

Weymouth NP Reg.14 Comments in Policy Order (with SG Conclusions)

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	General Comments on the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan	
G/1	Good luck with it all.	Support Noted
G/2	Strongly support	Support Noted
G/3	I don't think Weymouth is one neighbourhood and should be planned for in this way. The whole thing is too big to comprehend.	Noted objection to the Plan
G/4	The Information gathered is already out of date by recent political, world events and post Covid pandemic. Weymouth Parish area map1 is obviously too small to cater for the residents' Families' needs and residential waiting list.	Noted comment
G/5	This is a general observation and I see it all the time mirrored in the world today. It is a very long and wordy document. Words are very cheap these days, and when voiced by politicians and corporations, are empty and meaningless, as there is no real incentive to carry them out. Perhaps something more succinct would hold more credibility. I also see a contradiction in the plan to support nature and environment, and to provide housing. It would seem to me that the only real housing that is required is affordable, and the rest, which is usually the majority, are simple to feed the coffers of those who have enough anyway. On a personal note, I see that the land above Budmouth Avenue is still being considered, even though this is a haven for wildlife, access is limited, and it will diminish hugely those already established in this area. I guess it is because someone with influence would rather like to live high up above everyone with fantastic views. I know that finally a shortened version has been brought out, but one still needs to trawl through the full document. As stated before, this is not at all user friendly.	Noted objection to aspects of the Plan
G/6	Yes, you've gone tonto. The whole plan being underpinned by 'cross-cutting' eco-fanaticism is very bold! There are no mention of people and what they need until deep into the document. It's a seems to be written entirely for the benefit of frogs and insects. Again, this is a very bold political approach to gaining approval.	Noted objection to the Plan
G/7	The document is too broad ranging for members of the public to properly comment - who has the time!!! I know this is the most important part too	Noted comment
G/8	Page 123 clearly identifies Character Areas for Communities, and these is the level that each should its own NP, the current area is too big and diverse for a single NP.	Noted comment
G/9	The area covered by the plan is too big and not truly a neighbourhood plan. Contrast this Weymouth plan with the small neighbourhood plan for Sutton Poyntz. I think this Weymouth plan should be split into the individual villages that make up Weymouth, like Wyke, Upwey, Littlemore etc. A true neighbourhood centric plan could be achieved by creating a series of smaller plans.	Noted objection to the Plan
G/10	It's terrible. A total waste of time and tax payers' money.	Noted objection to the Plan
G/11	I fully support the Plan and its aspirations to preserve the nature of Weymouth, whilst moving towards a sustainable future. Thank you for all the hard work in creating it and allowing the opportunity to comment.	Support Noted
G/12	Overall, I think the proposals as set out are far reaching and excellent. I hope the Council are able to meet these high standards and look forward to seeing how the Plan develops over the coming months and years.	Support Noted
G/13	This comment refers to the whole plan. Far too much information guaranteed to overload any normal member of the public. Question designed to solicit a specific answer in favour. Previous objections dismissed. No guarantees on construction traffic and disruption. No guarantees on zero emission buildings. No guarantees on zero emission living environment/house running. Existing brown field site not put forward... There is no need for housing when there are uncompleted units clearly visible on Portland. If the builder will not complete, then the Council should compulsively purchase and complete as social housing.	Noted comment
G/14	A comprehensive plan. Well done to all those who worked so hard on it.	Support Noted
G/15	How much power does Weymouth Town Council have over it? I guess that most of it is up to Dorset Council.	Noted comment
G/16	No consideration of existing outstanding planning consents.	Noted comment
G/17	Although my points may seem critical of the plan. It is wonderful to see The council really pushing in the right direction I was overall proud to read the plan, but I think even more could be striven for. This is my first time engaging with a local plan. However it has enthused me to become more engaged with the town, the plan and the river. I am seeking to gain river habitat qualifications and engage more the community including Tumble Down and River Wey Society.	Support Noted
G/18	The whole plan should be scrapped, it is trying to address an area too large. Weymouth is a town not a Neighbourhood. Each Neighbourhood should have a plan as Sutton Poyntz has developed.	Noted objection to the Plan
G/19	The plan should be scrapped, and NPs delivered for each of the Weymouth Neighbourhoods rather than the whole town.	Noted objection to the Plan

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
G/20	This plan is very poor and contradicts itself. It is clear from the poor community engagement, the decision to ignore the democratic process and ignore previous responses that didn't fit with the personal agenda of the NP team that this plan does not reflect the wishes of the community. The plan should be scrapped with immediate effect.	Noted objection to the Plan
G/21	Just a final thanks for the obvious exhaustive investigation and analysis that underpins this plan. My previous comments are made to help to deliver this plan. I would be delighted to add further to any comments I have made as you may wish to request further clarification. Delighted to help in any way.	Support Noted
G/22	I have stated I don't support the plan overall as I have issues and concerns over the lack of "enforcement" to policies, over the let people hear what they want to hear. I do however believe that if this plan has some very good concepts, it just needs to be upheld and fight Dorset council to respect what this community is asking for.	Noted objection to the Plan
G/23	I feel the plan should be withdrawn. The plan is too large with no guarantee the builders will adhere to house numbers or drainage issues. Preston should be dealt with in same way Sutton Poyntz is. Their plan has been completed and accepted. Preston is a small community and should be allowed to provide and decide on the future of its own community.	Noted objection to the Plan
G/24	I do wish to applaud the obvious time and effort that has gone into preparing this draft of the Weymouth Town Plan. There are, I think, some major difficulties to be addressed particularly in relation to the planning impacts of climate change and Central Government housing dogma and it would be a lot to expect a Neighbourhood Plan to satisfy them. Further consideration of the matters raised in this response would be appreciated.	Noted comment
G/25	The Neighbourhood plan has obviously involved a lot of painstaking work by a small group of dedicated individuals, unfortunately it is a huge document that most people will struggle to read and comment on. Thank you for trying. I'm afraid to have to say that it does include too much wishful thinking, yes, we would like better housing stock, greener, better build quality and affordable housing. Better public transport, community infrastructure, cycle lanes etc. But we cannot leave this to private developers, this is too big for Weymouth Town Council, we need a Dorset wide strategic view: Why Weymouth, why not: New Towns - with purpose-built transport links, schools, retail, employment, healthcare. Social housing - owned by the Council. Piece meal filling in of brownfield and greenfield sites in Weymouth IS NOT the answer and is not sustainable - ultimately, we may as well just fill in all the current gaps and accept that in 100 years Weymouth and Dorchester will be linked - OR we could look at rural Dorset - or is that sacrosanct? We should push back against this plan - it is not the solution.	Noted comment
G/26	Size of the area covered by the plan. The plan is too big/long (is Weymouth really a suitable size for a neighbourhood plan). I have tried to read it all, but what happens with something this size is that most responses will be objections and will concentrate on what matters to them much more locally. Someone in Wyke Regis won't care about a development in Preston, but they're unlikely to support it either - they just won't respond. Similarly, lots of good work will go unnoticed. I'd like to respond to all aspects of the plan - and I'm sure, support some of the proposals - but a plan this size just doesn't lend itself to proper scrutiny and engagement. Quote from East Suffolk (guidance on creating a Neighbourhood Plan): The bigger the area the more complex the planning issues – and the more difficult it will be to secure backing from the community. Finally Thank you to all those who have worked hard to produce this plan.	Noted comment
G/27	I believe the whole plan should be withdrawn and the opportunity for individual communities to create their own plan. This has been allowed for Sutton Poyntz so why not for all the other Weymouth areas which have their own distinctive characters? If an area who do not wish to create their own plan, then the Town Council should take over. Taking Sutton Poyntz as an example, it is a small village, much smaller than other areas in Weymouth with a motivated caring population. They have managed to come to a group consensus which I understand is acceptable to the majority. This is not what is being proposed by the Town Council's approach for the rest of Weymouth. The term we are being asked to consider is a Neighbourhood Plan. The dictionary definition of neighbourhood is 'a district or community within a town or city'. I submit that this plan is far too big and far reaching and should be rejected. Please start this process again with a clear starting point and notify each community in writing (not social media) of the process and give each community or neighbourhood a chance to provide its own plan with guidance from the town council or other appropriate body as is seen fit. But please, please speak to the people who elected you and care about our town.	Noted objection to the Plan
G/28	The overall effect of the plan is to build on greenfield sites, rather than redeveloping existing built-up areas. Weymouth is made up of a number of unique villages, separated by greenspaces and fields. The plan is developing housing on these greenfield sites, it is closing the green spaces between the villages, not preserving them for future generations. Overtime Weymouth will be one large urban sprawl. I cannot support this plan.	Noted objection to the Plan

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
G/29	Furthermore, the NP process is supposed to be a bottom-up process centred around a homogeneous area of manageable proportion. Weymouth as a town of some 53,000 people fall outside this definition. Therefore by raising concerns over the quality of the data gathering and the undemocratic nature of the process applied in the neighbourhood I live in, I have no alternative other than to reject the plan in its entirety. Furthermore, it should be understood that I know as much about the Wyke Regis area of Weymouth as I do about a small village in the north of the County. The same will apply to the residents of Wyke Regis with regards to Preston. The attendance at meetings and walkabouts has been counted in barely double digits and cannot be classed as representative. This has occurred due to the lack of engagement by the steering group and their representative with the relevant neighbourhood. There is a strong hint that landowners and developers (sometimes one and the same) have had a disproportionate influence on the plan to the detriment of resident who should be the people responsible for generating the NP of their neighbourhood.	Noted objection to aspects of the Plan
G/30 Weymouth Civic Society (P&E Cttee)	The draft Plan contains many commendable policies and aspirations, which we can support, including environmental considerations, landscape, heritage, design matters, sustainability, and services. We also welcome the safeguarding of the many cherished local green spaces and their protection from infill development which has been a trend in recent times.	Noted comments in support
G/31 Somerset Council	We wish you every success with this endeavour.	Support Noted
G/32 Glos.CC Minerals and Waste Planning Authority	Mineral and Waste officers have reviewed the consultation information and have no further comments to make.	Noted comment
G/33 Lichfields for Haven Leisure	On behalf of our client, Haven Leisure Limited ("Haven") please find enclosed representations in response to the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 consultation, published for comment until 15 December 2023. We trust these representations are helpful, but we would be pleased to answer any questions or provide further clarification if needed.	Noted comment
G/34 Dorset Council	Thank you for providing your latest version of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan, Pre-submission (version 2.5.1) dated 27 October 2023 to Dorset Council. This response has been prepared by the Planning Policy Team and seeks to provide constructive comments relating to the drafted policies at this formal consultation stage. Draft policies have been assessed against the National and Local Planning Policy framework, principally the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) September 2023 and West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (WDWPLP) 2015. This response contains specific advice from specialist teams within Dorset Council such as: Assets, Conservation, Landscape and Urban Design, CIL/S106, Housing, Flood Risk, Transport Planning, Highways Development, Natural Environment Team (NET), Growth and Economic Development and Definitive Maps. All comments are from the Planning Policy Team unless attributed to a specific team or department. The relevant specialist teams should continue to be consulted as the Neighbourhood Plan progresses through the remaining stages of preparation. For ease of reference, comments are set out according to the paragraph and policies, etc in the proposed plan and have been numbered. Officers seek to encourage an on-going dialogue with the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan Group regarding finalising the submission version of the proposal. In the meantime, we hope that these comments are useful in progressing your plan towards meeting the basic conditions and eventually being 'made' part of the Development Plan for Weymouth.	Noted comment
G/35 Dorset Council	A revised NPPF is anticipated shortly, and consequently this response will likely require a further update where the National Policy position has changed. The comments provided are based upon the requirements to meet the 'basic condition' tests relating to the production of the neighbourhood plan.	Update NPPF references.
G/36 Dorset Council	1. Plan period - The Plan makes several references to the Plan period being 2021-2038 (Vision, paragraphs 2.16, 9.6, 9.8, 9.41, 9.43 and 11.51) however it is a legal requirement for it to be included on the front cover. It would also be helpful if the Plan period could also be made more prominent by its inclusion as a standalone paragraph in the supporting text.	Amend front cover of Plan to include plan Add reference to the plan -period to the introduction to circa para. 4.11.
G/37 Dorset Council	2. Plan viability - Without the full viability evidence base before us we cannot provide comments on whether any policy in the neighbourhood plan that adds a cost to development is actually viable, deliverable, and achievable. Once full viability evidence is provided, we will be happy to review.	Noted comment

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions																						
G/38 Dorset Council	3. Plan length – The Plan runs at 221 pages, contains 65 policies, and is supported by 5 appendices. The Plan vision is supported by 16 aims and 64 objectives. There are a further 31 Environmental Targets. Given the Plan must be read alongside the adopted West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan which already contains 98 policies there is likely to be a significant overlap of policy positions. To achieve a concise plan there are recommendations through this response where suggested edits could be made.	Noted comment																						
G/39 Dorset Council	4. Quotes - On several occasions throughout the document the draft plan quotes (often quite long) tracts of text from the NPPF and adopted West Dorset and Weymouth and Portland Local Plan. This is unnecessary and adds to the length of the plan.	Consider whether quotes are relevant and necessary.																						
G/40 Turley for Morrish Homes	My client has interest in land at Wyke Oliver Farm North, as proposed to be allocated for approximately 250 mixed affordable and market housing, and an extension to the Lorton Valley Nature Park, in Policy WNP 23 and WNP25 of the Plan. My client would welcome the opportunity of discussing the above representations, particularly those relating to Policy WNP25, with the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.	Noted comment																						
G/41 Historic England	Historic England has a long history of interest and involvement in Weymouth and its preservation and enhancement. It makes sense for the town to have a dedicated and detailed planning policy framework which has formal statutory status and can identify and respond to the particular and special issues associated with its social, economic and environmental wellbeing. We are therefore pleased that the town's community has decided to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan and impressed with the scope and detail of its policies, supporting text, and complementary aspirations, especially as they refer to the area's distinctive historic character. Our role in relation to Neighbourhood Plans is not to duplicate or substitute for the expertise and resources available locally, especially from the local planning authority. We note that your Plan has been prepared with support from Dorset Council and we hope that this has included advice from its heritage team given the profile and significance of Weymouth as an historic place. Our interest in such Plans is particularly attracted by proposed policies which allocate sites for development. Experience has shown that these can easily, and with the best of intentions, nonetheless, commit sites for development which unwittingly will generate harmful impacts on heritage assets. It is therefore important that the evidence base for such policies is fully informed about the estate and significance of relevant heritage assets to ensure that such policies within a made Plan can be delivered as intended and without causing harm to the historic environment. We note that the Plan proposes to allocate a number of sites for development, with varying degrees of prescription.	Ensure allocation policies will not generate harmful impacts on heritage assets.																						
G/42 Historic England	Otherwise, it only remains for us to congratulate your community on its work to date and wish it well in the making of its Plan.	Support Noted																						
G/43 Env'ment Agency	<table border="1" data-bbox="352 1323 1091 1823"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Residential sites</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Land off Budmouth Ave (Policy WNP24)</td> <td>Environment Agency constraints Adjacent Flood Zone 2 & 3 Historic Landfill site nearby Adjacent to Lodmoor SSSI</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North (Policy WNP25)</td> <td>Flood Zone 2 & 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land at Redlands Farm (Policy WNP26)</td> <td>Flood Zone 2 & 3 Main river within site</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land off Beverley Road (Policy WNP27)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land at St Nicholas Street (Policy WNP28)</td> <td>Flood Zone 2 & 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Land at Lodmoor Old Tip (Policy WNP29A,B & C)</td> <td>Flood Zone 2 & 3 Historic Landfill (Potential Contaminated land) Adjacent to Lodmoor SSSI</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="352 1630 1091 1711"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Mixed-Use site</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Land and buildings at Jubilee Sidings (Policy WNP41)</td> <td>Environment Agency constraints Adjacent to Rail line (Potential Contaminated land)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="352 1742 1091 1823"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Transport Interchange site</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mount Pleasant Old Tip (Policy WNP54)</td> <td>Environment Agency constraints Adjacent to Flood Zone 2 & 3 Historic Landfill (Potential Contaminated land) Adjacent to Lodmoor SSSI</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="296 1861 1182 2119">A key principle of the planning system is to promote sustainable development. Sustainable development meets our needs for housing, employment and recreation while protecting the environment. It ensures that the right development, is built in the right place at the right time. To assist in the preparation of any document towards achieving sustainable development we have identified the key environmental issues within our remit that are relevant to this neighbourhood area and the proposed allocated sites and provide guidance on any actions you need to undertake. We also provide hyperlinks to where you can obtain further information and advice to help support your neighbourhood plan. Flood Risk</p>	Residential sites		Land off Budmouth Ave (Policy WNP24)	Environment Agency constraints Adjacent Flood Zone 2 & 3 Historic Landfill site nearby Adjacent to Lodmoor SSSI	Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North (Policy WNP25)	Flood Zone 2 & 3	Land at Redlands Farm (Policy WNP26)	Flood Zone 2 & 3 Main river within site	Land off Beverley Road (Policy WNP27)		Land at St Nicholas Street (Policy WNP28)	Flood Zone 2 & 3	Land at Lodmoor Old Tip (Policy WNP29A,B & C)	Flood Zone 2 & 3 Historic Landfill (Potential Contaminated land) Adjacent to Lodmoor SSSI	Mixed-Use site		Land and buildings at Jubilee Sidings (Policy WNP41)	Environment Agency constraints Adjacent to Rail line (Potential Contaminated land)	Transport Interchange site		Mount Pleasant Old Tip (Policy WNP54)	Environment Agency constraints Adjacent to Flood Zone 2 & 3 Historic Landfill (Potential Contaminated land) Adjacent to Lodmoor SSSI	<p data-bbox="1209 1290 1422 1375">Include references to advice from the Environment Agency.</p> <p data-bbox="1209 1406 1445 2074">Ensure land allocation policies and development policies generally incorporate the advice of the Env. Agency regarding: 1. Flood risk measures and the sequential test 2. Linking policy wording to the latest The Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) Strategy 3. Suitable buffer distance between any proposed development and any watercourse/waterbody /flood defence 4. Issues of contamination and flood risk at Lodmoor</p>
Residential sites																								
Land off Budmouth Ave (Policy WNP24)	Environment Agency constraints Adjacent Flood Zone 2 & 3 Historic Landfill site nearby Adjacent to Lodmoor SSSI																							
Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North (Policy WNP25)	Flood Zone 2 & 3																							
Land at Redlands Farm (Policy WNP26)	Flood Zone 2 & 3 Main river within site																							
Land off Beverley Road (Policy WNP27)																								
Land at St Nicholas Street (Policy WNP28)	Flood Zone 2 & 3																							
Land at Lodmoor Old Tip (Policy WNP29A,B & C)	Flood Zone 2 & 3 Historic Landfill (Potential Contaminated land) Adjacent to Lodmoor SSSI																							
Mixed-Use site																								
Land and buildings at Jubilee Sidings (Policy WNP41)	Environment Agency constraints Adjacent to Rail line (Potential Contaminated land)																							
Transport Interchange site																								
Mount Pleasant Old Tip (Policy WNP54)	Environment Agency constraints Adjacent to Flood Zone 2 & 3 Historic Landfill (Potential Contaminated land) Adjacent to Lodmoor SSSI																							

