

Canford Energy from Waste  
Combined Heat and Power Facility



# Environmental Statement Technical Appendix 5.3

Applicant's Response to the EIA Scoping Opinion

March 2023

**We inspire  
with energy.**



## EIA Scoping Opinion

Scoping opinion comment	Response/Comments
<p><b><u>EIA General</u></b></p> <p>Environmental Topics scoped in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transport</li> <li>• Air Quality</li> <li>• Noise and Vibration</li> <li>• Ecology and Nature Conservation</li> <li>• Landscape and Visual Impact</li> <li>• Historic Environment</li> <li>• Hydrology</li> <li>• Geology, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions</li> <li>• Population and Health</li> <li>• Carbon and Greenhouse Gases</li> </ul> <p>Environmental topics scoped out</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Waste</li> <li>• Major Accidents and Disasters</li> </ul> <p>BCP Environmental Health officers note that while the report advises that the proposed facility would occupy the land that the low carbon gasification and pyrolysis energy from waste facility currently occupies, this site has a current Environmental Permit issued by the legacy Borough of Poole council – this permit has not yet been surrendered by the operator.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b><u>Transport</u></b></p> <p>Officers accept your conclusions – transport impacts should be scoped into the Environmental Statement. Your report suggests that only construction stage traffic would exceed IEMA levels; however, a robust assessment on operational stage traffic should also be provided.</p> <p>A detailed Transport Assessment will be submitted with any formal planning application to further expand on the trip rate and traffic analysis outlined within the Scoping Report. You are advised that any trip rate analysis of the highway network (along Magna Road) should include recently approved, although not all built yet, developments at Poole Local Plan allocated sites UE1, UE2 and also the approved development for</p>	<p>Noted, these comments are addressed through <b>ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Transport</b> and its associated technical appendices</p>

## A5.3 2

### Appendix 5.3: Applicant's response to the EIA Scoping Opinion



Scoping opinion comment	Response/Comments
<p>Bournemouth Football Club, off Knighton Land (land at former golf club site to the west of the UE2 site). Any other major developments with traffic impacts on Magna Road which receive planning approval prior to any formal application being submitted should also be included in any traffic analysis.</p>	
<p><b><u>Air Quality</u></b></p> <p>Officers accept your conclusions – transport impacts should be scoped into the Environmental Statement. The proposed assessment methodology and scope of impacts is agreed. The Air Quality Assessment (AQA) should undertake an assessment of cumulative impacts, including a trip rate analysis on traffic impacts, including the cumulative effect of any relevant development (under construction or permitted) with impacts on Magna Road. If there are relevant impacts, these should be screened into the AQA. The findings of the AQA should identify the mitigation measures to be enacted through the Construction Environmental Management Plan and Dust Management Plan.</p> <p>You are advised that the LPA's Environmental Health team are available to be contacted if any air quality data is required.</p>	<p>Noted, these comments are addressed through <b>ES Chapter 6: Air Quality</b> and its associated technical appendices</p>
<p><b><u>Noise and Vibration</u></b></p> <p>Officers accept your conclusions – noise and vibration impacts should be scoped into the Environmental Statement. Your report notes that there is a lack of information at this stage and therefore recommends scoping it in, to be assessed within the ES.</p> <p>The approach should take into account the cumulative impact of vehicle and construction noise at construction stage and then the cumulative impact of vehicle and plant/machinery noise at operational stage. In addition, the noise impacts should be calculated to include open windows during summer hours.</p> <p>The separation distance map does not include the urban extension to the west of Bearwood, which will be the nearest residential properties to the site. Assessments should assume construction of these units has been completed, based on the approved plans, and consider them to be sensitive receptors. A suitable location should be taken from this site in any survey. Noise from planes likely has an existing impact on the amenity of nearby residents and should be included in the assessments, with any cumulative disturbance or awakenings assessed.</p> <p>The impacts from noise and disturbance generated during construction and operation stages should also consider other sensitive receptors such as the wildlife in or around the site.</p>	<p>Noted, these comments are addressed through <b>ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration</b> and its associated technical appendices.</p> <p>The new housing development has been a focus for the sensitive receptors that have been derived.</p> <p>A noise assessment for ecological species has been undertaken and reported on within ES Chapter 13, specifically the noise assessment was processed based on sound frequencies sensitive to nightjars (as well as humans). The assessment outcomes for this species are reported in <b>ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration</b>.</p>

