

Summary of non-Policy changes from Regulation 14 Consultation comments

The Non-Policy Comments on the Neighbourhood Plan have been collated in corresponding order to the structure of the Pre-Submission Draft of the Plan. Some comments were general to the document or general to the presentation within the Plan and the Consultation Process.

General Comments

45 General Comments are noted on the first 3 sections of the plan; of these 10 supported the plan; 14 objected to the plan, 15 made a comment which have been noted. 4 comments required action and 2 considerations.

The comments in support wished good luck and success, offered strong support, praised the scope of proposal, the excellent and far-reaching proposals, the comprehensive plan, the right direction, the exhaustive investigation and analysis, the commendable policies and the welcome protection to greenspaces, and commended the endeavour.

The comments objecting to the plan were wide ranging; too large to comprehend, development blights nature, Weymouth too big for a neighbourhood plan, each area should have its own plan, waste of taxpayers' money, poor community engagement, Dorset council needs to respect what the community say, builders will ignore it, unwanted development on greenfield sites, and too much housing.

Dorset Council's comments on structure, dates and have been addressed. The revised area has reduced the number of policies. The Environment Agency Comments have been considered in the relevant Policies.

Presentation Comments

27 Comments are noted regarding the presentation of the plan many thought it too long and complex and pointed out inconsistencies. Most of the comments have been noted. Actions taken forward are to publish a Precis and Rationale of the Changes ahead of the next Consultation, removal of extraneous pictures and interesting facts, describe better relationship between Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan in the Strategic Context.

21 comments are noted on the Maps these have been addressed by presenting the Maps as full pages, splitting some maps into 2 parts, and improving the presentation, where possible. Where the source map is outside the NP group control, they remain as the original.

Consultation

32 comments are noted on the Consultation Process; these were critical of the notification of engagement, the survey process, confused at the repeated engagements, critical of the lack of consideration of the response to the 3rd Engagement (see earlier section in this paper), critical of the residential allocation and in particular the inclusion of Budmouth Avenue and Wyke Oliver Farm despite 3rd Engagement, use of the Post Office to deliver leaflets which were not received, the limited time to respond, limiting the response to those living in Weymouth and not the business community.

26 comments were received relating to non-land use issues and these will be directed to WTC for consideration as appropriate.

Foreword

1 comment was made on the Forward which referred to a missing paragraph break.

1. Introduction

3 comments are noted; one was critical that that the NP area was too large, a second supported the inclusion of Maps 1 and 2, and the last suggested reducing the text relating to Sutton Poyntz NP.

2. Neighbourhood Area

9 comments are noted; 3 will be addressed in the updated plan.

3. Strategic Context

10 comments are noted; 6 will be addressed in the updated plan. Of note was concern regarding the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which was referred to and has subsequently been published by Dorset Council.

4. Purpose of the Plan

6 comments are noted; critical comments are noted by Preston residents, 2 comments are actioned in the updated plan.

5. Plan Structure

4 comments are noted; 2 critical comments related to lack of dialogue with the community and failure in the past to build affordable homes. Dorset Council's comments on the SEA will be addressed in the updated plan.

6. Vision Aims and Objectives

17 comments are noted on the introduction to this section; 15 are noted and 2 others will be actioned in the updated plan.

14 comments are noted on the objectives; 9 express support for the Vision, Aims and Objectives, 2 are critical regarding impact of development and 3 requires update to the plan. Some confusion was mentioned regarding objective not matching policies particularly with regard to the Communities section of the plan – this transcription error has been addressed in the update plan.

16 comments are noted on the Environmental Sustainability Objectives; 2 supported the Objectives, 6 were critical of them (repetition of existing policies, development particularly on greenfield sites), and 7 will be considered in updating the Plan. The confusion between objectives and targets is acknowledged and has been clarified in the revised plan, noting also that the Environmental Targets are now referred to as 'Supporting' rather than 'Strategic' for purposes of clarity.