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>The neighbourhood plan area and the some of the proposed allocated sites are located within Flood Zone 2 and 3. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 159-164, we remind you that the Sequential Test should be satisfied as your plan is proposing development or promoting growth. This should ensure development is directed to the areas of lowest risk of flooding, taking climate change into account. The application of the Sequential Test should be informed by the Local Planning Authority's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p> <p>We note that the Neighbourhood Plan is reliant on the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Level 2 (L2) for Weymouth. This document will be used to build the flood risk evidence base that supports the Dorset Council Local Plan, through the Local Plan policies and the Sequential test position for the Town Centre area. It is noted that this document will supplement the SFRA Level 1 for the whole of the Local Plan area.</p> <p>Whilst it has not yet been published, we can confirm that we are satisfied the SFRA L2 document has robustly assessed the current and future flood risk for the Weymouth Town Centre area, and that it adequately represents the flood hazards up to 2138. The document confirms that come 2138 there is likely to be significant flood risk that will need to be adequately managed to ensure that new development is safe, and that the existing community can remain as a sustainable community from a flood risk perspective.</p> <p>The evidence in the SFRA L2 reports and maps demonstrate that the 2138 flood depths and hazards would, if unmanaged and climate change predictions are correct, be unsafe with depths greater than 2 metres in some locations. Therefore, we have advised the council it is essential the SFRA Level 2 is considered alongside the Weymouth Harbour and Esplanade Flood and Coastal Risk Management Strategy and Dorset Councils Flood Coastal and Erosion Management Team are undertaking on the flood risk business cases for delivery of infrastructure for Weymouth.</p> <p>The published Flood Risk Management Strategy confirms that an adaptive approach to managing the risk will be required with appropriate phasing and delivery of physical interventions to reduce the flood hazards. This is particularly important given that the National Planning Guidance confirms that safe dry access is available during the design flood event, and it should be secured through the planning process in order to demonstrate that development meets the Exception Test.</p> <p>We would suggest that the policy wording is additionally linked to the latest FCRM strategy and have advised the council that they will need a form of design code and funding contributions mechanisms to ensure that development does not compromise the aspirations set out in the FCRM Strategy. For example, this may be through raised finished floor levels or adaptable ground floor spaces, community infrastructure levy, S106, etc.</p> <p>We have highlighted that the evidence in the SFRA L2 demonstrates that if in the future the necessary flood risk management infrastructure cannot be delivered, the overall sustainability of the community will be compromised. Therefore, we have recommended that they could highlight this matter now, and that future plans may well need to consider alternative plans on how the town may need to adapt further or look at to how essential uses can be accommodated outside of area of flood risk.</p> <p>We note that there are some locations that are outside of the previously agreed Sequential Test area, such near as Lodmoor. Whilst these sites may be outside of the flood risk areas themselves as they are elevated on made ground. We would highlight that the access to these sites may be unsafe due to flood depths and velocities, from beach over topping or failing, so this should be considered this requirement as National Planning Guidance would indicate that they should have safe dry access over their lifetime. We would highlight that the Council's Emergency Planners should be involved in this decision-making element. We do not normally comment on, or approve the adequacy of, flood emergency response procedures, as we do not carry out these roles during a flood. Our involvement with this development during an emergency will be limited to delivering flood warnings to occupants/users covered by our flood warning network. Planning practice guidance (PPG) states that, in determining whether a development is safe, the ability of residents and users to safely access and exit a building during a design flood and to evacuate before an extreme flood needs to be considered. One of the key considerations to ensure that any new development is safe is whether adequate flood warnings would be available to people using the development. We also advise you undertake appropriate consultation with your, local planning authority, emergency planners and the emergency services to determine whether the proposals are safe in accordance with paragraph 167 of the NPPF and the guiding principles of the PPG. You should therefore consider the implications for access/egress with respect to flooding on any allocations including those where the development site may be at low risk.</p> <p>The plan should ensure that a suitable buffer distance is maintained between any proposed development and any watercourse/waterbody/flood defence, in order to maintain access, protect biodiversity and avoid impacts to flood defence infrastructure. Without this the plan may not be compliant with national policy and will likely fail the basic conditions for neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>Water quality</p>	<p>Ensure policies, such as site allocations and design of development, take flood risk and the future challenges of climate change into account. (WNP17, WNP20, WNP39</p> <p>Refer to nature conservation in association with public access to rivers (WNP14)</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>There are several main rivers and watercourses that run through the neighbourhood plan area for example the River Wey and the River Jordon. The River Wey is currently failing to reach good ecological status/potential under the Water Framework Directive. It is currently classified as having moderate status. Developments within or adjacent to this watercourse should not cause further deterioration. Further information on the current status of this watercourse can be found on the Catchment Data Explorer.</p> <p>Source Protection Zones/Aquifers Your plan includes areas which are located on sensitive aquifers / Source Protection Zones, which are groundwater resources that are particularly sensitive to contamination. These should be considered within your plan if growth or development is proposed here, in particular avoiding potentially contaminative development in these areas. The relevance of the designation and the potential implication upon development proposals should be considered with reference to our Groundwater Protection guidance: https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection. Without this the plan may not be compliant with national policy and will likely fail the basic conditions for neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>Contaminated Land It was noted that three of the allocated sites (Land at Lodmoor Old Tip, Policy WNP29A, B &C) are proposed on an historic land fill site. Development of historic landfills has the potential to disturb and mobilise contamination present within the deposit that could cause pollution of sensitive receptors, including human health and controlled waters. Any such development therefore requires careful planning and execution to ensure the risks are understood and managed appropriately. The regulatory implications can also be complex for development of historic landfill sites. We recommend developers approach the Environment Agency as early as possible to discuss the need for environmental permits or other regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Environmental Net Gain and biodiversity Biodiversity Net Gain is already established in the National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 174d, 179b and 180d., for new developments and planning policies. Under the Environment Act 2021, all planning permissions granted in England (with a few exemptions) will have to deliver at least 10% biodiversity net gain. As part of the government's Environmental Improvement Plan 2023. and 25-Year Environment Plan there is also the target to incorporate wider Environmental Net Gain into our planning decisions and strategic planning. Your plan should consider opportunities for how these requirements can be met and preferably where your plan can go beyond any minimum requirements to deliver environmental net gains.</p> <p>Managing and adapting to climate change Our latest Adaptation report, Living Better with a Changing Climate, shows that England will inevitably face significant climate impacts, and that early action is essential. Significant climate impacts are inevitable especially for flood and coastal risks, water management, freshwater wildlife and industrial regulation. On-going policy reform presents an opportunity to strengthen the role the planning system plays in mitigating and adapting to climate change, and to ensure a fair transition to a low carbon economy. Therefore your plan should ensure any policies, site allocations and design of development, takes the future challenges of climate change into account.</p> <p>Drainage and wastewater infrastructure Where your plan proposes development or promotes growth, we recommend early consultation with your appropriate water company. Your plan should determine whether there is (or will be prior to occupation) sufficient infrastructure capacity existing for the connection, conveyance, treatment and disposal of quantity and quality of water associated with any proposed development within environmental limits of the receiving waterbody. This may impact on the housing figures and the phasing of development. Please note that if there is not sufficient capacity in the infrastructure then we must be consulted again with alternative methods of disposal.</p> <p>Green and blue infrastructure Green and blue infrastructure is important for adaptation and resilience to climate change, provides health and wellbeing benefits, allows nature recovery, improves water quality, and assists in delivering net zero targets. Your plan should include policies which support and encourage opportunities to incorporate green and blue infrastructure, including natural flood management approaches, river restoration including de-culverting/naturalisation, and the protection of existing natural assets. You may also wish to identify important networks in your plan area and ensure policies manage development over or near these areas. We are pleased to see that biodiversity and nature conservation have been included within the plan policies and support any policy that encourage enhancement of the natural environment. We also support policy WNP14 with encouraging public access to rivers, but this must be done with nature conservation in mind.</p>	

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>We encourage you to seek ways in which your neighbourhood plan can improve the local environment. For your information, together with Natural England, English Heritage and Forestry Commission we have published joint guidance on neighbourhood planning, which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. This is available at: https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/toolkits-and-guidance/consider-environment-neighbourhood-plans/</p>	
<p>G/44 Lichfields for Haven Leisure</p>	<p>Haven operates more than 38 holiday sites in the form of holiday parks, resorts, and family entertainment in Great Britain, therefore, significantly contributing the national tourist economy, as well as local visitor economies.</p> <p>In the designated area, Haven operates Weymouth Bay and Seaview Holiday Parks. Together, these parks have a large team of staff, equivalent to 117 full time and 338 part time staff in the 2023 high season and as such is one of the larger employers in the Town. The two parks attract over 115,000 visitors each year bringing significant direct and indirect economic and social benefits to Weymouth and the wider area. The popularity of both Weymouth Bay and Seaview as holiday destinations is high, with occupancy levels of 90-95% at Weymouth Bay and 95-98% at Seaview from March to May 2023. Weymouth Bay alone creates £4.1m of off-site annual visitor expenditure supporting a further 65 FTE jobs. Haven is therefore an important part of the neighbourhood plan area and the community.</p> <p>It is vital for Haven to operate within a positive policy context that encourages investment in its holiday parks, to widen and increase the quality of the tourism offer which is necessary to attract visitors who, in turn, support the local economy through the creation of jobs, facilitating further investment and through visitor spending.</p> <p>Consultation has an important role in the neighbourhood plan-making process, providing an opportunity to shape the emerging plan and to seek to ensure it meets the basic conditions required in legislation².</p> <p>In making these representations, regard has been had to the NPPF, Planning Practice Guidance, Advice Note for Neighbourhood Plan Groups: Strategic Policies prepared by Dorset Council³ and the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service guide for service users and examiners⁴.</p> <p>Haven would like to assist Weymouth Town Council in ensuring that the emerging NP is robust. As drafted, there are matters our client considers need to be refined. Drawing together the representations made, the following overarching points are raised covering some areas of the draft plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is repetition of a number of policies set out in the Local Plan, national policy, national guidance or legislation; 2. Some policies conflict with strategic policies contained in the Local Plan; 3. Some policies are not precise and do not provide a clear basis for decision-making; 4. Some policies have not been positively framed; 5. Some policies do not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development; 6. Proportionate, robust evidence has not been provided for every policy; and, 7. The maps within the consultation document are not all clear. <p>As an integral part of the community, Haven is keen to work with the Town Council to support the sustainable development of the town and would be pleased to answer any questions about any part of these representations.</p>	<p>Consider points made about policies when drafting next version.</p>
<p>G/45 Weymouth BID</p>	<p>Why on earth is this even being considered? More housing will put more pressure on public services such as surgeries, police, and schools etc.</p>	<p>Noted objection to the Plan</p>
General – Presentation		
<p>P/1</p>	<p>I would like to express my view on the general layout of the plan. It is over 200 pages long with supporting documents probably doubling that amount. I am not an academic or a town planner and neither have the time or ability to fully understand all the contents.</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
<p>P/2</p>	<p>The numbering above does not appear to be consistent with the PDF while viewed in Acrobat PRO ... may explain why my comments may be out of synch with your numbering quoted.</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
<p>P/3</p>	<p>I have not been able to view the documents on my Mac so no page number offered I'm afraid</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
<p>P/4</p>	<p>Unable to read the specific policy whilst on mobile app but housing will only add more obstruction and destruction to the town</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
<p>P/5</p>	<p>Again, I find the layout too unwieldy to refer to while completing a form that I can't save as I go. Maybe consider a précis that contains the policy boxes for future consultations?</p>	<p>Consider publishing a short community version for the referendum</p>
<p>P/6</p>	<p>Couldn't find pages 219, 220 and 221</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
<p>P/7</p>	<p>I couldn't get footnote 26 to open. How old is this plan? When is due to be updated?</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
<p>P/8</p>	<p>There is far too much information hidden in so many documents. I can only assume many things have been hidden in an attempt to bulldozer the plan through.</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
P/9	The documents were large and too difficult/time consuming for some people to provide feedback. This should be improved in the next stage."	Noted comment
P/10	The plan is poorly produced/checked e.g. sentences with missing words (which would have been picked up with a basic grammar checker), maps that look like they have been drawn with a felt tip etc. The final version must be much better produced and checked. All the maps are too small, so there is a need to scroll in to see the detail, making too difficult to easily progress through the document. The maps and other illustrations should be clickable to open a larger version.	Noted comment
P/11	The Neighbourhood Plan is far too long and complex to be viable for a referendum. I note that WTC policy on consultation and engagement says that 'says it is unreasonable to expect the public to read large volumes of information when being consulted.' It will hold no democratic legitimacy if the turnout is very low, or the Plan is rejected because residents feel unable to engage with it because they do not want to give up a day of their life to read it. There is a real danger that the extensive work that has been done by councillors and others will be wasted due to the size and complexity of the resulting document. Much more effort needs to be expended to focus the document down to the issues on which residents will consider that they have opinions. All pointless 'motherhood and apple pie' statements should be deleted, and appendices should be used for supporting information. In summary, the Neighbourhood Plan is a Planning document, not a description of the area and work that has been done.	Ensure that all aspects of the Submission Version are relevant to a land use plan for Weymouth
P/12	The Plan needs an Executive Summary which sets out the broad intent, the priorities or key points of the plan that distinguish it from the WDW&P LP. The Maps do need to be clearer. Perhaps a separate Map Book is needed. This will be less of a problem when Policy Maps are included by Dorset Council on Dorset Explorer.	Consider the need for and purpose of companion documents when drafting next version
P/13	The 'interesting fact' regarding the black death gives the wrong year.	Change date when drafting next version
P/14	I could not complete this important consultation form as 220pp to read and absorb is impossible, and there was no indication as to where the document should be returned. I would like to say the exercise is a travesty and not at all democratic, a great shame.	Noted comment
P/15	The 218 pages is daunting and therefore off-putting to absorb and respond to even with the summaries that have been provided (and welcomed). Could it not be reduced using more references to supporting documents for those wanting more background information?	Noted concern about the size of the Plan document, consider how it might be reduced.
P/16	The plan is huge and difficult to read and together with the supporting documents is completely unreasonable for most people to be able to go through. There should be a simpler version available with an overall summary. You really do not make it easy to respond, and in an area with a vast elderly population this way of doing things makes it very hard for many. There are other areas such as Sutton Poyntz that had a small development, there is no major house building being suggested there. The plan should be withdrawn, the development suggested is far too large. For any plan there should be proper communication to give the local community the chance to become properly involved and be able to put forward their ideas for the future of the community they live in.	Noted concern about the size of the Plan document, consider how it might be reduced. Consider publishing a short community version for the referendum
P/17	Please make this shorter when it comes to the referendum, it's too much. A three (MAX) page document with hyperlinks to the details would be much easier to wade through - I know this has beaten me!	Noted comment
P/18 Dorset Council	6. Consistency - There is a general inconsistency in the policy wording and layout of the policies within the document. It is apparent that they have been drafted by different authors. It is therefore recommended that the policies are revised to be read in a consistent and coherent manner.	Ensure more consistency of wording and terms used in policies.
P/19 Dorset Council	7. Cross references – Too many cross-references can make a policy difficult to read and understand. Many of the policies cross reference to 'other relevant policies in the Neighbourhood Plan' or 'Development Plan'. In most cases, these cross references are not considered necessary as the Development Plan must be 'read as a whole'.	Ensure cross references are necessary and relevant
P/20 Dorset Council	8. Photos – The use of photos throughout the document is welcome, however, it is recommended that these should be directly relevant to the Policy or Proposal to reduce confusion.	Ensure any photos used are of direct relevance to the topic
P/21 Dorset Council	9. Local Government Reorganisation - The Plan makes no reference to Local Government Reorganisation and Weymouth's wider relationship with Dorset Council as a whole.	Noted comment
P/22 Dorset Council	320. Paragraph 10.15 refers to Map 27 on page 98, however this map appears on page 104.	Ensure map and page references are correct
P/23	The document that is being proposed only came to my attention from a newsletter from one of the opposition parties, something as important as this proposal should be communicated to the wider community in a more transparent way. The amount of	Noted comment

