated mineral resource of the Frogden and Whithill Quarries consented sites and proposed allocations should be shown in the Minerals Sites Plan. This not only gives certainty to local people and organisations about the scale and location of extraction that could take place over the plan period, it also provides greater certainty that future demand (which is difficult to predict) would be met and a more focused basis for safeguarding against non-minerals development.	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Question 6	DMSP773	<p>4.70 Policy MS-7 Provision of other building stone Questions 5, 6 &amp; 7</p> <p>No, it seems unnecessary to include these sites if the existing planning permissions extend beyond the life of this Plan, and in the case of Redlands Quarry, Todber, there is no new extension proposed.</p> <p>Dorset Wildlife Trust is particularly concerned about the proposed extension to BS05 Whithill Quarry, which received permission for an extension in 2014. The additional area proposed would bring the quarry nearer still to Honeycomb Wood which is an Ancient Woodland and a Site of Nature conservation Interest. (See more detailed comments under Proposed Site Nominations )</p>	Comment	Your comments are noted and will be taken into consideration as this proposed allocation is considered further.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 7	DMSP632	Yes. No new development is proposed now but might well be proposed at any time between now and 2032.	Agree	Your comments are noted.
D.K. Symes Associates	Question 7	DMSP636	If there are good reserves remaining then it should be identified.	Comment	Your comment is noted.
Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 7	DMSP429	<p>The plan states that there is 40 years supply of stone left in the quarry, with a current extant permission for extraction for 5 years.</p> <p>Quarrying local stone is important to maintain the character of local buildings and settlements. Due to the supply of stone remaining at this site, it is considered important to allocate it.</p>	Comment	Your comments are noted.
North Dorset District Council	Question 7	DMSP551	The Council takes the view that reference to Redhill Quarry should be removed from the MSP.	Comment	Your comments are noted.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Dorset Wildlife Trust	Question 7		DMSP775	<p>4.70 Policy MS-7 Provision of other building stone Questions 5, 6 &amp; 7</p> <p>No, it seems unnecessary to include these sites if the existing planning permissions extend beyond the life of this Plan, and in the case of Redlands Quarry, Todber, there is no new extension proposed.</p> <p>Dorset Wildlife Trust is particularly concerned about the proposed extension to BS05 Whithill Quarry, which received permission for an extension in 2014. The additional area proposed would bring the quarry nearer still to Honeycomb Wood which is an Ancient Woodland and a Site of Nature conservation Interest. (See more detailed comments under Proposed Site Nominations )</p>	Comment	Your comments are noted. Proximity to Honeycombe Wood is noted and will be addressed through the specific site allocation information.
Stephen Bowley Planning Consultancy	Question 8		DMSP54	The concept of a Puddletown Road Policy Area is supported. The southern boundary doesn't follow an obvious boundary and it is suggest the A352, or possibly the railway line, would be easier to use.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 8		DMSP604	The Policy area boundary seems about right. It is good to see a long-term strategy developed over a substantial area of the Heath/Forest Mosaic Landscape.	Agree	Your comment is noted.
Environment Agency	Question 8		DMSP651	The southern boundary of the area appears to come close to the River Frome, it is vital that any proposals do not impact the integrity of the River Frome SSSI and its floodplain. Proposals should also take into account the objectives of the Frome Restoration Plan and any other plans relevant to this area. The north eastern boundary runs along the River Piddle. Any proposals should also not impact on this watercourse and its associated floodplain and habitats.	Comment	Your comments are noted. Consideration will be given to the suggested wording changes, and making reference to The Frome Restoration Plan.
RSPB, South West Regional Office	Question 8		DMSP1019	As presented we support the boundary of the current Policy area.	Comment	Your comment is noted.
D.K. Symes Associates	Question 8		DMSP637	Is there merit in extending the area northwards to include all the mineral workings in this locality?	Comment	Your comment is noted. Consideration will be given to this suggested change as this proposed policy/area is considered further.
Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 8		DMSP430	Too site specific, no comment considered appropriate.	Comment	Your comment is noted.
North Dorset District Council	Question 8		DMSP552	The Council has no comment to make.	Comment	Your comment is noted.
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Question 8		DMSP776	<p>Policy MS-8 Puddletown Road Area Policy</p> <p>Question 8 Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the Puddletown Road Area Policy, but would like it to clarify that working with landowners does not only mean the landowners who have minerals workings on their land, or who put forward sites for consideration, but with all landowners in the area covered by the Policy (which includes DWT), to ensure a coherent long-term restoration and management plan for the area.</p> <p>As far as we can tell, the area covered by the boundary shown on the map is the most appropriate.</p>	Comment	Your comment is noted – it is agreed that as far as possible all landowners should be involved, though in some cases this will be by negotiation and agreement.