### A5.3 3

#### Appendix 5.3: Applicant's response to the EIA Scoping Opinion



Scoping opinion comment	Response/Comments
<p><b><u>Ecology and Nature Conservation</u></b></p> <p>Officers accept your conclusions – ecology and nature conservation impacts should be scoped into the Environmental Statement. A wide variety of species should be considered, with respect to the England Biodiversity List of 'habitats and species of principal importance'.</p> <p>In addition to the areas identified in your scoping report, you are advised to consider the potential impact on the following</p> <p>European/internationally designated nature conservation sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Dorset Heathlands SPA</li><li>• Dorset Heathlands Ramsar</li><li>• Dorset Heaths</li><li>• Dorset Heaths (Purbeck &amp; Wareham) &amp; Studland D SAC</li><li>• Poole Harbour SPA</li><li>• Poole Harbour Ramsar</li></ul> <p>Sites of Special Scientific Interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Canford Heath SSSI</li><li>• Bourne Valley SSSI</li><li>• Corfe &amp; Barrow Hills SSSI</li><li>• Turbary &amp; Kinson Commons SSSI</li><li>• Luscombe Valley SSSI</li><li>• Slop Bog &amp; Uddens Heath SSSI</li><li>• Hurn Common SSSI</li><li>• Parley Common SSSI</li><li>• Holt &amp; West Moors Heaths SSSI</li><li>• Arne SSSI</li><li>• Moors River System SSSI</li></ul> <p>The development should achieve biodiversity net gain on site. The improvements in biodiversity should be calculated within the ES through an appropriate metric such as the Biodiversity Metric 3.0. Another key local consideration is the local nightjar route, which you have identified in your scoping report. Access to nature should also be considered, in line with NPPF Paragraph 100 and mitigate any impacts on public rights of way.</p>	<p>Noted, these comments are addressed through <b>ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation</b> and its associated technical appendices</p> <p>All relevant protected and priority species and the listed designated sites have been considered as part of the HRA/EcIA.</p> <p>Biodiversity Net Gain assessment with the latest version of the Defra Metric has been undertaken, achieving a net gain on site.</p> <p>Impacts on nightjar, including consideration of their commuting routes have been fully assessed as part of the HRA/EcIA.</p>



Scoping opinion comment	Response/Comments
<p><b><u>Landscape and Visual Impact</u></b></p> <p>Officers accept your conclusions – landscape and visual impacts should be scoped into the Environmental Statement. The submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should include the cumulative impact of any other development in the area, either under construction or that which has extant planning permission.</p> <p>Locations that the LVIA should view the site and proposals from will be provided as part of pre-application discussions by an external consultant (LBLA) on behalf of (and in agreement with) the LPA.</p>	<p>Noted, these comments are addressed through <b>ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual</b> and its associated technical appendices</p> <p>Viewpoint and photomontage locations for the LVIA were agreed through consultation with Laird Bailey Landscape Architects (acting on behalf of BCP Council).</p>
<p><b><u>Historic Environment</u></b></p> <p>Officers accept your conclusions in relation to both the built environment and archaeology – impacts on these issues should be scoped into the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Your report identifies 72 listed buildings, 19 scheduled monuments and five conservation areas (this should include the Talbot Village CA to make six total) to be assessed within a 3km ZTV to form part of the LVIA. BCP conservation officers recommend extending this to 10km in relation to grade I and II* listed buildings to ensure the taller elements of the building would have no impact. This range may need to be widened if impacts are found at 10km. The assessment should also consider the impact on 'groups' of heritage assets as well as individual buildings and the cumulative impact of this. A recommended methodology from the BCP conservation team will be sent under separate cover.</p> <p>Mitigation should be a direct response to impacts. Once an assessment on impacts has been conducted, any mitigation measures that are subsequently required would have to be robust and should not rely solely on landscaping or tree coverage as a mitigation measure. Site layout, building/plant design, materials and the colour palette would all be important ways to mitigate.</p> <p>It is important that all heritage assets likely to be impacted, are identified in the first instance, their significance addressed and described and the impact that the proposal would have on each of them individually and as part of a group or wider view or setting.</p> <p>The archaeology methodology within the report is acceptable in principle; however, is generic and should be tailored to the site. Officers appreciate the development is still at pre-application stage. Preliminary works should take place at pre-application stage and the results included in the ES, including site-specific information on how the works are undertaken and a heritage Desk-Based Assessment.</p>	<p>21/10</p> <p>We are currently reviewing a list of LBs in 3km (Grade II) and 15km (Grade I and II*) to assess which may be sensitive to development, and justify scoping out where considered relevant.</p> <p>Requested update from EDP on agreed viewpoints (landscape) and if any overlap with heritage assets which are considered sensitive (LBs, SMs).</p> <p>Re archaeology – following initial discussion with County Archaeologist, who confirmed that '<i>In my opinion there should be no archaeological issues for parts of this site that have been quarried previously (and I don't think the type of quarrying here would have left anything behind that would be of industrial archaeological interest)</i>'. Now trying to identify if the cable routes have been subject to previous quarrying (information from the land owner (Nathan) via Adam Neil suggested these routes had received consent for quarrying in the 1970s/80s. To review planning history. I understand that the proposed cable routes have already been used and cables input – Philip Saunders to check previous cable route works. Further</p>