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	information that is presented in this document is overwhelming, 221 pages of detailed plans, littered with assumptions, acronyms, low resolution maps, etc. All this information presented in a PDF file that is difficult for most people to load and read, especially the elder members of the communities that would be directly affected by these proposals. Even this survey is difficult and confusing to complete, it took me a number of attempts to get all the sections completed and I am a computer professional. The last public meeting regarding this plan in Preston Village Hall was a farce, I only found out about this after the event. It seems like the council is going out of its way to push this through with the illusion of community involvement and agreement. My opinion and the opinion of the people who will be affected seem to be an annoyance to someone's grand scheme; the Council should represent the views and aspirations of the local community.	
P/24	Some work on the images – would like slightly less and what is used made and more relevant to the section they are representing.	Ensure any photos used are of direct relevance to the topic
P/25	I like the facts, but can they be reviewed to ensure they are relevant to the section and relate to the plan and planning as much as possible.	Ensure any images/factoids/illustrations used are of direct relevance to the topic
P/26	The plan is very long and consequently will have been inaccessible to many people.	Noted concern about the size of the Plan document, consider how it might be reduced.
P/27 Weymouth BID	We have a number of other reservations about the plan and would like to consult further with levy payers. However, both the form and length of the current consultation document makes it inaccessible to all but the most determined reader. We certainly cannot expect our hardworking levy payers to properly review this in its current form.	Noted concern about the size of the Plan document, consider how it might be reduced.
General - Maps		
M/1	Map 4 - legend is illegible	Address map issues
M/2	the key on Map 6 is not legible in the pdf version of the document the words are all blurred.	Address map issue
M/3	The resolution on all the maps is insufficient to read the detail. This makes it difficult to get an informed picture of the proposals.	Address map issues
M/4	Maps are too small to study online and do not expand.	Address map issues
M/5	Map 6, legend is illegible	Address map issues
M/6 Dorset Council	41. Map 6 – Increase the size and resolution of the map presented in the document.	Address map issue
M/7	Legends on the maps are illegible	Address map issues
M/8	Several of the maps and legends contained within the supporting documentation/plan are illegible making interpretation and comment very difficult. Despite the Council's own [internal and external] experts indicating (through well researched and written expert reports) the long term (>100 years) unsuitability for development of several areas contained within this plan, this plan appears to have completely ignored them, and pushed on regardless.	Address map issues
M/9 Dorset Council	5. Maps - The size and resolution of the information presented on almost all maps presented in the plan mean that a large number are not legible. Many of the maps also do not include a key. The town council should consider larger maps presented at a higher resolution with keys to clarify what information the map shows.	Address map issues
M/10 Dorset Council	42. Map 7 - Definitive Map Team note that the fields on Map 7 have two public footpaths (only one shown on the map). Also suggest using the term walkers instead of rambles.	Address map issues
M/11 Dorset Council	52. Map 8 - Increase the size and resolution of the map presented in the document.	Address map issues
M/12 Dorset Council	67. Map 10 - Increase the size and resolution of the map presented in the document. The Definitive Map Team add that Map 10 requires a disclaimer that it is not the Definitive Map and has no legal status.	Address map issues
M/13 Dorset Council	80. Map 12 - Increase the size and resolution of the map presented in the document.	Address map issues
M/14 Dorset Council	95. Map 15 – It is unclear if this policy covers all areas marked blue on map 15. Clarification is need to as to the exact extent this policy applies, and this should be made clear in the policy text. For example, by stating 'Development proposals should maintain, and where viable improve, public access to the waterways marked blue on map 15.'	Address map issues
M/15	Map 19 page 66. Label 2. Difficult to read.	Address map issues