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Question 8		DMSP777	<p>Policy MS-8 Puddletown Road Area Policy Question 8</p> <p>Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the Puddletown Road Area Policy, but would like it to clarify that working with landowners does not only mean the landowners who have minerals workings on their land, or who put forward sites for consideration, but with all landowners in the area covered by the Policy (which includes DWT), to ensure a coherent long-term restoration and management plan for the area. As far as we can tell, the area covered by the boundary shown on the map is the most appropriate.</p>	Comment	Your comment is noted – it is agreed that as far as possible all landowners should be involved, though in some cases this will be by negotiation and agreement.

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Natural England	Question 8	DMSP1267	<p>Is this the most appropriate policy area boundary? Should it be amended, and if so, how?</p> <p>We note that in most locations the policy area has been drawn quite widely and thus includes land where at present there is no prospect of quarrying or related activity but nevertheless there is the possibility of interactions with the core area of mineral working.</p> <p>We would support this approach (as we do the objective of the policy) but would suggest that along the Piddle Valley boundary needs to be extended in some locations to include land at least up to the edge of the river. This land has previously been part of a common land exchange proposal associated with a planning application and we understand is under the control of one of the quarry operators.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to this suggested change as this proposed policy/area is considered further.</p>
Purbeck District Council	Question 8	DMSP1301	<p>Purbeck District Council believes it is sensible to base the policy largely on the Heath Forest Mosaic Landscape Type, as this is a recognised area. The area appears to be broad and therefore has the potential for a comprehensive and coordinated approach to management, resulting in creating a coherent and resilient ecological network, in line with the NPPF.</p> <p>Purbeck District Council believes that the intention of the policy is for all of i-iv to apply. Therefore, it should be amended to include an 'and' after every clause.</p> <p>There is no mention in the preamble or policy of the green belt or AONB. The AONB is particularly relevant in terms of its setting. There are also some heritage assets either within the zone or close to it, e.g. listed buildings in the Stokeford area.</p>	Comment	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to the suggested changes as this proposed policy/area is considered further.</p>
Resident	Question 9	DMSP7	<p>The buffer zone should vary according to activity proposed.</p> <p>A reasonable compromise should be achieved so not to lose valuable mineral resource due to hard and fast regulations.</p>	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Resident	Question 9	DMSP38	The buffer zone should be relevant to the likelihood of development		Your comment is noted.
Stephen Bowley Planning Consultancy	Question 9	DMSP55	Some developments within 250 metres of existing or allocated mineral workings can have a significant impact - for example where blasting is proposed. RBMR therefore supports the suggested 250 metre consultation buffer since it is an appropriate precautionary approach that should prevent an incompatible development being allowed.	Agree	Your comments are noted.
Albion Stone PLC	Question 9	DMSP266	The buffer surely has to be site specific and relate to the consultation area that the MPA would expect a mineral applicant to be considering when making an application.	Comment	Your comment is noted – it is considered necessary to have some set distance established in policy, as this is the distance that will be used to protect a minerals operation as well as surrounding non-mineral development, existing or proposed. The buffer is not intended to be an area of no development - it is the area where the MPA wishes to be kept aware of proposed development.
Resident	Question 9	DMSP268	It would seem reasonable to have a similar 250m buffer zone for existing properties.	Comment	Your comment is noted.
Chairman, East Dorset Environment Partnership	Question 9	DMSP731	<p>Policy MS-9 Safeguarding Minerals Sites and Infrastructure Recommendation:</p> <p>For sand and gravel, restoration of mineral working is likely to attempt to restore heathland. Thus, as with new housing development close to designated heathland sites, a buffer of at least 400m should be adopted.</p> <p>We recommend including this as a lower limit to allow for the possible adoption of a wider buffer zone between housing and heathland in the event that the 400m zone proves inadequate.</p>	Comment	Your comment is noted and will be taken into consideration
Campaign to Protect Rural England	Question 9	DMSP603	A buffer zone of 250 metres seems a good starting point but each site should be considered on its merits. A very large open-cast sand and gravel pit might need a wider buffer zone but a wharf or rail siding might need less.	Disagree	Your comment is noted – it is considered necessary to have some set distance established in policy, as this is the distance that will be used to protect a minerals operation as well as surrounding non-mineral development, existing or proposed. The buffer is not intended to be an area of no development - it is the area where the MPA wishes to be kept aware of proposed development.
Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire	Question 9	DMSP918	In the section of your draft document relating to Safeguarding you ask the question about buffer zones. The experience of this AONB is that whilst an indicative buffer zone has some utility it is better to take a	Comment	Your comment is noted – it is considered necessary to have some set distance established in policy, as

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty				flexible approach which takes into account the type of facility, the activities being undertaken and, most importantly, the local landscape character and quality. A robust approach to such safeguarding of the landscape around mineral sites will be important if the character and quality of the landscapes of Dorset are to be sustained for future generations.		this is the distance that will be used to protect a minerals operation as well as surrounding non-mineral development, existing or proposed. The buffer is not intended to be an area of no development - it is the area where the MPA wishes to be kept aware of proposed development.