Scoping opinion comment	Response/Comments
<p>Historic England mapping shows land around the site, especially to the south/west, sprinkled with Scheduled Neolithic/Bronze-Age bowl barrows and burial-fields. These monuments confirm landscape-wide prehistoric occupation, characteristic of Dorset and neighbouring counties. Wider mapping reveals further heritage assets, including Roman roads, Roman fort remains and medieval sites, particularly between Wimborne and Poole; clearly this is a long-established, actively developed, diverse landscape.</p>	<p>conversation with County Archaeologist to follow re cable routes and proposals for them to understand what, if any, archaeological investigation is required. It is understood that cable routes will be subject to 2m trenching, including easement, and depth of 1.5-1.6m.</p>
<p><b><u>Hydrology and Water Environment</u></b>            Officers accept your conclusions – impacts on hydrology and the water environment should be scoped into the Environmental Statement. The potential effects identified are agreed. The development should employ SuDS and note the Flood Water Management Act (2010) within the submission.</p> <p>The assessment on surface water runoff should include any alterations to site access required, including the shared roads off Magna Road.</p>	<p>Noted, these comments are addressed through <b>ES Chapter 11: Hydrology</b> and its associated technical appendices</p> <p>No alterations are proposed to the site access from Magna Road.</p>
<p><b><u>Geology, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions</u></b>            Officers accept your conclusions – geology, groundwater and contaminated land impacts should be scoped into the Environmental Statement. The necessary issues are included within the scope.</p> <p>The report advises that a preliminary risk assessment will be prepared to inform a ground investigation strategy, the results of which be used to identify any pollutant linkages and any remedial work required.</p> <p>Parts of the development would cross agricultural land. Natural England have advised that an Agricultural Land Classification may be required, if not already available, and an assessment on how agricultural land would be disturbed or lost.</p>	<p>Noted, these comments are addressed through <b>ES Chapter 9: Geology, Hydrogeology and Ground Conditions</b> and its associated technical appendices.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to the need for an agricultural land assessment, none of the land contained within the Red Line Boundary is currently in agricultural use and the EfW CHP Facility Site sits on previously developed land. Therefore an agricultural land assessment is not required as the Proposed Development will not result in loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land. This is further addressed in <b>ES Chapter 5: Approach to Assessment</b>.</p>
<p><b><u>Human Health</u></b>            Officers accept your conclusions in relation to human health – this should be scoped into the Environmental Statement. The methodology is accepted, including standard assessment of air quality impacts.</p>	<p>The scope is agreed for a light touch health assessment covering key health pathways (air, noise, transport, socio-economic).</p>