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
M/16 Dorset Council	145. Map 20 – It is not clear what the red and blue outlines in the map show? It would also be helpful to have the policy numbers for each of the allocations, rather than the separate numbering.	
M/17	2. Many images in the pdf version of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan are not of sufficient detail to be able to be read, e.g. Map 6 on page 29. Improve image resolution in next issue or provide external diagrams/web links.	Address map issues
M/18 Dorset Council	Map 32 – The map identifies existing allotments, community growing space and potential areas for allotments. It is difficult to determine site location due to scale. Please provide additional maps and at a higher scale.	Address map issues
M/19	it is impossible, or at least extremely difficult, from this document to check the details because most of the maps are illegible. It is very hard to determine what areas are actually included (or may have been omitted) Reference in Plan: 8.0	Address map issues
M/20 Dorset Council	Appendix C: Local Green Space Maps 438. Figure 9, 15, 18, and 39B do not match the other maps. These maps should be revised and made uniform.	Address map issues
M/21 Dorset Council	The maps provided in Appendix D do not go far enough to identify specific areas of open space as they only identify large areas of a mix of housing, employment, etc. Each individual space should be mapped and defined.	Address map issues
General – Consultation		
Z/1	I don't believe you consulted widely and genuinely - unless everyone you asked is a member of the Green Party. It reads like a luxury Green manifesto for a town that knows it can't afford luxuries. Also, it's a questionable idea to put nearly all the new homes in Tory voting NIMBY Central, i.e. Preston. They will all vote against this. Didn't the authors pause to consider the politics of winning the referendum when they wrote all of their hobby horses into the plan?!	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/2	Reg. 14 consultation – What a useless survey. There is no address for the Neighbourhood Plan in the leaflet received today. Obviously, it is pointless replying to anything here. I think this routine is called pretence to hold a survey without giving any assistance. I'm not wasting any more time.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/3	Para. 9.12 'Consultation exercises' - the one for Preston was poorly attended because it was held in August when many residents were away and was poorly advertised. I understand that just over 60 people attended these 'consultations' across the whole of Weymouth. This hardly counts as public consultation, in fact, it seems that lip service was paid to consulting residents. I also believe that my first-round consultation response was filtered out because of a perceived suggestion of impropriety - this is an insult to my intelligence and undemocratic.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/4	Consultation with the community Earlier this year I completed a questionnaire relating to the development at Wyke Oliver Farm. I have been informed that some of the responses were not included in the final report by the Steering Group. This report does not reflect the true opinions of the community. It is a misrepresentation of people's views and a complete lack of transparency of this whole process. In addition, meetings have been very poorly publicized. In particular I refer to a meeting held during the school holidays on a Friday Bank Holiday weekend in August. A time when many residents would be away on their holidays. Obviously very few participants attended and again a misrepresentation of public opinion. My conclusion is that there appears to be some urgency with this procedure and any results and decisions derived from it appear to be rushed. Also, Wyke Oliver Farm is a working farm, a greenfield site not a brownfield site. In this event, as a priority, brownfield sites should be considered for development above all other rural locations.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/5	Firstly the suggestion that there was a process of community consultation is disingenuous. To advertise the consultation on Facebook and the Dorset Echo during the busy summer break is inadequate - this does not reach many residents. Additionally a large proportion of the responses were disallowed - community consultation means all responses must be taken into account if due process is followed.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/6	Section 6 - appears that it advises the Steering Group has formulated the plan following evidence gathered during 'by a process of community consultation' (6(2)) and further, 'Following strong community support, it has been decided that the objectives set out under the Environmental Sustainability Theme heading should underpin all policies' (6(4)). They do not appear to be underpinning the housing developments suggested later in the plan (preserving our unique environment and to celebrate the unique character and culture of each local neighbourhood, to name just two as examples). Regarding consultation this was virtually non-existent - I was unaware of consultations which I am now know took place in August and have no knowledge of any other consultation except the on-line consultation following the initial proposal earlier this year. With regard to the August events, I understand at five separate centres some 61 people attended out of a population of 53,000. I would submit this is not evidence of a representative sample. In Preston only 9 people attended. If I had known of this, I would definitely have attended	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	and in Preston. I know of many others who would have done the same. This is not a fair and consultative process if the local people are not made aware of the consultation! Equally with the online survey earlier this year I am aware that many residents from the Preston area took the trouble to respond however it is my understanding that the steering group sought to exclude our views on the basis that we had been ill advised on the number of houses which could be built. This is again hardly democratic and further, the numbers of potential houses mentioned in the revised plan are even greater than we were supposedly advised of.	
Z/7	Selection of the proposed development sites in WNP 23 and WNP24 is said to be influenced by the community consultations in August 23. However, many residents including me were unaware that this consultation was taking place. There was inadequate publicity given to this with no leaflet drop to individual properties in the area and the meetings were held at a time when many people were on their annual holidays. The attendances reflect this and cannot be said to be in any way representative of the community, with only 9 people attending the event at Preston Village Hall in the area most affected by the proposals.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/8	As far as consultation is concerned this was virtually non-existent from my perspective. I was unaware of consultations which I am now know took place in August and have no knowledge of any other consultation except the on-line consultation following the initial proposal earlier this year. With regard to the August events, I understand at five separate centres some 61 people attended out of a population of 53,000. I would submit this is not evidence of a representative sample. At my local meeting (Preston) only 9 people attended. As mentioned, I was unaware of the event however had I known I certainly would have attended and made my feelings known as I did at a recent event at the start of this Regulation 14 process. With regard to the online survey earlier this year I am aware that many residents from the Preston area took the trouble to respond however it is my understanding that the steering group sought to exclude our views on the basis that we had been ill advised on the number of houses which could be built. This is again hardly democratic and further, the numbers of potential houses mentioned in the revised plan are even greater than we were supposedly advised of.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/9	Reg. 14 consultation - To start with you cannot get the page numbers correct on this survey.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/10	Filibustering in secret, refusal to lease in reasonable time and accept comments from local people. No liaison with third parties who own access land to developments.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/11	In para. 4.1 - Neighbourhood planning is intended to give communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of the local area. Nowhere in this statement does it say land owners or developers have a significant say, eclipsing that of the local community. This show that the steering group in more influenced by house builders than the community who should be at the heart of this plan. Democracy is not working. The area behind Budmouth Avenue was always considered unsuitable for development by previous Councils until the last couple of years due to pressure from the landowner/Developer. As the NP is a democratic process, please name the land owners (and any know developer) who should have nothing to hide or fear and this information is publicly available anyway. By the steering groups own stats (attendance at meetings/walkabouts) it can be seen that the consultation with the local community has been next to non-existent, all resulting from poor communication, a reoccurring theme throughout this document.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/12	<p>Para. 11.3 Community Consultation</p> <p>1. 573 responses made in January have been disallowed because they did not fit in with the agreements between the Weymouth Council and Bellway Homes for approx. 500 homes to be built in Preston.</p> <p>2. It was necessary for the Neighbourhood Plan to change the designated use of Key Sites 6 and 7 (WNP 23) from Green Space to Development Land to accord with these arrangements with Bellway Homes. This now forms the reasons for our 2 Freedom of Information requests to Weymouth Town Council as well as our complaint of Maladministration.</p> <p>3. The 573 responses were disallowed because the Chairman of the Steering Committee and the Liberal Democrat majority on the Council put in writing that the figure of 500 homes was "highly inaccurate". In fact, the Neighbourhood Plan allows for 480 homes so this statement of "highly inaccurate" is bogus, misleading, untruthful and unlawful.</p> <p>4. The Steering Committee were negligent in August 2023 to arrange a meeting on the August Bank Holiday weekend in such a way that very few Preston residents could have been aware of it. Mysteriously, the Weymouth Council admit that advertising in The Echo was somehow so late in appearing as to be meaningless. The Committee are negligent to use the 33 views expressed from this bogus meeting in place of the 573 views expressed in January. It conforms to the planned agreement between Weymouth Council and</p>	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>Bellway Homes to turn a vote from January of 366 votes 'against' (64% of 573) into an August vote 'for' of 48%/58% (using a total sample of just 33). This is both undemocratic and unlawful.</p> <p>5. We have suggested that the 573 residents from January should be recontacted to see if they wish to change their opinions in the light of further information which has come to hand since January. The Steering Committee have not responded to this entirely reasonable suggestion so that democracy can prevail within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>6. It would appear to a reasonable person that the Steering Committee is majority controlled by the Liberal Democrat faction against the Conservative faction and that this has been allowed to taint the Neighbourhood Plan process and disenfranchise 573 residents of Preston who expressed an opinion 7. If this is not rectified, it will certainly be complained about to the Inspector and may lead to a Judicial Review against Weymouth Town Council</p>	
Z/13	<p>1. The principal awareness method of communicating with the Weymouth residents was the "Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan Consultation" leaflet. An audit is required of how many households/areas did not receive the leaflet that was meant to be delivered by Royal Mail to every household. I live in Redlands, and I did not receive the leaflet and other people I have spoken to did not receive it too. In addition, the leaflets there were delivered were very late in the consultation process. If the public are not aware of the consultation or have very limited time to respond, then they cannot provide feedback so it can give a false impression of the local resident's views and interest.</p>	<p>Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement</p>
Z/14	<p>It is a sad state of affairs when the Councils own survey cannot reference the correct pages in the NP. Section 11 starts on page 123!</p>	<p>Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement</p>
Z/15	<p>This plan appears to have been developed without proper consultation and this concerns me very much. The steering group formulated the plan and the consultation that has been made has been delivered in such a way that limited amounts of local people were aware of any development proposals let alone any consultation meetings that have taken place. Surely the local communities - people that live in the affected areas - should have the right to a proper and fair consultation process rather than the will of some councillors and developers bulldozing this through in what appears to be a very underhand and sly manner. It's important that the Town Council have the views of the community they have been elected to serve and take note of them and reflect them in the proposed plan. It seems this is being presented as a done deal and we have had the very limited opportunity for initial input.</p>	<p>Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement</p>
Z/16	<p>One of my main concerns is that the steering group seem to have made a plan with very limited consultation with the local people. The Town Council have been elected to serve the community and should seek the views of the public in a more open way. I must note that the plan is difficult to read and after speaking to my friends and neighbours, most of us found it daunting to read. I suggest a simplified version would have been most helpful. But sadly it does make me feel that this has been the intention from the beginning of this whole process to make it not easy to understand or deal with so that people do not bother to put their views forward. I must reiterate that I ask for the Brackendown / Budmouth and Wyke Oliver plan to be removed</p>	<p>Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement</p>
Z/17	<p>I have strong concerns as to how this plan was formulated. It appears to me that with very little consultation a steering group constructed a plan which was then put to the population in a very limited way. I admit many are apathetic to local government however this top-down method of creating a plan is surely wrong. Should it not be that communities (more on that later) should be consulted perhaps on an informal basis to ask what their needs and aspirations are, and by all means explain that a certain number of houses need to be built and seek their thoughts. You will find some communities will be enthusiastic and some not. For example, Sutton Poyntz were very motivated and have had their Neighbourhood Plan 'made'. Incidentally I note they have not included any major building projects within their plan. One you have the considered vies of local communities (their informal neighbourhood plan) a town plan could be drawn up. It seems we were given a 'fait a complis' with limited initial input. Maybe I should have read the Echo more thoroughly or subscribed to social media to find out about meetings but surely a letter outing the process, dates and an invitation to participate even at a low level would have been the easiest way to communicate with everyone in Weymouth. It's important that the Town Council have the views of the community they have been elected to serve and take note of them and reflect them in the proposed plan. One last point, I believe that the plan is much too unwieldy and difficult to read and together with the supporting documents is a daunting read for most people. A simplified version (executive summary) would be helpful. I have agonised over this response as I wanted to provide something that was fair and accurate. And yes, I've had sleepless nights. I may not have read every document and some of what I've written may not be appropriate, but it is what I feel. I hope my comments are taken seriously.</p>	<p>Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
Z/18	You state that effective consultation has taken place regarding WNP24 and 25. This is not true. Our local Councillors have bust this myth that effective consultation took place. Indeed we are left to understand that those residents who were able to respond had their comments discounted for spurious reasons. This does not comply with your duty to consult on major development issues.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/19	The draft WNP has been thrust upon the residents. Despite comments to the contrary, there has been little consultation. Additionally, public meetings have been arranged at short notice and without full, widespread notice. For example, a meeting was arranged in Preston at 2 weeks' notice, without notifying the residents and on the Friday of the August Bank Holiday weekend. Unsurprisingly, very few attended. In this survey of 12 questions, there are only 8 which carry any weight. The other 4 are 'personal details'. Only 2 of these four can be completed; any one person can only be 'an individual', or 'an organisation' or 'an agent', yet the completion rules indicate that they all must be completed. Any statistics derived from this survey must take this into account if they are to have any validity.	
Z/20	WNP 23 Residential Site Allocation Prior consultation on these sites was not well publicised and was held at times least likely to attract local engagement (August bank holiday at very short notice, for example). At a previous consultation in January 2023, I registered my opposition, but I understand that negative responses were discounted due to an allegation that respondents were misguided by a third party. I can confirm that in my case, this was not the case, but I believe that you discounted my views and those of many others, nonetheless. There was also prior consultation under the Joint Local Plan Review for West Dorset and Portland in 2018. At that time development proposals of these areas were withdrawn. The apparent avoidance of widespread engagement most recently and failing to take into account prior plan rejections seems to suggest that you are not really inclined to listen to local views. The document (and its associated attachments) presented this time is far too large to expect people to provide comprehensive responses and for that reason my responses are also limited.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/21	I do have many other objections but sadly I have run out of time to return this form. I completed a much more complete form (The preferred option: Comment form) in October 2018 but I also do not know if that form was retained. All my objections were listed in that form.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/22	Reg 14 consultation - "Both the form and length of the current consultation document makes it inaccessible to all but the most determined reader. This survey is not in accordance with WTC policy which states that "it is unfair to expect the public to read large volumes of data." It also notes that yes/no questions should be avoided.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/23	Reg. 14 consultation - The responses from this consultation should be made public.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/24	Consultation and information have been very poor.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/25	This was a clunky Reg. 14 form to complete, defaulting to 'yes' and having to unclick that box to send, and not easy to refer to policy numbers from a big document.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/26	The Steering Group have not consulted properly. During the consultation process, the Steering Group have ignored local representations that do not conform with their views. Insufficient publicity was given to consultation which was held in the summer months when many residents were on holiday. Insufficient time was allowed for comments from the local community.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/27	I feel that residents have not been given the opportunity to contribute to the plan. There have been few public meetings, and my understanding is that the principles of neighbourhood plans are that they should be developed from the bottom up rather than the top down. I also feel that expecting residents to plough through pages of detailed maps, plans and statements is not conducive to receiving broad feedback from the general population. As indeed is asking for referencing to the pages and policy numbers in the responses to this survey.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/28	I feel that residents have not been given the opportunity to contribute to the plan. There have been few public meetings, and my understanding is that the principles of neighbourhood plans are that they should be developed from the bottom up rather than the top down. I also feel that expecting residents to plough through pages of detailed maps, plans and statements is not conducive to receiving broad feedback from the general population. As indeed is asking for referencing to the pages and policy numbers in the responses to this survey.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/29	Firstly I was not aware of any consultations taking place which are mentioned in your document. I have also checked with neighbours and friends in Preston, and they were of the same conclusion. Therefore I do not class this as adequate evidence of a	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	representative sample of community consultation. I also would like to note that the online survey completed by many residents of Preston earlier this year was excluded due to the supposed ill-advised number of potential houses which could be built. This seems very unfair and undemocratic when in the revised plan the number of houses is greater than we were supposedly advised.	
Z/30	The extension of the consultation period is welcome but does not reflect the time taken to get information into the public domain. Therefore I am concerned that we have not given residents sufficient opportunity to find out and respond. The timing is unhelpful being December and in the lead-up to Christmas.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/31	The feedback form and neighbourhood plan are not very friendly especially for people who do not have access to or unable to use the Internet. If community feedback is truly desired this needs to be remedied.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
Z/32	The neighbourhood plan consultation only allows those 'living' in Weymouth to have a voice and business owners who are not in the accommodation sector are not able to vote or have a voice unless their home of residence is within the Weymouth boundary. We request consultation with the business community as a matter of urgency, as whilst business owners may live in the surrounding towns and villages, they contribute to the town's economic picture, with employment of local staff within the community.	Noted comment Address in Consultation Statement
	Foreword	
F/1	The Foreword has a missing paragraph break after 'occurrence' and before 'I'd like to thank...'	Redraft the Foreword for the next version
	1 Introduction	
I/1	The overall area for the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan is too large and attempts to covers a too diverse a character, ranging from Semi Rural to Urban. Consequently the needs and desires of residents will most likely not to be met. Already there is ample evidence of residents in the town favouring the retention of car parks over housing whilst those on the periphery of the area favour the retention of Greenspace.	Noted critical comment
I/2 Dorset Council	10. Maps 1 and 2 are supported and a legal requirement for submission.	Support Noted
I/3	Are paras. 1.3 - 1.6 necessary? Can a single para just refer to the incorporation of the Sutton Poyntz Plan and its policies and then refer to Appendix E. Otherwise it places too much weight on this small part of Weymouth.	Ensure references to the SPNP are relevant and necessary.
	2 Neighbourhood Area	
I2/1 Dorset Council	Para. 2.11 – We disagree that 'Access to services and jobs is limited in Southill and Redlands'. Southill is well related to the Granby Industrial Estate and Redlands is well positioned relative to employers on Mercey Road and related services.	Consider whether para. 2.11 description is correct.
I2/2	Para. 2.14 - my Family has aspirations in protecting the current Preston and Overcome residential area. Our family moved here because we liked the style of housing and relatively quiet neighbourhood with low traffic off the Main Preston Road. The proposed development of every open space and carparks will blight the area and enjoyment of residents and visitors with extended queues on entering and leaving especially during Holiday seasons.	Noted objection to aspect(s) of the Plan
I2/3	Para. 2.16 affordability. The council has allowed land purchases and developers to speculate on green field sites that only increases cost of new dwellings thus exacerbating local people in moving or affording new properties.	Noted critical comment
I2/4	Para 2.18 - Penultimate sentence, clarify the four areas.	Consider whether more clarification is necessary or helpful for understanding the Plan.
I2/5	Para. 2.19 - Our community Services are already overstretched and there is no allocation of additional Doctors, Dentists, schools, sports or youth centres for increased population.	Noted critical comment
I2/6	Para. 2.21 - You acknowledge Lorton as a SSSI, yet Site 6 WNP 23 lies within the 500m Exclusion Zone for development near a SSSI	Noted critical comment
I2/7	Para. 2.24 - Climate change (Cc)is causing Extreme measures with flooding from sewage and rainfall. This will only increase, and sea bathing quality deteriorate as there are no sewage plants with waste pumped out to sea. Pollution will deter Holiday people and commercial income. It is evident that CC is underestimated by Government and serious consequences it will bring to low lying areas.	Noted critical comment
I2/8	Section 2 Needs introduction to 5 Themes?	Add an additional para. before 2.15 introducing the five themes of the NP and their relevance.
I2/9 Dorset Council	Paras. 2.6-2.14 Character areas The five-character areas appear well evidenced, although it is unclear how they have influenced the preparation of the Plan?	Noted Comment in support
	3 Strategic Context	

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
I3/1	Para. 3.2 - You have disenfranchised 573 Preston Residents from having their views taken into account. This is therefore not a "shared vision".	Noted critical comment
I3/2	Para. 3.7 - The extant LP has 16 Strategic Policies specific to Weymouth but also Strategic Policies Applicable to Weymouth. Can these be listed in an Annex? Perhaps indicating where the WNP policies add detail.	Noted comment.
I3/3	Section 3 - Reports and their conclusions are flawed in that reports have been omitted or tweaked to be more acceptable to general circulation especially non-disclosure of the Venning and Bailey report dated Oct 23 as missing in Pre-submission plan. I have been advised that earlier Neighbourhood Plans have had Residents comments redacted by the Steering Committee as no longer relevant, but nothing has changed to previous residents' concerns in fact been amplified by world events. It is unfair and politically biased to conclude poor residential response to earlier meetings and drop-in sessions as significant and importance in policy findings.	Noted critical comment
I3/4	"Strategic Flood Assessment" statement You have not taken into account for WNP 23 that this is the 'seven springs' area regularly subject to flooding for Site 6 and for which Wessex Water have no solution to alleviate	Noted critical comment
I3/5	Page 13 the Level Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Box sits proud without a paragraph number. Please add para numbers. Is the best place for this statement to sit?	Replace text box with relevant and up-to-date numbered paragraphs regarding the Level Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and its relevance to the NP
I3/6	Flooding – there is no SFRA in place which brings into question decisions about “viability” on a practical as well as an economic level – how reliable are the viability tests without this important information? When will the plan be tested against different types of planning proposals as a desk top exercise to assess its efficacy?	Refer to the Plan's relationship with the SFRA.
I3/7	Where is the Character Assessment produced by consultants ECA (did I miss it?) Did it ever get amended?	Include reference and weblink to the Character Assessment in para. 2.7
I3/8	The Level 2 SFRA referred to on p13 has the potential for major disruption to the WNP and I wonder if it is premature to make a plan until it is sorted out. To see that the EA have required a further SFRA, that Dorset Council have prepared that Assessment but won't share it with WTC appears concerning. We can have sympathy for those preparing the NP under these circumstances, but to say that they have to assume that sea defences will be successful in obtaining Government funding and that Dorset Council say it is "likely" that an engineering solution will be possible seems like a hostage to fortune. It may be better if the WNP is delayed until DC and the EA are more transparent regarding what exactly they think the implications of climate change will be for Weymouth and what practical measures will be needed as a result.	Replace text box with relevant and up-to-date numbered paragraphs regarding the Level Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and its relevance to the NP.
I3/9 Dorset Council	13. Paragraph 3.8 – This sentence seems to imply that SPDs are DPDs and that they are part of the development plan which they are not.	Ensure reference to the status of SPDs is correct.
I3/10 Dorset Council	Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 14. The document is currently in draft form and therefore not ready for publication. Dorset Council would welcome the opportunity to work with the town council on the flood and coastal erosion issues relating to Weymouth. Alongside the council's work on its emerging local plan, Weymouth Town Council will also need to consider flood risk when preparing its neighbourhood plan. This means gathering evidence to allow risks to be properly assessed and applying national planning policy and guidance relating to flood risk as part of the plan making process. 15. The Council's Level 2 SFRA may feed into this process. We will keep the town council up to date with progress of the Level 2 SFRA and its publication. As part of the neighbourhood plan making process, this should also involve applying the sequential and exceptions test to the emerging Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan allocations.	Replace text box with relevant and up-to-date numbered paragraphs regarding the Level Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and its relevance to the NP
4 Purpose of the Plan		
I4/1	Para. 4.1 - 573 residents of Preston have not been allowed to "have their say"	Noted critical comment
I4/2	Para 4.1 states in last sentence that the Town Council as a qualifying body can '...and grant planning permission 'How can this be when the LPA is Dorset Council. This needs clarification.	Add a qualifying sentence following the quote referring to the role of Neighbourhood Orders.
I4/3	Para. 4.7 - 573 residents of Preston have been disenfranchised so it is not a "thorough consultation process"	Noted critical comment
I4/4	Para 4.9 - last sentence says, ' how they are being addressed' this cannot be said yet suggest change are being to 'might be'.	Consider whether "might be" in para. 4.9