9 comments are noted on Landscape & Greenspaces Objectives; 4 in support, 2 critical relating to development and 1 will be addressed in updating the Plan.

32 comments are noted on Development & Homes objectives; 16 in support relating to empty buildings, need for social housing, need for mixed development, desire to use brownfield, 12 critical relating to lack of infrastructure, lack of employment opportunities, use of greenfield sites, restriction on 2nd homes, environmental impact, transport infrastructure, development of social housing in Preston and 4 comments will be addressed in the updated plan.

Note use of brownfield sites is advocated but brownfield sites are already allocated in the Local Plan and so cannot be allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan.

18 comments are noted on the Jobs and Economy Objectives; 8 comments in support, 5 critical relating to xxx and 4 will be addressed in updated plan. However. the tone was that more could have been done to address the lack of choice and quality of employment.

Note creating jobs and boosting the economy is limited in the NP as it is limited to land-based allocations which are mostly done at a Strategic Level in the Local Plan.

18 Comments are noted on the Communities Objectives; 8 comments in support noted the desire for walkable neighbourhoods, 3 critical relating to development in Preston, impact on transport infrastructure, lack of local facilities to developments, and 4 will be reviewed in the update to the plan. Many comments pointed out the shortage of schools, doctors, dentists, fire service, entertainment centres and other amenities.

Note development can enable amenities and facilities either through Section 106 constraints or contribution to the Community Infrastructure Levy

Note the Aims and Objectives should be viewed across the needs of the whole plan not solely from a single site perspective.

7. Environmental Sustainability

33 comments are noted; 12 are in support expressing a desire do more for the environment and address the increased flood risks from climate change, 9 critical relating to development on greenfield sites and impacts on wildlife and habitat, scepticism on climate emergency, localised flood risks as a result of development, and 10 will be reviewed in the update to the plan.

Environmental Targets

36 comments are noted, 15 are in support covering retention of hedgerows, trees and greenspaces, these set a high standard, yes to solar panels on new build, support response to climate emergency, none are critical and 12 will be reviewed in the update to the plan. Concern was again raised about flood risks.

Note the Strategic Environmental Targets are referred to in the Submission Draft as Supporting Environmental Targets. Whilst these are not mandatory, at this point in time, they are nationally recognised as forward looking and achievable and will add considerable weight to the 'sustainability' reputation of developer and add weight in the planning balance to developers promoting sustainable development.

Policies Sections 8 to 11

These are reported in a separate document: [link](#)

12. Monitoring the Neighbourhood Plan

2 comments were received on monitoring from Dorset Council, these are acknowledged and will result in a minor change to the plan.

13. Weymouth Community Aspirations

8 comments were received on Community Aspirations relating to crime and anti-social behaviour, empty and derelict buildings, traffic pollution, solar generation, footpaths, CIL funding and layout of the section and are noted.

14. Glossary

12 comments were received on the Glossary, relating to rewording definitions and these will be addressed in the updated plan.

[Appendix A: Weymouth Strategic Environmental Targets](#)

18 comments are noted on Appendix A Strategic Environmental Targets, 14 are critical relative to cost implications for housing provision, setting prescriptive targets, clarity as to their status within policy; 4 are supportive of the concept; and 3 comments will be addressed in the updated plan.

[Appendix B: Affordable Housing Definitions](#)

1 comment was received on Appendix B Affordable Housing Definition and will be addressed in the updated Plan.

[Appendix C: Local Green Space Site Maps](#)

1 comment was received on Appendix C Local Green Space Site Maps relative to a typographical error and will be corrected in the updated Plan.

[Appendix D: Incidental Open Space Maps](#)

1 comment was received on Appendix D Incidental Open Space Maps relative to provision of site-specific maps and removal of an image unrelated to the topic and will be addressed in the updated Plan.

[Appendix E: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Policies](#)

3 comments were received on Appendix E Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Policies, all were supportive of the content subject to streamlining the presentation, this will be reflected in the updated Plan.