Scoping opinion comment	Response/Comments
<p>While they might fall outside the remit of planning, you are encouraged to progress the relevant environmental permits with the EA in tandem with a planning application and keep the LPA up to date.</p>	<p>The permitting comment is important and noted, alongside the EIA process, the applicant has sought to engage with the Environment Agency on the permit process. This demonstrates the conclusions that have been drawn in <b>ES Chapter 14: Population and Health</b> that there is no material risk from the proposed facility over the course of its entire operational life.</p>
<p><b><u>Carbon and Greenhouse Gases (GHG)</u></b>            Officers accept your conclusions in relation to carbon emissions and GHG – this should be scoped into the Environmental Statement. The methodology is accepted in principle, but should factor in vehicle movements and should provide the various potential outcomes in relation to other EfW plants within the plan area and the plant running at expected and maximum capacity. The ES should also consider the impact on the natural environment's ability to store and sequester greenhouse gases.</p> <p>While the application would not be required to provide a whole life-cycle carbon emissions assessment, officers welcome the approach to reduce embodied carbon and encourage the decommissioning of the plant to be considered.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The operation of other EfW plants and their waste inputs is market-driven and not an impact attributable to the Proposed Development. The Planning Statement provides consideration of the other EfW plants within the plan area. Any changes in waste treatment or throughput at other EfW plants is not something that can be determined by the applicant but clearly if the capacity provided by the Proposed Development led to a decrease in waste throughput at other facilities, then there would be a commensurate decrease in GHG emissions.</p> <p>The confirmation that a whole-life LCA is noted.</p>
<p><b><u>Topics to be scoped out</u></b>            Waste and Material resources            Officers accept your conclusions – these matters are not required within the Environmental Statement. The proposal relates to waste management itself and will move waste up the hierarchy. The Environment Agency have advised that their interests in this regard will be covered through the Environment Permit.</p> <p>Accidents and disasters</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

**A5.3 7**

Appendix 5.3: Applicant's response to the EIA Scoping Opinion



---

**Scoping opinion comment**

**Response/Comments**

---

Officers accept your conclusions – the development would not trigger any of the relevant criteria. The approach to employing staff to coordinate and ensure the facility is run safely is welcomed.





## Consultee Comments

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Relevant disciplines	Response/Comments
<b>BCP Highways</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expected that a Transport Assessment will be submitted to expand on trip rate and traffic analysis from Scoping Report.</li> <li>Trip rate analysis should include allocated sites UE1 and UE2 and also approved development for Bournemouth Football Club, off Knighton Lane.</li> <li>Any other major developments with traffic impacts on Magna Road which receive planning approval prior to an application being submitted should be included.</li> </ul>	Transport	UE1 UE2 and Bournemouth's training ground are factored into the analysis presented in ES Chapter 15 and its associated appendices.
<b>Natural England</b>	<p>The site is within or near the following internationally designated sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dorset Heathlands SPA</li> <li>Dorset Heathlands Ramsar</li> <li>Dorset Heaths</li> <li>Dorset Heaths (Purbeck &amp; Wareham) &amp; Studland D SAC</li> <li>Poole Harbour SPA</li> <li>Poole Harbour Ramsar</li> </ul> <p>The site is within or near the following SSSI's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Canford Heath SSSI</li> <li>Bourne Valley SSSI</li> <li>Corfe &amp; Barrow Hills SSSI</li> <li>Turbary &amp; Kinson Commons SSSI</li> <li>Luscombe Valley SSSI</li> <li>Slop Bog &amp; Uddens Heath SSSI</li> <li>Hurn Common SSSI</li> <li>Parley Common SSSI</li> <li>Holt &amp; West Moors Heaths SSSI</li> <li>Arne SSSI</li> <li>Moors River System SSSI</li> </ul> <p>The ES should assess the impact of all phases of the proposal on protected species (including, for example, great crested newts, reptiles, birds, water voles, badgers and bats). Natural England does not hold comprehensive information</p>	Ecology	<p>All relevant protected and priority species and the listed designated sites have been considered as part of the HRA/EcIA.</p> <p>Biodiversity Net Gain assessment with the latest version of the Defra Metric has been undertaken.</p> <p>Impacts on nightjar, including consideration of their commuting routes have been fully assessed as part of the HRA/EcIA.</p> <p>The Ecology ES Chapter contains the details mentioned as part of the Ecological Impact Assessment and also includes the Arboricultural Impact Assessment.</p>

### A5.3 9

#### Appendix 5.3: Applicant's response to the EIA Scoping Opinion



regarding the locations of species protected by law. Records of protected species should be obtained from appropriate local biological record centres, nature conservation organisations and local groups. Consideration should be given to the wider context of the site, for example in terms of habitat linkages and protected species populations in the wider area.