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
		is a better term for the Submission Version of the NP.
I4/5	Para. 4.10 - It cannot be a 'balanced plan' when 573 Preston residents have been disenfranchised	Noted critical comment
I4/6 Dorset Council	Chapter 4 sets out the Neighbourhood Planning process, community involvement and the Plan's status. 16. Paragraph 4.11 states that the Neighbourhood Plan once made will be a statutory development plan. It would be more accurate to say it will form 'part of the statutory development plan'. The paragraph would also benefit from making references to the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan.	Revise para 4.11 wording to read: <i>"part of the statutory development plan"</i> .
5 Structure of the Plan		
I5/1	Para. 5.1 - It cannot be a 'dialogue with the community' when the council disenfranchises 573 residents when their views do not accord with the pre-planned aims of the council and its Steering Committee"	Noted critical comment
I5/2 Chapman Lily Planning Ltd for Bellway homes	Para. 5.7: indicates how the plan will be monitored and reviewed but should also include reference to the 'Environmental Targets' set out within pages 158-169.	Noted comment.
I5/3	Section 5 Plan Structure Owing to failure in building Affordable homes in the past this leads to a 100% requirement now in excess of 7000. Developers been allowed to buy out for profit reasons. This is why so few have been built. We don't need large high-cost properties to suit Developers pockets. Why have Brownfield sites Especially in Council Ownership or use been omitted from the plan. Brownfield must take precedence over Greenfield. Council must be forced to return the Noth Quay redundant site to residential and affordable homes. Infilling of Greenfield space, carparks have been earmarked for possible development. This will lead to a dramatic change and erosion in Character of surrounding areas, views and enjoyment of our neighbourhoods for residents and holiday visitors. Visitors are the Lifeblood and financial support for town business and Council income. Global Warming assessment and its effect to Dorset is out of date. An updated report is essential with low lying areas withdrawn from future planning redevelopment as based upon Cop 28 reports.	Noted critical comment
I5/4 Dorset Council	Paras. 5.9 - 5.10 – Dorset Council considers a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan is required. The policy team welcome the preparation of a Scoping Report (July 2022), Site Options Report (July 2023), Interim Report (September 2023) and Environmental Report to accompany the Regulation 14 Plan (October 2023). A finalised SEA with any updates will need to be submitted with the Neighbourhood Plan. 18. The Council's Senior Environmental Assessment Officer has reviewed the Environmental Report for the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan which has been prepared by AECOM to accompany the Regulation 14 consultation (revision 2.0, published Oct 2023). 19. The scope of the review was to consider whether the SEA meets the statutory requirements of Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment ('SEA Directive'), which is transposed into UK law through the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 ('SEA Regulations'). The Basic Conditions require conformity with this legislation, since there is a requirement that the making of the plan "does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations" through the basic conditions of the neighbourhood plan. 20. The Senior Environmental Assessment Officers review didn't pick up any non-compliance issues, as the requirements of Annex II of the Habitats Directive and Regulation 12(3) and Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations have been met. However, as previously noted, the SEA process is iterative and we would require there to be further assessment undertaken at the later stages of the plan preparation - however, this is noted by AECOM in para 6.2, so they are confident that this will be undertaken. 21. Regarding the monitoring section, we would clarify that Dorset Council prepare an Authority Monitoring Report rather than an Annual Monitoring Report and that Weymouth Town Council should consider if local monitoring is also required. 22. Finally, as a summary of the findings of the Environmental Report, the assessment concludes that the plan will result in a major positive effect upon community well-being as a result of the strong focus on town centre regeneration, which will provide housing and facilities for the public. Minor negative effects are identified for biodiversity/geodiversity, historic environment, land, soil and water quality, and landscape largely due to the impact of development upon the natural environment. A minor negative effect upon transportation was also reported, due the distance of the allocations	Seek a Screening Opinion from the LPA on the draft Submission Version of the NP to check the SEA remains relevant or whether a revised SEA in whole or part is required. Ensure the reference and description of the SEA and HRA in Section 5 are up-to-date.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>from the town centre which may lead to an increase in trips in private vehicles – although it is noted that this is largely unavoidable due to the limited availability of land.</p> <p>Habitats Regulation Assessment</p> <p>23. Paragraph 5.11 – Dorset Council has concluded through a determination statement (March 2022) that the emerging Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan should be subject to a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA). A complete HRA will expect to be submitted alongside the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
	<p>6 Vision, Aims and Objectives</p>	
	<p>Intro – page 18</p>	
O/1	<p>Section 6 Our Vision.</p> <p>I think this should have something like "We are sensitive to the foundations of our Environmental and Historical heritage". Otherwise there is nothing overarching, which covers e.g. Jurassic coast, AONB, SSSIs, MCZs etc.</p>	Noted comment
O/2	<p>Overall vision is good. Town councils are responsible for allotments, open spaces and locally for the prom and beach. There seems to be some mission creep into the territory of Dorset Council. Dorset Council is responsible for housing. I would suggest that the plan for the Town Council concentrates more on open spaces, allotments etc rather than try to steer the Dorset Council housing allocations from the back seat.</p>	Noted comment
O/3	<p>There are some very questionable and unsubstantiated statements in this section in particular 6.2 and 6.4,</p> <p>Para. 6.2 There was next to no 'community consultation', certainly in the Preston area. As a resident heavily involved with the previous Local Plan I and others were totally unaware of this consultation and evidence gathering. Statements such as 'Following strong community support' are therefore disingenuous at best. The section aims to lay out aims and objectives of the NP which are then, in certain sections of the document, largely totally ignored them. IF the aims and objectives are to be overridden then it must be with the approval of the neighbourhood not by an unrepresentative Steering Group.</p>	Noted critical comment
O/4	<p>Para. 6.2. talks about consultation with the community. Firstly, I submitted a questionnaire previously relating to development at Wyke Oliver Farm. It is my understanding that the Steering Group didn't like some of the responses to the questions posed so in compiling their report deleted the questions so that the unpalatable answers weren't represented. Secondly, a series of meetings were arranged for public engagement, but they weren't widely advertised and were scheduled for a Friday afternoon prior to a Bank holiday weekend during the summer school holidays. No surprise that hardly anyone attended. There has not been enough public engagement and the above suggests that the Steering Group is 'bulldozing' its' views and policy through. In what I've read I have seen a reference to building on 'brown field' but within the proposed Plan I haven't seen any suggestions of that happening.</p>	Noted critical comment
O/5	<p>Para. 6.2 states the vision was 'developed by a process of community consultation' but in fact it hasn't changed since the start of the process. The vision is bland and unimaginative – remove the word 'coastal' and it could apply to anywhere in the country. Could it not say something, for instance, about retaining our unique heritage and exploiting our links with the sea and the fantastic Jurassic Coast which surrounds the town? Reference in Plan: 6 and 6.2</p>	Noted critical comment
O/6	<p>Para. 6.4 'Following strong community support' – meetings have been poorly advertised and poorly attended. Consultation in this case makes a mockery of local democracy.</p>	Noted critical comment
O/7	<p>Para 6.4 states that 'Following strong community support, it has been decided that the objectives set out under the Environmental Sustainability Theme heading should underpin all policies.' All surveys and reports that I have seen of local opinion have focussed on the need for good jobs and affordable housing. These should underpin all policies. Environmental sustainability is clearly essential, and the theme is reasonable. It should be one of the criteria against which any development proposals are assessed. It is noticeable that all other themes have 'draft objectives' whereas the environmental sustainability objectives are shown as 'cross-cutting objectives'. Surely all objectives should have been endorsed (signed off by WTC) before the document is offered for consultation. I note that four of the proposed development sites are within, or surrounded by, existing flood zones. As a minor point of accuracy, I presume that you mean pages 18-21.</p>	<p>Ensure objectives are revised as necessary and in sync with the final policy set.</p> <p>Up-date the statement on community support for the cross-cutting objectives as evidenced by the Reg.14 response.</p>
O/8	<p>The Vision needs to integrate/address the following:</p> <p>1/ Provision of services as the population increases through infill developments The local schools are full (see Wey Valley), there are not enough surgeries (waiting several weeks for an appointment), the traffic congestions are building up and public transport is limited.</p> <p>2/ Mismatch between new developments and job availability - The intense focus on new developments in Weymouth while there is very limited job creation in the area generates increasing traffic towards Dorchester and the BCP area. The new developments should be located where jobs are provided.</p> <p>3/ Wastage and urbanisation of green spaces - The current priority for developers is traditional houses with garage/garden which are consuming a lot of green land (see Littlemore). Instead, the focus should be on brownfield and flats in the town centre area.</p>	Noted comment.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	4/ Affordable homes - The provision of affordable homes is insufficient as developers make more profit from larger houses. The younger generation tend to migrate to towns/cities where jobs are available, and they can afford to rent or buy a home. Also, due to the lack of affordable home it is challenging to attract teachers and nurses in the area.	
O/9	All pages - why are these draft objectives? While these all sound good, they are not SMART objectives. For example "ensure new homes are as energy efficient as possible". How will this be measured? What does it really mean?	Noted comment in support
O/10	All objectives need to be measurable, time bound and subject to testing.	Noted comment in support
O/11	Section 6 'The unique identities of our local neighbourhoods will be attractive to all age groups and will foster healthy and happy lifestyles.' I believe the planned large-scale housing developments in Preston will lose the unique identity of this semi-rural neighbourhood. The decrease in green spaces on the Jurassic coastline will make the area less attractive to tourists and will adversely affect leisure activities of residents. The vision is sound but the way it is to be delivered runs counter to it.	Noted comment in support
O/12	The current vision lacks inspiration and does not represent the drive and ambition that exists in the town. It also downplays the enormous challenge that the future presents to the world. Something a bit more inspiring and Weymouth focused please! Although the below is overly long – how about something more like this: “During the plan period to 2038 Weymouth could become a more equal place to live with opportunities for all-year-round jobs from renewables as we transition to more sustainable lifestyles. Homes could be built for those in most need, such that the waiting list for housing is reduced. New development could include efficient renewable energy and be built to withstand more extreme weather – greater rainfall and higher temperatures. Greater attention could be given to wildlife habitats and connecting local green spaces which would benefit people, as well as the plants and animals that are dependent on it. An integrated public transport system could remove the need for as many cars and we would all benefit from cleaner air, less noise and safer road space for low carbon travel like cycling. This plan cannot deliver all the above, but it takes steps in that direction of travel”.	Noted comment.
O/13	The vision is not hard hitting enough. Resilience in the context of the CEE challenges that we ALL our facing, needs to be front and centre of the vision and objectives that spin off from it.	Noted comment in support
O/14	In 'Our Vision,' you have mentioned Weymouth as a resilient coastal community without elaborating on what you mean by resilient. I do not perceive Weymouth in a phase of recovery from something unpleasant like shock or injury. Additionally, although the aspiration might be for a diverse range of jobs, Weymouth seems primarily focused on catering to tourism, retail, defence and aerospace, and some within the building and housing industry. It is worth mentioning that a considerable number of people now commute from Weymouth to Dorchester, a topic I will delve into later, given the construction of the bypass in 2011.	Add reference in para. 10.3 to the effect of the construction of the bypass in 2011.
O/15 Lichfields for Haven Leisure	The NP Vision (page 18 of the Pre-submission NP) states: “By 2038, Weymouth will be a resilient coastal community with a diverse range of jobs and homes which meet the needs of residents for present generations without compromising the needs of future generations. The unique identities of our local neighbourhoods will be attractive to all age groups and will foster healthy and happy lifestyles.” The representations are: Tourism is a key driver of jobs and investment in Weymouth. The visitor economy is significant to the economic and social well-being of the town and therefore visitors should be recognised within the emerging Vision, particularly given that there are policies related to this sector within the emerging plan.	Noted comment.
O/16 Lichfields for Haven Leisure	Many if not most of the draft policies in the emerging plan reference the need to align with the environmental objectives and targets. The representations are: 1. In relation to environmental objectives and targets in general: a. If there are requirements from the objectives and/or targets that need to be met, these should be set out clearly within a policy or series of policies. At the moment they have a 'half and half' role that goes beyond what is required of policies but are required to be 'aligned'. b. Reference to 'alignment' is not clear nor precise. c. There is a need to ensure that any such policies are based upon evidence, are consistent with national policy and have regard to strategic local policies. d. Any such policies need to be positively framed. e. The policies should not repeat Local Plan policies.	Consider points of criticism and suggestions when drafting next version of Plan and making revisions to the SET

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>f. Helpful guidance arising through the NP plan-making process could be included in the supporting text, but it needs to be clear where this is guidance rather than policy. There is uncertainty in how the objectives/targets are drafted at this time.</p> <p>2. With specific reference to the environmental objectives and targets set out in the draft plan:</p> <p>a. Any such policies need to recognise that caravans are different to buildings and policies surrounding for example, adoption of electric based heating and hot water systems, need to provide flexibility for development that is not a standard brick building.</p> <p>b. Policies need to be land use related e.g. target 29 (equipment) requires equipment to be Class A energy-rated. This falls outside of the planning system. All targets that fall outside of the planning system should be deleted from the emerging NP.</p> <p>c. The summary table on Page 165 is not fully consistent with the detail set out in the subsequent pages e.g. reference to Zero Carbon.</p> <p>d. The targets and means of reaching targets should not exceed national requirements and should focus on planning-related matters only. Such requirements, whilst attractive, become challenging to meet and risk undermining the ability to deliver sustainable development.</p> <p>e. The target policies need to be realistic and supportive. For example, specific requirements for retrofitting may put off applicants seeking approval to retrofit if the development cannot meet all of the listed requirements. It would be better to ensure some improvements if a proposal is submitted rather than no improvement at all.</p> <p>f. The requirement for a minimum 20% BNG in target 23 should not be pursued. This relies on representations to a draft Local Plan consultation, which has not been included in the Local Plan to date. There is insufficient evidence provided to justify this requirement. Seeking greater requirements than those contained in national legislation risks undermining the delivery of other aspects of sustainable development. The imminent national legislation requirement of 10% net gain should be retained.</p>	
O/17	<p>1. Generally this section is motherhood and apple pie, it is all the things I see written in documents like this. That's fine, but the proof is in the actions that are taken, and the plans themselves. There is no point in aims and objectives if they are forgotten when it comes to the detail. Immediately I see a contradiction between the aim, under environmental sustainability to "ensuring future resilience to climate change impact" and the plan to build on the Lodmoor old landfill tip which is always going to be vulnerable to future changes in weather and sea conditions. The term sustainability is a very loose one, used and abused and misunderstood, it is important that the concept isn't just used to provide justification for a chosen course of action. For a development to be genuinely sustainable requires consideration of all of the factors, not just those that suit the case for or against. This needs to be rooted in impartiality and science. It is difficult for me to see how the aims and objectives set out in this section can be followed in development in such a vulnerable location as the low-lying land in Lodmoor.</p>	Noted comment in support
	Objectives - General	
O/18	They all appear to be sound, appropriate and relevant.	Support Noted
O/19	All the aims and objectives sound nice but in reality, we all know they will be steamrollered at a later date by unscrupulous developers and proposers and lack of strong control.	Noted comment in support
O/20 Chapman Lily Planning for Rapide (Beverley Road) Ltd	Support the Vision, Aims and draft Objectives	Support Noted
O/21	Vision... if you build over all the beautiful landscapes here in Weymouth, it will totally discourage visitors to the area in which Weymouth needs to survive as financially viable tourist resort and family style town.	Noted critical comment
O/22	Given that the policies and supporting information have evolved since the Vision, Aims and Objectives were drafted I think it would be sensible to re-visit these to check that the final set of policies and supporting text are appropriately reflected in the Objectives, Aims and Vision. Conversely, are the aspirations of the Vision, Aims and Objectives adequately reflected in the final plan. For example: 1. The vision talks of a "resilient coastal community" but resilience isn't covered comprehensively and cohesively enough for me in the plan. 2. The plan has an aim to "promote and facilitate the production and use of renewable energy" but the How Green is my Plan assessment has shown that renewable energy provision is the weakest area of the plan (which also links back to point 1 above about resilience).	Ensure aims and objectives are revised as necessary and in sync with the final policy set.
O/23	Focus on vision and rejuvenating the beauty of a fine English seaside town.	Noted comment in support

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
O/24	The vision and aims are commendable, and I believe set the ambition of Weymouth over the coming years. My only concern is that, as the economy, this is a very fluid and I would like to believe that the aims / objectives ought to be the subject of annual review to ensure they still reflect the journey for news is breaking that some of the enforcement of green belt land to become land for development may be relaxed. This therefore may point towards better use of 'brown-field' land and work to recycle existing building assets to protect valuable community acreage. This is not to understate the need for more affordable housing but simply to ensure we are getting the best use of existing. This is outlined in page 20 / 221 but perhaps, the reflective nature of the suggested annual review, should be added into the aims on page 18.	Ensure aims and objectives are revised as necessary and in sync with the final policy set.
O/24	The Vision and Aims are very laudable but not reflected in the developments	Noted comment in support
O/25	The vision, aims and objectives are very general, and most people would agree with them.	Noted comment in support
O/26	In general, I agree with the vision and objectives, but I don't think the plans always comply. We really need to avoid turning Weymouth into one huge low-cost housing estate! I would, of course, welcome the introduction of more trees, hedgerows and green spaces!	Noted comment in support
O/27	Section 6 seems to indicate that the Steering Group has formulated the plan following evidence gathered during 'by a process of community consultation' (6(2)) and further, 'Following strong community support, it has been decided that the objectives set out under the Environmental Sustainability Theme heading should underpin all policies' (6(4)). Whilst the general ethos of the aims is sensible, they do not appear to be underpinning the housing developments suggested later in the plan (preserving our unique environment and to celebrate the unique character and culture of each local neighbourhood, to name just two as examples).	Noted comment in support
O/28 The Ramblers (Dorset Area)	The Ramblers welcomes the Vision, Aims and Objectives as set out in the present draft of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Support Noted
O/29 Turley for Morrish Homes	<p>Vision, Aims and Objectives</p> <p>My client supports the overall vision of the WNP. The significance of delivering jobs and homes for Weymouth is vital in securing a resilient and thriving community and economy. My client also broadly supports the related aims and objectives of the WNP relating to environmental, greenspace, housing and the economy. Morrish Homes are committed to delivering high quality and sustainable new developments.</p> <p>It is noted that the Environmental Sustainability aim refers to 'achieving or surpassing national and local agreed targets for sustainability.' Whilst surpassing targets is referred to as an aspiration, and as such this is more than reasonable, any related policy objectives that go beyond current national or development plan policy will need to be suitably justified. The related objectives for development to enhance bio-diversity net gain and ensuring no additional flood risk are enshrined in existing policies and supported. Those relating to carbon neutrality and resource efficiency are less well defined within both national and development plan policy.</p> <p>More specifically, the aim to achieve the highest sustainability standards for all new development is broadly supported. The standards required for new homes are set out within part L of the building regulations. These regulations are anticipated to be upgraded to the Future Homes Standard in 2025, requiring low carbon heating and world-leading levels of energy efficiency.</p> <p>My client also acknowledges the aim of exploring and prioritising opportunities for the redevelopment of brownfield land. This is also highlighted within national policies. It is important to recognise that potential brownfield opportunities will not be of sufficient scale to meet all housing needs of the NP, and often that the delivery of affordable housing is compromised by viability associated with the redevelopment of such land, e.g. demolition, contamination. This is indirectly acknowledged within the NP through the allocation of greenfield sites that will secure significant affordable housing delivery.</p>	Noted comments in support
O/30 Dorset Council	<p>Chapter 6 sets out the Plan's Vision which is supported by 16 Aims and 84 Objectives. The Council's NET made the following suggestion:</p> <p>24. Landscape and Greenspace aims. It would be helpful to make specific mention of statutory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) (i.e. the mandatory minimum 10% required by law) at this early stage in the plan, to establish it as a separate concept to more general biodiversity requirements. Perhaps an additional objective under Aim 2: -Deliver at least the national mandatory minimum 10% BNG, with the expectation that a higher % will be sought where possible.</p>	Ensure aims and objectives are revised as necessary and in sync with the final policy set.
Environmental Sustainability - 19		