D.K. Symes Associates	Question 9		DMSP638	The purpose of the buffer zone is to bring alternative development to the attention of the MPA, in order to inform the decision making process. As long as this is clear and that a buffer zone should not be interpreted as a 'no development' zone then it should be the same for all facilities. The 250 metres suggested is appropriate.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
The Crown Estate	Question 9		DMSP647	Careful consideration should to be given to the compatibility of coastal development with mineral extraction & processing type activities. Continued coastal development has led to further pressure on wharf infrastructure which can make safeguarding such facilities challenging. Industrial activities such as aggregate wharves are not necessarily compatible in close proximity with other types of land use such as residential development, which means buffers are increasingly important to ensure that interface issues between these activities can be managed.	Comment	Your comments are noted.
Blandford Forum Town Council	Question 9		DMSP431	It is considered that each quarry will have a different impact on the surrounding area and therefore buffer zones should vary accordingly.	Comment	Your comment is noted – it is considered necessary to have some set distance established in policy, as this is the distance that will be used to protect a minerals operation as well as surrounding non-mineral development, existing or proposed. The buffer is not intended to be an area of no development - it is the area where the MPA wishes to be kept aware of proposed development.
North Dorset District Council	Question 9		DMSP553	The Council takes the view that 250m should be the minimum buffer zone and should be adopted alongside an examination of the different type of mineral workings and infrastructure involved in order to determine whether or not more extensive buffer zones would be applicable to the particular elements concerned.	Comment	Your comment is noted – it is considered necessary to have some set distance established in policy, as this is the distance that will be used to protect a minerals operation as well as surrounding non-mineral development, existing or proposed. The buffer is not intended to be an area of no development - it is the area where the MPA wishes to be kept aware of proposed development.
West Dorset & Weymouth & Portland Councils	Question 9		DMSP738	Question 9: The use of a buffer around safeguarded sites is supported. The size of the buffer should be appropriate to the type of infrastructure/facility being safeguarded and the extents of the safeguarding should be constantly reviewed so as to not permanently sterilise pieces of land, preventing other types of development.	Comment	Your comment is noted – it is considered necessary to have some set distance established in policy, as this is the distance that will be used to protect a minerals operation as well as surrounding non-mineral development, existing or proposed. The buffer is not intended to be an area of no development - it is the area where the MPA wishes to be kept aware of proposed development.
Halletc Environmental Ltd	Question 9		DMSP1037	Buffer zones should be determined on objectively assessed geotechnical and environmental impact criteria which may vary according to the type of mineral to be worked and the type of adjacent property. For example residential property would merit a larger stand off than employment land or agricultural land. To apply a standard stand off for all types of property would be unreasonable and risk sterilising valuable mineral resources. There are established criteria for geotechnical, noise, dust impacts etc that can be applied on a case-by-case basis.	Agree	Your comment is noted – it is considered necessary to have some set distance established in policy, as this is the distance that will be used to protect a minerals operation as well as surrounding non-mineral development, existing or proposed. The buffer is not intended to be an area of no development - it is the area where the MPA wishes to be kept aware of proposed development.
Dorset Wildlife Trust	Question 9		DMSP778	Policy MS-9 Question 9 The buffer size should vary according to the type of facility - 250 metres is probably more than is needed for something like a rail siding.	Comment	Your comment is noted – it is considered necessary to have some set distance established in policy, as this is the distance that will be used to protect a minerals operation as well as surrounding non-

Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole – Responses to policies/proposals of the Draft Mineral Sites Plan - 2015 Consultation

						mineral development, existing or proposed. The buffer is not intended to be an area of no development - it is the area where the MPA wishes to be kept aware of proposed development.
Hampshire County Council	Question 9		DMSP811	<p>Suggestion to consider different buffer distances based on urban/rural location. With regards to different distance buffers be applied to different mineral operation types, there may be a need to justify this though rationale. For example, taking into consideration operational aspects, strategic importance etc</p> <p>Alongside developments which may encroach on mineral sites, it may be useful to also address change of use proposals which may also impact nearby mineral operations.</p>	Comment	<p>Reference to change of use proposals is helpful.</p> <p>Your comment is noted – it is considered necessary to have some set distance established in policy, as this is the distance that will be used to protect a minerals operation as well as surrounding non-mineral development, existing or proposed. The buffer is not intended to be an area of no development - it is the area where the MPA wishes to be kept aware of proposed development.</p>
Purbeck District Council	Question 9		DMSP1302	<p>Purbeck District Council is unable to provide a comment, as the map on figure 12 does not show what the implications of a 250m buffer would be. Purbeck District Council would like to request copies of maps to show the extent of a range of buffers in order to take an informed view. Purbeck District Council does not have a view about varying buffer zones according to the type of facility.</p>	Comment	Your comments are noted.