The Environmental Statement should include details of:

- Any historical data for the site affected by the proposal (e.g. from previous surveys)
- Additional surveys carried out as part of this proposal
- The habitats and species present
- The status of these habitats and species (e.g. whether priority species or habitat)
- The direct and indirect effects of the development upon those habitats and species
- Full details of any mitigation or compensation measures
- Opportunities for biodiversity net gain or other environmental enhancement

The ES should assess the impacts of the proposal on any ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees, and the scope to avoid and mitigate for adverse impacts. It should also consider opportunities for enhancement.

<b>BCP Conservation Officer</b>	<p>In order to establish the extent of the study area the following exercise may be helpful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• identify and list all Listed Buildings within the immediate PDA and the 3km radius.</li><li>• break down the above list into Grade I, II*, and II LBs</li><li>• provide a list of all Conservation Areas within a 5-10km radius</li><li>• provide a list of all NDHAs (i.e., Locally Listed Buildings) within the 3km zone.</li><li>• provide a list of all Grade I and Grade II* LBs within a 15km radius from the PDA (this is in regard in particular to the potential impact of the proposed tall chimney) so it will be necessary to identify the higher grade LBs in the 5km radius beyond the 10km zone. (This extended radius may be useful in the event that the 10km ZTV is not sufficient. This is a recommendation).</li></ul>	Heritage	<p>Noted. Recommendations on study areas have been followed. A stepped approach (identify, assess significance, assess impact) was followed, in accordance with our standard methodology as set out in the Scoping Report.</p> <p>Contact with the Conservation Officer (phone and email) direct and via asking the Case Officer at BCP Council, to discuss the feedback and just talk over the approach, however did not receive any response to correspondence.</p>
---------------------------------	---	----------	---

### A5.3 10

#### Appendix 5.3: Applicant's response to the EIA Scoping Opinion



- Walkovers and desk based study can then make an initial assessment of likely intervisibility between the PDA and the above receptors.

Once all the receptors i.e. DHAs -including CAs and NDHAS (except for SMs which are not within my remit to discuss) have been identified in the complete visual envelope, the likely impact on them can be studied and assessed, the detail and scope of which would vary according to the receptor's significance.

I would recommend that the Grade I and II\* receptors are fully assessed within a 10km radius in regard to the tallest structure/s. If it is considered that the 10km ZTV would need to be widened then this exercise may need to be extended accordingly.

In regard to CAs would also recommend that Talbot Village CA is included within the scope of the forthcoming HEI and Heritage Statement. There may be other CAs that may need to be included as well.

In order to identify and address all heritage constraints, it is important that all heritage assets likely to be impacted, are identified in the first instance, their significance addressed and described and the impact that the proposal would have on each of them individually and as part of a group or wider view or setting. This exercise would require the identification of all non-designated heritage assets likely to be impacted by the PDA (I have recommended a 3km radius for NDHAS), as well as all the DHAs within a 3km/10km/15km radius as set out above, the 15km radius only being recommended as a way of completely ruling out any risk of harm to the setting and significance of the higher grade receptors. This 'exercise' may also need to examine impact on groups of heritage assets as well as individual buildings.

It is recommended that the applicant should carry out an EIA in relation to the historic environment. A fully detailed Heritage Statement would be required for the forthcoming application.

#### **Bournemouth International Airport Ltd**

Given the nature and scale of the proposed development it is essential that the Airport are consulted promptly as soon as any application is submitted. The location and proximity of the site relative to the runway, and the scale and height of development – mean that it is of immediate interest to the Airport from a safeguarding perspective.