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
OS/1 CG Fry and Son	Environmental Sustainability - Carbon Neutrality New development must adhere to the most up to date Building Regulations standards, which includes carbon emission targets. In the past two years, carbon emissions targets set by Building Regulations have required new development to be 32% more efficient than previous targets. Whilst this has been achievable, it has increased development costs and is therefore a consideration in terms of development viability. The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) notes that "All new developments are expected to minimise the emissions of greenhouse gases and be as near to carbon neutral as is reasonably possible". Whilst new development is becoming more efficient in terms of carbon emissions, achieving carbon neutrality is not yet required by national or local planning policy (including the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan), nor as part of Building Regulations. Whilst the NP suggests development should be "as near to carbon neutral as is reasonably possible" and so does not specifically require full carbon neutrality, it is suggested that reference to Building Regulations standards could be included as this will bring the NP more in line with national requirements.	Consider need to make reference to the Building Regulations.
OS/2	Carbon Neutrality Resource Efficiency Biodiversity Climate Change Management. In the main these objectives are already covered by existing policies and merely repeating them here serves little purpose	Noted critical comment
OS/3	Aims/Objectives: Environmental Sustainably Considering Rishi Sunak's recent announcement, where he diluted the UK's net-zero policies but reiterated the commitment to meet the legally binding 2050 target, it seems fitting to align local targets with the central government. This alignment should encompass aspects such as the phase-out of combustion engine cars (11.24), transitioning away from gas boilers, and implementing insulation upgrades, all aimed at achieving these goals by 2035; and not in the near future. The focus should instead presently shift towards enhancing the biodiversity of the area, which is a more manageable and cost-effective approach that I will elaborate on under the relevant objective.	Consider comment when reviewing and revising the SET.
OS/4	The plan as presented does not support the aims and objectives, especially the bio-diversity and net gain vision and aims. The plan has identified areas of land that are currently critical to Bio-Diversity and the area and recommended building on them and has not considered the current environmental legislation that protects these areas.	Noted critical comment.
OS/5	"Environmental Sustainability" and "Landscape and Greenspace" The Objectives are general aspirations with no evidence as to how, time scales, what works will be undertaken, by whom and how much (cost), to get a defined outcome. Also Weymouth is a coastal town its economy and landscape shaped around these. So for example: Coastal erosion and cliff instability. What measures and investment are planned to manage Coast erosion and Cliff instability?	Consider comment when reviewing and revising the SET.
OS/6	Environmental Sustainability Plan fails to meet the aim to 'preserve or enhance our unique environment' by proposing to build on land outside the development area.	Noted critical comment.
OS/7	'All new developments are expected to result in no increase in the risk of flooding' How will this be tested? Some of the sites chosen already have large rain water run offs into existing developments. Building is likely to exacerbate this unless contractors (who are there to make a profit) are genuinely held to account to deal with these issues. This is the right objective but means nothing if contractors are not held to it.	Noted critical comment.
OS/8	I feel there is not enough safeguards for the environment, especially mitigation against Climate Change. There is too much housing development on greenfield sites.	Noted critical comment.
OS/9	laudable aims which do not marry well with the proposed housing developments in Preston.	Noted critical comment.
OS/10	Environmental Sustainability Objectives No mention that conserving the historic built environment is eminently sustainable and should be a priority. The reuse of buildings for existing or new uses rather than demolition and new build should be emphasised as a preference for the WNP.	Ensure aims and objectives are revised as necessary and in sync with the final policy set.
OS/11	Objectives Given the identified and specific risk of flooding for Weymouth I would like the plan to give flooding greater prominence and clearer signposting. Flooding needs to be flagged as an important consideration and the strategy for managing it made clear. At present reference to flooding is spread throughout policy and as such is incoherent and, in some instances, policies contradict the stated objective on Climate Change Management (see section 9 comments)	Consider comment when reviewing and revising the SET.
OS/12	Generally: Referring to a vision in terms of resilience to CEE challenges, the environmental objectives should apply to all other objectives and policies in the entire plan. They need to be considered by planners for every single policy. I would like to see targets, e.g. as described in Appendix A set in policy.	Consider comment when reviewing and revising the SET and its relationship with the Plan.
OS/13	I agree with overarching objectives. they are important to contribute to climate emergency.	Support Noted

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
OS/14	Of the four cross-cutting objectives for Environmental Sustainability, the most important that is immediate is 'Climate Change Management' for without it much of the remainder of the 'Neighbourhood plan' will be undermined. For without adequate sea defences which may also enable innovative design to harvest energy the redevelopment of harbour and coastal properties will be subject to flooding. I quote the additional defences that Venice have added which now protect high-tide and adverse weather conditions as commendable civil projects.	Noted comment(s) in support
OS/15	'All new developments are expected to result in no increase in the risk of flooding' How will this be tested? Some of the sites chosen already have large rain water run offs into existing developments. Building is likely to exacerbate this unless contractors (who are there to make a profit) are genuinely held to account to deal with these issues. This is the right objective but means nothing if contractors are not held to it.	Noted comment.
OS/16	Is there policy addressing the objective: *supporting flood resilience measures? *supporting local food production?	Consider comment when reviewing and revising the SET.
Landscape and Greenspace Objectives – page 19		
OL/1	I support all the objectives, particularly those relating to Landscape and Greenspace	Support Noted
OL/2	Under "Landscape and Greenspace" your stated aim of "Encourage engagement with nature, enhance biodiversity and habitat conservation, and invest in our natural environment and ecosystems" is hardly going to be met by the proposals to develop Wyke Oliver Farm and Budmouth Avenue sites, destroying productive farm land (hardly supporting "sustainable local food production") nor will it "protect wildlife habitats and key landscape features and characteristics" as a core wildlife corridor between Preston and Lodmoor is covered in almost 500 houses. It's hard to see how this can "protect important green gaps between settlement areas".	Noted comment
OL/3	"protect Green Spaces" - WNP 23 has been fought over many times and each time the council has assured residents that it would be protected as Green Space	Noted comment
OL/4	I support the Landscape and Greenspace aims. I realise these are mentioned but actions speak louder than words and too often the green spaces are lost despite talk to the contrary. With the known damage to the environment and biodiversity in the UK in the past, and the known benefit to physical and mental health of nature and the outdoors my own opinion is that this section is THE most important one to focus on. ALL green spaces should not just be conserved but developed.	Support Noted
OL/5	The principles of green space are vital to human wellbeing, mental health, physical health via exercise and wildlife conservation. What I object to is the concentration of proposed housing development between Preston and Littlemore, given the extensive developments in Littlemoor already. Why is there not more development of brown field sites elsewhere in Dorset instead of removing green space and wildlife habitat	Noted Critical comment
OL/6	It is disappointing to see little regard for the marine environment in Weymouth Bay in the aims and objectives. Water quality and protection of sea grass are two things I would have liked to see included e.g. by adding 'bluespace' to Landscape and Greenspace.	Noted comment(s) in support
OL/7	We shouldn't be considering building housing within 500m of a nature reserve.	Noted Critical comment
OL/8	I applaud the landscape and greenspace objectives	Support noted.
OL/9 Dorset Wildlife Trust	It is noted that the aims under Landscape and Greenspace have been reworded since the January 2023 draft. Where the second Aim previously read: "Reverse biodiversity loss, enhance engagement with nature, encourage biodiversity and habitat conservation and invest in our natural capital and our ecosystems to safeguard sustainable food production, ensuring protection from natural hazards and continued recreational activities." The reference to reversing biodiversity loss has been removed. DWT consider that this weakens the intent of the aim to maintain and enhance biodiversity. The ambition to reverse biodiversity loss provides a much stronger resolve and framework for decision making which will benefit nature and should be restored. It also provides a more ambitious framework against which the proposed development allocations should be assessed to ensure that sites are not taken forward which will contribute to the loss of biodiversity.	Ensure aims and objectives are revised as necessary and in sync with the final policy set.
Development and Homes Aims and Objectives – page 20		
OD/1	Where builders agree to a proportion of a development to be affordable housing there needs a planning imperative that the homes are built in that proportion to stop builders building the larger, more profitable homes first and then walking away from completing the development. This should be included as an extra objective on this page.	Noted comment.
OD/2	Infrastructure is not good enough for extra housing. Not enough jobs- low salaries- not enough housing for current low paid workers which are in the majority. More homes are being purchased by non-Weymouth people to be used as second homes or Airbnb.	Noted Critical comment
OD/3	ensure the impact of water in the environment is taken into account when building so that as well as the new buildings are protected so are the surrounding buildings.	Noted comment(s) in support

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	prevent wholesale destruction of areas like Curtis Field. Trails and spaces must be safe for all at all times unlike what happens down the Rodwell Trail where drug dealing is a constant problem and threat to all.	
OD/4	All well and good identifying areas to build more housing, but until Weymouth and Portland put in place the infrastructure to support these proposed new builds, I am unable to see any benefit to the community.	Noted comment(s) in support
OD/5	I support to maximise the use of existing building. Weymouth town centre has a large number of existing buildings, mostly commercial, that are empty and could be converted into dwellings. Retail premises with empty accommodation above could be used as dwellings. Retail units that are unlikely to be used as retail in the near future should be converted into dwellings. This would reduce the amount of farm land that is being used for new developments and offering accommodation in the town centre near to work. This would reduce travel and also better for the environment.	Noted comment(s) in support
OD/6	Provide a broad mix of homes which align with housing need. Until job availability issues are addressed, there is insufficient need for the housing development proposed in the WNP. Commuting to jobs outside of the Weymouth/Portland/Dorchester locality is contrary to WNP 51 (Transport and Travel) and WNP 57 (Traffic Impact). It would appear that the main reason for the requirement for 1000 approx. homes as depicted in the WNP is to appease the allocation dictated by Dorset County Council. This needs to be renegotiated in view of the paucity of local, well-paying jobs. Ensure housing development is suitable to its locality. The proposed development north of Budmouth Avenue (WNP24) and Wyke Oliver Farm North (WNP25) is high density at approx. 23 houses per hectare compared to the current dwellings immediately to the south and east of these proposed sites. Additionally, 50% 'affordable housing' within this development is significantly at odds with the local area's high individual ownership. The Plan makes no mention of why feasible house building development sites not selected have been rejected. This needs to be made clear for the WNP proposal to have any validity.	Noted Critical comment
OD/7	<p>The aims and objectives are often contradictory. Examples include:</p> <p>The prioritisation of new homes for local people and the restriction on second homes and holiday lets will deter both visitors and new residents from creating jobs and spending in local businesses.</p> <p>The use of brownfield sites for housing will result in less land for employment uses and, in one particular case, run counter to the sustainable tourism strategy.</p> <p>The maximisation of the reuse of buildings will deter the use of the limited available land for its most productive use and will act as a limiting factor to the positive developments of the town envisaged within the report.</p> <p>Overall there is no recognition that the challenges faced by Weymouth require much more extensive actions to be taken than to mildly adjust the status quo.</p>	Noted comment(s) in support
OD/8	... includes the aim to "Support and encourage the reuse of brownfield sites" yet the key development locations proposed are greenfield, quite literally. And whilst Lodmoor could be argued to be brownfield due to its use a tip, it must also fall foul of flood risk concerns. In relation to "Jobs and the Local Economy", this seems to be an irrelevance in relation to the proposed sites for residential development.	Noted comment(s) in support
OD/9	I do not think building on green field sites is a correct policy when there is other land within the Defined Development Boundary. To achieve the low-cost housing why not build councils houses and keep the cost's down and away from greedy landlords.	Noted Critical comment
OD/10 CG Fry and Son	Provide a broad mix of homes, which align with housing need. The NP notes that the new development should maximise the provision of affordable housing. Whilst this objective is understood, the viability of a development is a key consideration. Both the adopted West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan, and the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan sets the required affordable housing percentage for Weymouth at 35%. This figure has been determined following detailed viability assessment and so should be considered the baseline for affordable housing provision in Weymouth. This point is discussed in more detail later in this consultation response.	Noted comment(s) in support
OD/11 CG Fry and Son	Remain responsive to local housing issues and opportunities. The NP aims to restrict second homes and holiday lets, however, is a disputed that there is a legitimate need for this objective. Whilst second homes and holiday lets are clearly present in Weymouth, levels of such properties are not sufficiently high enough to significantly raise house prices in Weymouth or create areas of a very low occupations during winter months. As such it is not considered vital to include a policy in the NP which prevents such properties. Whilst similar policies have been included in NPs in Cornwall (most notably St Ives) where second homes and holiday lets have caused more of a significant issue (although it is now debatable whether such policies have indeed had the desired affect), areas more local to Weymouth, notably the recently adopted Bridport NP, have not been successful in demonstrating that second homes and holiday lets are such a problem as to warrant being formally restricted.	Noted Critical comment

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
OD/12 CG Fry and Son	Achieve the highest sustainability standards. The NP notes that development should ensure new homes are as energy efficient as possible. Similarly to carbon neutrality, energy efficiency targets for new development are largely regulated by way of Building Regulations. Given that Building Regulations are frequently updated to ensure more energy efficiency developments are achieved, it is suggested that reference to Building Regulations standards could be included as this will bring the NP more in line with national requirements.	Consider need to make reference to the Building Regulations.
OD/13	There are not enough safeguards for the environment, especially mitigation against Climate Change. No more building on the limited greenspaces inside the Weymouth boundaries, all developments should be brownfield sites.	Noted Critical comment
OD/14	Not enough Social Housing. The plan calls for 50% Social Housing, but we all know that Housing Developers buy themselves out of these constraints, effectively building zero social housing. The plan should call for 100% social housing. We are in a housing crisis!	Noted comment(s) in support
OD/15	"ensure housing development is suitable to its locality". WNP 23 is not suitable to its locality because it infringes a SSSI, is within flood land, is distant from public transport and facilities and will be impossible for walking or cycling with residents facing an incline change from the nearest bus stop to their dwelling of 32 metres (Charlbury Corner bus stop at 13m, site at 45m, the equivalent of climbing a 13-storey building)	Noted Critical comment
OD/16	Infrastructure is not good enough for extra housing. Not enough jobs - low salaries - not enough housing for current low paid workers which are in the majority. More homes are being purchased by non-Weymouth people to be used as second homes or Airbnb	Noted Critical comment
OD/17	There seems to be a lack of determination to provide more social housing, the builder will build more profitable 3/4/5-bedroom homes and later claim the provision of social housing is not financially viable as has been done many times before	Noted comment(s) in support
OD/18	Failure to provide affordable or social homes, only expensive, holiday homes for the rich moving to Weymouth.	Noted comment(s) in support
OD/19	Aim: "Provide a broad mix of homes, which align with the housing need". In the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan the housing need is based on 3,225 strategic housing target from the January 2021 Dorset Council Local Plan Consultation. This is out of date based on planned changes to the NPPF and the delayed Local Plan. The housing needs number must be updated by either Weymouth Town Council or Dorset Council in light of these changes before proceeding. Also, Weymouth Town Council looked at affordable housing need in 2021 but not the total housing need and just used the 3,225 figure. Housing developments immediately next to Weymouth (e.g. in Southill/Chickerell) and Littlemoor North Extension should be taken in to account when considering housing need and infrastructure requirements.	Update the housing requirement figures and strategic LP policies and targets.
OD/20	The obvious need for more social housing for people on low income necessitates proper infrastructure. This includes job opportunities, nearby public transport, schools and shops. The development of the Sites at Preston does not meet these aims and visions.	Noted Critical comment
OD/21	I concur with the aspiration to enhance the energy efficiency of homes, but I find myself puzzled by the reference to 'superior' homes in later sections of the plan. The lack of a defined metric for achieving this and the emphasis on green site development over brownfield alternatives leaves me seeking clarification. Contrary to the depicted housing crisis in Weymouth, I observe a different perspective. Restrictions on houses in multiple occupation may evoke resentment, particularly among young professionals seeking affordable rentals in the area. Holiday-lets play a pivotal role in sustaining the local economy, contributing to the quintessential seaside experience. The ongoing developments in Littlemoor, Upwey, and Chickerell appear to exceed the demand for 'Affordable Housing'. Additionally, the modest 0.2% growth over a ten-year period, equivalent to just over 1000 individuals, contrasts with the availability of over 80 properties for the average wage earner (40k) in this region, particularly during this current sluggish fourth quarter. An idea that warrants further exploration under the relevant objective is the financial incentivisation for older couples residing in larger properties to consider investing in luxury flats, such as those that could potentially be developed on the now defunct borough council block.	Noted comment(s) in support
OD/22	but have very mixed feelings about the development and homes policies on the same page. The addition of hundreds of new houses alongside existing housing areas will not only blight Dorset's lovely natural environment, but also impose a huge strain on already struggling roads and other infrastructure. Tourists, already put off by appalling traffic congestion, will think twice about returning to the area. Is it not possible for some of the new accommodation to be created out of existing, empty or run-down housing stock in the middle of Weymouth itself? Or would it not be better to build a new town, complete with provision of schools, doctors' surgeries, community hubs, etc, and fully thought-through road access? If plans like that of the Wyke Oliver Farm and Budmouth Avenue site go through, more of the area's lovely downland will be obliterated from view and our lovely skylines spoiled forever.	Noted Critical comment
OD/23	Homes and development: We should only be building passive housing, especially for affordable homes. Therefore no requirement to heat them, negating the cost of heating a	Noted comment(s) in support

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	home. The more passive homes that are built the cheaper the materials will become. Increase cycle lanes on main roads through the whole of the town, in fact all roads should have a cycle lane, and if need reduce roads to one way and dedicate one lane to two-way cycles. The aim being to reduce traffic 24around the town. I agree we need to do something to reduce the amount of second homes and especially holiday lets. Roads are becoming congested with the increase of homes; more homes mean more traffic. We therefore need to restrict the amount of homes built.	
OD/24	In reference to the following Aim: 'Support and encourage the reuse of brownfield sites' There are no specific Policies directly related to this aim. There are several lacklustre references made to Brownfield site development at various points in the Plan, but they are devoid of any conviction. I was surprised not to see a listing of Brownfield Sites in the Weymouth local area. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) lists 28 sites with a recommendation to develop for 25 of them. Many of these are included in the Dorset Council Brownfield database; the total number of sites this resource is only 22. The AECOM report includes 27 of the SHLAA sites and yet the WNP only mentions 5 of the sites in detail and 4 In Part despite a firm recommendation that some are fit for development! Regrettably, there is no detail provided in either the WNP or any of the supporting documentation such as the Steering Group Minutes, as to why these sites have been excluded. Instead the emphasis can clearly be seen to be the development of Greenfield sites outside of the Defined Development Boundary and adjacent to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) now Natural Landscapes, and/or Important Open Gaps and Land of Local Landscape Importance in accordance with the extant Local Plan.	Noted comment(s) in support
OD/25	The aim to provide for a 'Broad Mix of Homes/Maximise Affordable Housing' cannot be achieved on the Budmouth Avenue development due to the high cost of building on a sloping site. The hoped for proportion of affordable housing will not materialise as developers will say that the cost of development will preclude this.	Noted Critical comment
OD/26	"establish an appropriate mix of dwellings on new developments" This is commendable, however unless Dorset Council/Weymouth Town Council elect to build much needed council owned housing, developers WILL NOT build social housing on prime land behind Brackendown Avenue, they instead will seek to maximise profits and bypass any rules regarding building certain percentages (50%) of social housing.	Noted Critical comment
OD/27	Aim - Achieve the highest sustainability standards for all new development. Again, being deeply cynical and having seen the poor quality of the new builds at Preston Downs, the developers will not build high standard, green homes, they are in their business for PROFIT. Dorset Council could build high quality sustainable properties for our citizens - that is a good solution.	Noted comment(s) in support
OD/30	The new houses being built at Littlemoor only have 3 solar panels (circa 1.5KW) - this is far below the need of such properties. Developers should maximise use of available roof spaces for solar panels, otherwise this is just paying lip service to the green sustainable policies that are required for energy efficient buildings.	Noted comment(s) in support
OD/31	New development on the Littlemoor Road and on Curtis Fields typically put three solar panels on the roofs of detached houses; not only does this appear to not be enough to provide any significant power to the house or the grid - the placement of the panels will make adding panels by homeowners more difficult and costly. At the moment some of this looks like contractors paying lip service to this view and not genuinely committing to it. Again - a good objective to have but are contractors being tested on this.	Noted comment(s) in support
OD/32	There is not enough Social Housing. The plan calls for 50% Social Housing, but we are in a housing crisis, and I feel 100% social housing is needed by the local community.	Noted comment(s) in support
OD/33	New development on the Littlemoor Road and on Curtis Fields typically put three solar panels on the roofs of detached houses; not only does this appear to not be enough to provide any significant power to the house or the grid - the placement of the panels will make adding panels by homeowners more difficult and costly. At the moment, some of this looks like contractors paying lip service to this view and not genuinely committing to it. Again - a good objective to have but are contractors being tested on this.	Noted comment(s) in support
OD/34	Aims for Development and Homes - Add to improve the value and appeal of the town centre and neighbourhood centre by greatly reducing the night-time economy which is so damaging to the image Weymouth presents.	Ensure aims and objectives are revised as necessary and in sync with the final policy set.
Jobs and the Local Economy Objectives - 20		
OJ/1	I found the plan and its objectives lacking ambition. It also had no direction or sense of how Weymouth could develop and grow the local economy. Yes, Tourism is the major part of the local economy. That can be said for any seaside town. We have moved to the area after living in Bournemouth for 10 years. There is a lot wrong with Bournemouth (at the moment) but it has done a huge amount to assist and develop the economy. For example creating digital business hubs and support for local businesses in that field. This links into the local colleges, university. They also help encourage new businesses to locate in the area. Furthermore over the years the council has incentivised finance/insurance/banking	Noted comment(s) in support

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	companies to locate in the area. I saw nothing inspiring in the plan to continue to drive, promote and grow tourism for the local economy. You need to identify what your product and offer is ... You also need to start to appeal to a higher demographic of tourist/visitor. Bringing more spend to the town will attract a wider offering/investment in food/restaurants, retailers etc. I'm sorry I saw nothing to convince me this was being considered.	
OJ/2	Weymouth relies predominantly on the tourist industry. There needs to be more focus on developing other large-scale industry to support the WNP housing policy. Should the tourist industry collapse then Weymouth has nothing to offer the current workforce, let alone others attracted to the additional housing allocation. There are insufficient job creation plans for the 'new' residents who will occupy the 1500 approx. homes currently being built (or for which planning permission has been approved). The WNP identifies the 'need' for an additional 1000 homes. This cannot be supported without a meaningful local job creation policy.	Noted comment(s) in support
OJ/3	Transport accounts for over a quarter of UK greenhouse gas emissions but there is no objective to minimise transport movements. "15-minute neighbourhoods" should be an objective not just an aspiration. Minimising the number of residents who have to commute out of town should also be a key objective for both environmental and social/well-being reasons Reference in Plan: Environmental Sustainability objectives	Noted comment(s) in support
OJ/4	The initiation of the Weymouth Quay Regeneration Project is a positive development for businesses in the area. However, there is a growing concern about the town centre, which is undergoing a figurative transformation into a ghost town with the relocation of McDonald's and Marks and Spencer, along with numerous other businesses. While both establishments have cited a variety of factors for their moves, these aspects have not been thoroughly addressed or questioned in the plan. I suspect that increased leasing costs, rates, building dilapidation, and other factors may have played a role in these relocations. In the initial survey, numerous participants expressed concerns about the inadequate reuse or underuse of town centre buildings. Additionally, there were complaints about the poor condition of streets and public spaces, aspects that I feel are not adequately addressed in a broader beautification strategy for the area. Furthermore, the overall aesthetic appeal is compromised by issues such as excessive litter, graffiti, dog waste, and the general disrepair of the area's verges. I agree that this is more a failure of Dorset Council's policy over the lack of mowing verges this year, and the problem of so many bins better served by communal bins, something that Dorset Waste Partnership should address. Education is at the cornerstone of any community, and it both confuses and concerns me that there are no plans to build more primary and secondary schools in this area, especially with the growth of Littlemoor and Chickerell. I will address this issue later, though with one fifth of the population leaving school with no qualifications, it is a real issue that has to be addressed! Though 2.7% of the population are unemployed, a brief look online shows me that there are 850 plus vacancies for jobs mostly requiring little or no experience supported by on-the-job training. These are jobs ranging from prison work, education, telesales, catering, finance, transport, etc., and this plan should be looking at what is trending and why these jobs are vacant and how that reflects on almost one in five (17%) leaving education with no qualifications.	Noted comment(s) in support
OJ/5	My Question is: What job opportunities are created to attract and retain young people? What investment is planned short/long term to ensure sustainable entrepreneurial, cultural, new technologies opportunities for young people?	Noted comment(s) in support
OJ/6	Objective to "identify suitable areas for renewables and infrastructure" – should there not have been a call for employment sites to address this?	Noted comment(s) in support
Communities – page 21		
OC/1	Ensure that owners of property are forced to keep their buildings in a good state particularly on the high streets and the Esplanade. Some are in a shocking state and have been so for ages e.g. the old Mabbs' shop on St Mary's Street.	Noted comment(s) in support
OC/2	How about supplying schools and doctors to support the overcrowded doctors, dentists and every other over-stretched amenity in this area?	Noted comment(s) in support
OC/3	How does building nearly 500 houses in Preston "celebrate the unique character and culture of each local neighbourhood"? The words "promote", "support" and "encourage" are doubtless well-meant but how do they translate into actual, deliverable actions? Developers will not heed this, and you will not hold them to it. More platitudes which translate into wood framed, low quality buildings in a retro design style that is somehow supposed to enhance the neighbourhood. "Communities" also encompasses "Allocate sustainable sites for new homes and jobs which are within walking distance to town or a neighbourhood centre". If you have ever tried walking from Preston to a town then you will know that, at a good pace it takes around 40 minutes. If you wish to suggest that there is another "neighbourhood centre" worth walking to from Preston, then you are thinking wishfully. The proposed developments at Wyke Oliver Farm and especially Budmouth Avenue would be totally car dependent despite the fact that they would be connected to Preston Road by wholly inadequate road access. The aims of this objectives	Noted Critical comment

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>simply will not be met by destroying productive farmland and wildlife areas with 500 houses. Repeated reference to "affordable housing" sounds nice but Weymouth has relatively low average salaries. How "affordable" can houses be made. The council could perhaps focus more on attracting better paying industry to the area driving up salaries and improving the chances of local people to afford something decent. Building new buildings to ever lower budgets will not result in sustainable or resilient housing. It will just result in cheap housing unless significant innovation is introduced and nowhere in the vision do I see reference to that.</p>	
OC/4	<p>The latter three aims under the Communities section are more appropriate to policies in the Homes section and should be included in the latter section.</p>	<p>Ensure the objectives are relevant to the aims in the next version.</p>
OC/5	<p>"The unique identities of our local neighbourhoods will..." I hope it will not only be the Unique identities but be the entirety that will "be attractive..." etc.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
OC/6	<p>Provision of Dr/Dentist Surgeries across Weymouth. Mention is made of these facilities, but there are currently insufficient numbers to serve the existing population. We require more of these practices to meet the needs of the proposed increases in population. Also, the current Fire Station would, in my opinion, be unable to meet the needs of the increased population to the Littlemoor Area as the current station would be too remote to attend in an emergency given the current road usage.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
OC/7	<p>Need more permanent art venues to encourage better performers to visit.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
OC/8	<p>As a resident of Sutton Poyntz, and supporter of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan (SPNP), I am pleased to see that the top aim in the Communities Vision is to, 'Celebrate the unique character and culture of each local neighbourhood'. That our own Neighbourhood Plan is respected, incorporated and where appropriate enhanced within the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan (WNP), is I believe what all villagers want.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
OC/9	<p>There should be an additional objective to minimise, so far as possible, the impact of road traffic on local communities (e.g. noise pollution, parking problems etc.) by reducing traffic speed (by limits and design), by increasing separation and noise shielding from higher speed main roads, by addressing bottlenecks and by rigorously mitigating any "rat runs".</p>	<p>Ensure aims and objectives are revised as necessary and in sync with the final policy set.</p>
OC/10	<p>There is no mention of the protection or enhancement of the historic built environment in the Aims and Objectives of the draft WNP. This seems to suggest that the built heritage is not important to the Town Council. WNP19 does make some reference to it but clearly is an afterthought. This is not acceptable.</p>	<p>Ensure aims and objectives are revised as necessary and in sync with the final policy set.</p>
OC/12 CG Fry and Son	<p>Aim "Allocate sustainable sites for new homes and jobs which are within walking distance to town or a neighbourhood centre". The NP allocates numerous sites for housing development. This approach is supported and is considered positive in that it will effectively boost delivery of a wide range of open market and affordable dwellings. The site identified as Land at Redlands farm is included as a housing allocation and is strongly supported. The location of the site and its proximity to existing and consented housing makes it an ideal location for new housing, whilst simultaneously offering extensive public open space as well as appropriate landscape, ecological and surface water mitigation initiatives.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
OC/13	<p>Reinforce the unique character of each local neighbourhood. Whereas I agree to the concept I don't agree with the areas! The neighbourhood I am (border Lodmoor / Park district) see page 8 in bears no relationship to the neighbourhood areas I seem to be bundled into (Weymouth Urban), the other part of my area is separated by the railway line with Radipole RSPB and two busy roads which would need to be crossed. I virtually never go there don't know anybody living there etc so how can I be in that community? I (like my neighbours) regularly walk into town via the prom /Greenhill areas or cut through the Park Area. Think the Central Weymouth designation to the left of the Dorchester Road should be extended back a few more roads to include the mainly Victorian and Georgian in the road (Carlton / Alexander/Westbourne/ Grosvenor etc). There is a natural break point where more modern houses were built on reclaimed land and with more modern houses on the other side of the Dorchester Road)</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
OC/14	<p>The aim to 'Allocate sustainable sites for new homes and jobs which are within walking distance to a town or neighbourhood centre' - not achievable on the Budmouth Avenue Site which is on the top of a hill half a mile from the nearest main road or bus stop</p>	<p>Noted Critical comment</p>
OC/15	<p>Celebrate the unique character and culture of each local neighbourhood. Adding 230 houses in this area is again against your aims and objectives of reinforcing the unique character of each local neighbourhood and also your aim of protecting green spaces. It also is at odds with your objective of prioritising and facilitating brownfield site development. You should actually be fulfilling your aim of discouraging second homes and holiday lets e.g. there are more and more Airbnb's springing up all over the Weymouth area.</p>	<p>Noted Critical comment</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
OC/16	The Community Aims and Objectives in the introduction do not reflect the policy that is subsequently proposed in Section 11. The first Community Aim and its associated objectives works but the other 3 are covered in the homes section 9.	Noted comment
OC/17	What is the objective "create a safe and inclusive environment" referring to? Which policy/policies cover this? The same objective also appears in homes section.	Review objectives in the light of comments and ensure they are relevant to the aims.
OC/18	Protecting green space is vital. It seems in the 5 years I have lived in Weymouth so much has already been lost.	Noted Critical comment
7 Environment Sustainability		
E/1 Wyke Regis Society	There has been a lot of pressure from Weymouth Civic Society for a road through Wyke Regis, which we at Wyke Regis Society strongly resist. Apart from the damage done to our Jurassic Coast by another road and its infrastructure - and the fact that extra roads rarely reduce traffic problems - the true problem is that of the bridge over to Portland. We need a "Skye bridge" over to Portland, one which is high enough above the sea not to cut Portland off at some high tides, which already happens, and which is future-proof. Some predictions of sea height indicate we can expect 7m by 2100. We need a bridge which will not fall victim to this. Possibly it could run from the Old Castle area, from the end of Boot Hill.	Noted comment
E/2	I really cannot see how Section 7 Sustainable Environments and house building can be seen as reducing carbon, efficient use of resources, protecting wildlife and managing flood risk. Although I am most concerned about my local area plan e.g. new homes at rear of Budmouth Avenue and Brackendown Avenue my comments relate to the whole of Weymouth. Surely by building new homes on open land inhabited by wildlife and making less open land for rain to drain into, increasing cars/other vehicles can in any way be a sustainable environment. On top of that we do not have the infrastructure e.g. doctors/dentists/ jobs etc. The plan talks about new business but surely that must be confirmed and businesses moving into the area before building new homes. Also we have heard so many horror stories about affordable housing, does it really happen and are we going to give our local younger people the chance to purchase these houses or are they for the richer people moving to the area? We already have so many second home owners here and properties are empty for large parts of the year and only used for holidays. Could this give more people the chance to buy a holiday home?	Noted Critical comment
E/3	If Environmental Sustainability really does underpin planning policies rather than just "greenwash" then I fail to understand how a development on the land to the rear of Brackendown Avenue in Preston can meet this objective. This site is adjacent to a large Site of Special Scientific Interest. A large development as would be proposed cannot fail to impact the biodiversity of the area. Additionally the need is for social housing and such housing is rarely resource efficient or carbon neutral. Finally, this land has natural springs and is prone to flooding and with the volume of rainfall likely to increase the objective of climate change management is extremely unlikely to be achieved. This site is currently productive farmland growing foodstuffs. It is also a green space supporting a wide range of wildlife habitats. Currently this land is a green gap between Littlemoor and Preston which are completely separate neighbourhoods and communities. Removing this green gap not only fails to meet the Landscape and GreenSpace aims on many fronts but also flies in the face of the draft objectives set out in the "Communities" section on page 21! The identification of a green space for housing does not align with the identified objectives on page 20. Not only is it not a brownfield site the affordable housing which is the identified need is unlikely to use sustainable techniques and materials set out in the Aims as such sustainability is expensive.	Noted Critical comment
E/4	Some of the environmental aims should be stronger e.g. rather than saying that 'developments will be expected to', it should read 'developments will be required to include measures to conserve and enhance the biodiversity of the area'. Expecting is not strong enough.	Review objectives in the light of comments and ensure they are relevant to the aims.
E/5	Planning of sites and infrastructure to minimise transport movements has not been considered.	Noted Critical comment
E/6	The NPPF environment objective quoted in para. 7.1 is absolutely key and I would say that protecting and enhancing the environment includes ensuring that greenfield sites are avoided where humanly possible, particularly AONBs and SSIs. It is reassuring that the Council is committed to making its activities net zero carbon by 2030 and this must be adhered to. Indeed, if it can be managed, the date should be brought forward.	Noted comment(s) in support
E/7	Para. 7.3 - Coastal flooding will happen, mitigation measures need to be implemented urgently. Building houses on low lying Land i.e. Lodmoor is foolhardy.	Noted Critical comment
E/8	Para. 7.3 - It says that the plan takes into "account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change." It doesn't. It plans to build hundreds of homes in areas (e.g. Melcombe Regis) that in the long term will be under water!	Noted objection to aspect(s) of the Plan
E/9	Para. 7.3 The flooding in Wyke Oliver Close would be greatly increased by the building of such a development. As it stands, flooding is a serious issue. It's bad enough as it is. In	Noted