Aviation  
EIA General

Policy 20 (Airfield Safeguarding Areas) of the BCP and Dorset Waste Plan requires the need to demonstrate that the Proposed Development will not give rise to new or increased hazards to aviation.

## A5.3 11

### Appendix 5.3: Applicant's response to the EIA Scoping Opinion



It is noted however that “Major Accidents and Disasters” has been scoped out of the assessment for reasons including that, “There are no external sources of hazard identified that the Proposed Development will interact with, to give rise to vulnerability.” It appears that the development might in fact interact with the Airport from a safeguarding perspective. This suggests that further consideration should be given to the exclusion of this topic.

The Applicant's specialist safeguarding consultant contacted their counterpart at Bournemouth Airport and commented that if the proposed development would not penetrate any safeguarded surfaces, then there would be no requirement for an Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) check to be undertaken. IFP design relates to route planning for aircraft and is a complicated, technical and highly regulated process.

The Airport's representative carried out a brief initial assessment in this regard which indicated that there would be no effect on some relevant surface, approach and departure area considerations. However, it also identified a significant penetration of the Airport's “Type A” surface. The “Type A” surface describes parameters which enable an aircraft operator to comply with the relevant International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) limitations. The responsibilities of the ICAO include establishing the requirements that exist internationally for aviation safety.

These limitations are intended to ensure that for each flight, accurate take-off performance calculations are made and, in the event of an engine failure, an aircraft can either abandon the take-off run and stop safely or become airborne and clear obstacles by the required margins. Such assessments are not generic. Rather, they are unique to the aircraft type being used by the individual airline at the specific setting, so any one airline may have different assessments against the same obstacle environment.

The Applicant's consultant was therefore advised that an in-depth IFP assessment would be required to support an application. This would be needed in addition to provision of other relevant details, including for example in relation to risk of bird strike.

An assessment of the Proposed Development's compliance with safeguarding for Bournemouth Airport has been undertaken and concludes that there will be no conflict between the EfW CHP Facility and the safe operation of the airport. This forms Appendix 2 to the Planning Statement.

### A5.3 12

#### Appendix 5.3: Applicant's response to the EIA Scoping Opinion



If the Applicant's IFP assessment identifies any performance impacts in relation to current arrangements, then this is very highly unlikely to be acceptable to the Airport and the airlines operating from it as it may (for example) demand reduced payloads or changes in the type of aircraft operating. Any changes to IFPs to accommodate the scheme would also be unacceptable. Even if an alternative could be identified it would have to be agreeable to the airlines and acceptable in terms of the altered impacts on local people from modified flight paths, and even then, go through a full redesign and approval process which would be expected to take a period of years.

In essence, any impact from the proposed development in this regard is unlikely to be acceptable. The Airport represents infrastructure of considerable economic importance to the BCP area and wider sub-region. It was impacted heavily by the pandemic and any threat to its recovery from that will be strongly opposed. In this context any planning application for a facility of the nature anticipated at Canford will be subject to very careful scrutiny.

Environment Agency	<p>The proposed development includes the incineration of non-hazardous waste in a waste incineration plant or waste co-incineration plant with a capacity exceeding 3 tonnes per hour.</p> <p>This activity will require a bespoke installation environmental permit issued by the Environment Agency (EA). As part of the environmental permitting process, the EA assess all applications to ensure that they meet the requirements of the Environmental Permitting Regulations. During assessment, the design of the plant is reviewed, as well as how it will be operated, the emissions it will generate (to air, water, and land) and whether emissions will have an adverse impact on people living nearby and the natural environment. The EA do this by consulting partner organisations, such as Natural England (experts on impacts on wildlife) and Public Health England (experts on human health impacts). Emissions limits and techniques used to protect the environment and human health are set by the EU Industrial Emissions Directive (IED). To achieve the limits, set by the IED the operator will need to show that they will use Best Available Techniques (BAT). The EA cannot set environmental permit conditions that go beyond what is specified by the IED and BAT.</p> <p>Having reviewed the information within this scoping report, we do not have any further comment at this stage.</p>	Contaminated Land  Hydrology  Ecology  EIA General	<p>All points raised are noted.</p> <p>The matters raised in relation to the Environmental Permit are noted but the permitting process sits outside of the EIA and therefore this will be addressed separately.</p> <p><u>Ecology</u> Regarding biodiversity, all relevant protected and priority species and designated sites have been considered as part of the HRA/EcIA. A Biodiversity Net Gain assessment with the latest version of the Defra Metric has been undertaken.</p>
--------------------	--	--	--



Groundwater Protection and Contaminated Land

We can agree that from a groundwater and contaminated land perspective that all the necessary issues have been covered off within the scope.

Biodiversity

The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that pursuing sustainable development includes moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains for nature, and that a core principle for planning is that it should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Information on biodiversity impacts and opportunities should inform all stages of development including, for instance, site selection and design including any pre-application consultation as well as the application itself. An ecological survey will be necessary in advance of a planning application if the type and location of development are such that the impact on biodiversity may be significant and existing information is lacking or inadequate.

Pollution Prevention During Construction

Safeguards should be implemented during the construction phase to minimise the risks of pollution from the development. Such safeguards should cover:

- The use of plant and machinery
- oils/chemicals and materials
- the use and routing of plant and vehicles
- the location and form of work and storage areas and compounds
- the control and removal of spoil and wastes
- The applicant should refer to the Environment Agency's Pollution Prevention Guidelines at:

Prevention Guidelines at:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pollution-prevention-for-businesses>

BCP  
Environment  
Officer

Environmental Planning Regulations

- The report advises that the EfW CHP Facility is to occupy the land that the low carbon gasification and pyrolysis energy from waste facility currently occupies. This site has a current Environmental Permit issued by the legacy Borough of Poole council - this permit has not yet been surrendered by the operator.

Air Quality

EIA General

Air Quality

Contaminated  
Land

Environmental Planning Regulations

- This is noted, but this is a matter that falls outside the EIA process

Air Quality

- The location of sensitive human receptors was agreed with BCP Council's Environment Officer



- An Air Quality Assessment will be prepared to assess the operational impact of the proposed Energy from Waste and Combined Heat and Power Facility emissions on surrounding relevant receptors and sensitive environmental receptors.
- At this stage, predicted traffic impacts are yet to be confirmed and it is not confirmed if a detailed analysis of the air quality impacts of operational traffic is required in the Air Quality Assessment. The applicant should note the comments from the BCP Highway Authority regarding developments (any approved prior to submission of formal planning application with impacts along Magna Road) to include in any trip rate analysis to determine if this element of the development should be screened into the Air Quality Assessment.
- The report advises that a Construction Environmental Management Plan and Dust Management Plan will be prepared and this should include mitigation measures identified within the Air Quality Assessment.
- Cumulative air quality impacts must also be assessed within the Air Quality Assessment.
- The applicant should confirm the proposed methodology for the Air Quality Assessment when the predicted operational traffic impacts are known, and also confirm the proposed receptor locations with Environmental Health. The applicant should contact Environmental Health if any air quality data is required.

#### Contaminated Land

- The report advises that a preliminary risk assessment will be prepared to inform a ground investigation strategy, the results of which be used to identify any pollutant linkages and any remedial work required.

(Sarah Sutton). The habitat sites identified for inclusion by Natural England above were also included as sensitive receptors.

- Anticipated maximum and typical traffic movements generated by the scheme were shared with BCP Council's Environment Officer. Typical traffic flows (excluding waste vehicles already on the local road network) indicated that these were below the IAQM criteria for requiring a detailed assessment. Nevertheless, background pollutant concentrations were adopted that were precautionary to allow for additional traffic movements for this and other future developments. Therefore, the impact of traffic impacts was screened out of the assessment.
- A CEMP and DMP have been prepared which includes mitigation measures identified within the AQA.
- The cumulative impact of other permitted developments (combustion related) and other emission sources within the site (e.g. emergency diesel generator) were assessed. Cumulative impacts during the

### A5.3 15

#### Appendix 5.3: Applicant's response to the EIA Scoping Opinion



construction phase in relation to combustion and dust were also considered.

- This was agreed with BCP Council's Environment Officer

Contaminated Land  
Noted.