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>periods of heavy rain, the road and surrounding properties, including our own, are subject to an increase in flooding. This is due to water flowing off the hill behind. The ground is comprised of 2 types of clay and thus the absorption potential is very minimal. There is a varied population of deer, badgers, owls and bats present in the local area. This wild life population would be critically endangered by the implementation of such a housing scheme. Generally building on such a green space would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding area. I believe that the surrounding area is plagued by many subterranean springs and streams thus leading for the potential for further flooding and subsidence.</p>	<p>objection to aspect(s) of the Plan</p>
E/10	Strongly support	Support Noted
E/11	Para. 7.4 - This is a good definition of resilience and is essential to a good plan	Support Noted
E/12	Para. 7.4 - Health services should be highlighted as a requirement for resilience. Access to GP/dentists is probably more fundamental than fibre broadband and should be a Planning consideration.	Noted comment(s) in support
E/13	Para. 7.4 - Both walking/cycling and flood prevention are not suitable under WNP 23	Noted Critical comment
E/14	Para. 7.4 - A rich diversity is not achieved by planting isolated trees.	Noted comment(s) in support
E/15	Para. 7.4 - ref: joined up walking and cycling infrastructure, (add) "to help promote active travel"	Noted comment.
E/16	Para. 7.6 - It is acknowledged that there are restrictions on the extent that high standards can be imposed by planning policy. In many instances therefore we have only been able to advocate and encourage the achievement of standards and finishes higher than are statutorily required. I would like to see planning policy be much stricter, but sadly that is not within your power.	Noted comment(s) in support
E/17	Para. 7.6 - We must rely on the development industry to recognise what we aspire to as a community, and what we expect from new development, and urge them to work with us to achieve the strategic " The above, as much of the plan, are fine words, but you admit there are limitations and rely on the development industry to sustain them. There is ample, clear evidence, all around us, that this will not happen.	Noted comment(s) in support
E/18	Para 7.7 - commits WTC in the future. This needs reconciling before the Submission Plan is produced.	Re-word first sentence to affirm WTC's position regarding 'Strategic Environment Targets'.
E/19	Para 7.8 - would be better placed in Section 12 Monitoring.	Include a revised first sentence of para. 7.8 to read: "The Strategic Environment Targets document will be reviewed periodically.....".
E/20	Para. 7.10 Good idea to complete a self-assessment using external guidance	Noted comment(s) in support
E/21	Para 7.11 states that 'The Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan's Strategic Environment Objectives have been translated into 31 local targets.' It is not clear how some of these targets would be applied to planning decisions on proposed developments. The list appears to be a generic list that includes other aspects of the Council's operations (e.g., meet set net zero requirements, minimise unnecessary water usage, promote renewable energy use and energy savings). As such I believe that this list, endorsed by WTC within approved policies, should be an appendix with a reference to the applicable parts of it in the Neighbourhood Plan. The 'interesting fact' included on page 24 is a distraction, and a clear indication that the document is too long and detailed for public consultation.	Consider how best to ensure the SETs are acknowledged as an important facet of the planning strategy and how they relate to individual policies, after review and redrafting SET.
E/22	Note para 7.11, the referenced table is on p24 not p27	Ensure the page reference in 7.11 is correct.
E/23	The Council's naivety in matters related to the environment is further demonstrated by "making the Council's activities net zero carbon by 2030, which included ensuring all planning comments to Dorset Council are consistent with a shift to net-zero carbon by 2030." I do not believe that the council understands the meaning of net zero nor the challenge such a commitment entails. Of course, to be committed to radically improve performance is absolutely what is needed, and the intent is laudable, but the statements made, and the implication that this would, in any way, make the implementation of the neighbourhood plan somehow "sustainable" is misleading at best, dishonest at worst. Without direct enforcement these objectives will not be achieved. What are the "set" targets referred to? How will they be measured? What happens in the case of non-conformance? It would seem more honest to state that development would comply with national standards as applicable. Nothing special will be imposed here, just be honest about that. Everything you list is merely the base provisions under current regulations.	Consider comment when reviewing and revising the SET and its relationship with the Plan.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
E/24	As someone, who in his day job, works to support the Dorset Local Resilience Forum in Planning for, Responding to and Recovering from emergencies, I fully concur with the comments on page 22 (para 7.2) 'It is certain we are facing a climate and ecological emergency and its consequences.' The Environment Agency should be able to provide comparative data around the number of Flood Alerts and Flood Warnings they've issued annually over the past few years for fluvial flooding on the River Wey and River Jordan and coastal flooding at Weymouth Harbour, Preston Beach Road and Portland Harbour. Since the Met Office started naming storms, the public's awareness of severe weather events has increased and, whilst not all of these storms have affected Weymouth, as a country, to still be in November and to have had four named storms already this year (Storm Debi followed Storm Ciaran) is unprecedented.	Noted comment(s) in support
E/25	The Plan needs to consider 'Climate Change', the changes to temperature, rainfall, and flooding, especially sea defences. The plan has a big impact on the wild life and diversity of the planning area, by building on greenspaces, especially Budmouth, Brackendown and Wyke Oliver, effectively cutting off RSPB Lodmoor, removing the only wildlife corridor from the reserve to the countryside. Building so many houses and cutting off the only corridor left.	Noted Critical comment
E/26	This is a good section and I feel a triumph for Weymouth's plan. The only comment I'd add is that it's a shame that more of the points in this section and the Strategic Environment Targets associated with this section can't be more explicitly and directly reflected in policy wording.	Consider how best to ensure the SETs are acknowledged as an important facet of the planning strategy and how they relate to individual policies, after review and redrafting SET.
E/27	The plan as presented does not support the environmental objectives detailed within pages 25-27, the statement "Open greenspace is very important to the sense of health and wellbeing experienced by the people of the area. 64% of respondents to the 2022 Community Survey expressed high regard for the area's countryside and parks" is contradicted by the plan presented. The plan has identified areas of land that are currently identified as Important Open Gaps and recommended building on them.	Noted Critical comment
E/28	Climate change Make the town centre completely traffic free. Ensure that Holiday parks and rental properties comply with recycling rules. There is no real recycling if you stay in a caravan, the emphasis on these parks is only if the visitor cares to recycle items. Most visitors put everything in the general waste. Don't allow businesses to set up in Weymouth/Portland if it means their business requires the increase of traffic such as large lorries on the roads.	Noted comment(s) in support
E/29	My question relates specifically to Weymouth Town Council declaring a local climate and ecological emergency in 2019 page 25 paragraphs 7.1- 7.4: Questions: (1) Other than "Controlling" new developments has the Council identified (bearing in mind the coastal location) specific areas where climate change and lack of adequate drainage poses particular risk? and (2) What measures has the Council taken/ plans to take to mitigate such risk?	Refer to SFRA
E/30	We need to encourage everyone locally - public, businesses, education to make sustainable changes relating to climate change.	Noted comment(s) in support
E/31 Dorset Council	The Council's NET made the following comment: 25. Objective 3: Biodiversity Net Gain. This objective name is confusing and potentially misleading. BNG is a specific term referring to the legal requirement for mandatory minimum 10% BNG as set out in the Environment Act. Objective 3 appears to refer to wider biodiversity enhancements (including species specific measures which do not form part of mandatory BNG) as well as giving more general advice on urban tree canopy cover, provision of green and blue infrastructure, and grassland (and scrub and hedgerow) management. If all these issues are to be kept as part of one objective, perhaps consider renaming the objective to make it clear that it refers to more general biodiversity provisions. Strategic Environmental Objectives (SEO) 26. Strategic Environmental Objectives (SEO) are not fully explained in the policies for them to be properly implemented. As they are referred to in the policies, they are not just public opinion, they become policy and need to be evidenced to justify them. As policy they should be viability tested as there are costs with complying with the proposed targets. It is therefore recommended that SEO are not referenced in the policies but instead are interpreted into more detailed and evidenced criteria on a policy-by-policy basis unless they are viable.	Consider comment when reviewing and revising the SET and its relationship with the Plan.
E/32 Dorset Council	27. It should be noted that that Appendix A refers to Strategic Environmental Targets but the policy states Strategic Environmental Objectives. On occasion they are simply referred	Ensure clarity of terms and consistency of titles

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	to as environmental objectives. This phrasing should be more consistent throughout the reports and plan.	in the Submission Version of the NP.
E/33 Dorset Wildlife Trust	DWT is generally supportive of the policies described under the Environmental Objectives	Support Noted
Environmental Targets – page 24		
ET/1	Environmental Targets are slightly woolly, when applied to the larger developments (where anything is achievable when compared to small retrofit single house.) New builds have limitless possibility, and anything can be achieved with good design and proper though. Meeting targets should be required from small restoration projects, large developments should be forced to exceed. Mandatory items could include (some are already included within the targets). House build with south facing roof and solar installed both PV and Water. Rain water harvesting (in loft) for flushing toilets / garden. Provision for 1 x composting toilet to be fitted within homes. Super insulated. GS/ASHP Soft landscaping to prevent increased surface run off (along with commitments of homeowners not to grub out trees etc). If larger building companies are not able to commit to future proofing our housing stock, then small developers should be allowed. As a local it is very sad to see a new build being built on an E/W direction even before completion. I think to myself "another opportunity lost"	Noted comment Take account of view expressed in any revision to SET document
ET/2	Whilst I agree with the wish list, with the lack of finance available to realise these aspirations, it feels like turkeys voting for Christmas without facing the inevitable consequences	Noted comment
ET/3	Objective 4 - far greater emphasis should be made for active transport (walking/cycling/mobility scooters). The town is too car orientated, pedestrians should have priority moving forward to rectify (and make the town more walking friendly hopefully dissuading un necessary car travel)	Noted comment Take account of view expressed in any revision to SET document
ET/4	Environmental Targets – these are laudable, but I really hope they will be followed through. We should not be losing hedgerows/ trees / green spaces at all. There is already too much development around and, in the town, e.g. all the land and diversity lost at the Weymouth Gateway	Noted comment(s) in support
E/5 Wyke Regis Society	Promote renewable energy use - There should be much more emphasis on solar panels on roofing, both new build and existing. Heat pumps etc are only feasible when enough electricity is being produced to supply demand. Panels on roofs take up no land space, which is what is generally the objection to them.	Noted comment Take account of view expressed in any revision to SET document
ET/6	These are all sensible objectives and it's good to see the intention to set measurable targets, but I wonder who will be setting the targets, using what guidance, and when.	Noted comment(s) in support
ET/7	I fully support these targets which are broad ranging, provide useful guidance and are pro-active and measurable. These will help to determine the standards expected of developers if we are to produce quality housing that is resilient and adaptable and reduces day to day living costs.	Noted comment(s) in support
ET/8	All new homes should be fitted with solar panels -this is much cheaper than retro fitting them and can be a planning condition to help toward net zero	Noted comment(s) in support
ET/9 CG Fry and Son	Objective 1: Carbon Neutrality and Objective 2: Resource Efficiency, includes many objectives which are effectively covered under Building Regulations. Given that Building Regulations respond to national targets and requirements, they should be considered the baseline for tackling climate change. Where the NP seeks to encourage measures that go beyond national targets, these should be encouraged only and not strictly required. Where enforced, this could jeopardise the viability of a development or result in refusal of an application, resulting in the delay or prevention of housing delivery.	Noted comment Take account of view expressed in any revision to SET document
ET/10 CG Fry and Son	Under Objective 3: Biodiversity Net Gain, it is noted that development should "Exceed minimum set Biodiversity Net Gain". 10% BNG has been set Nationally for all development and this figure is reiterated in the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan. Whilst biodiversity net gain is an important factor in new development, it requires substantial land and cost to achieve. As such, if the NP demands a higher BNG % than set nationally or by Dorset Council, this could have serious implications in terms of viability and/or achievability which could result in development being unachievable and thereby stunting housing growth.	Noted comment Take account of view expressed in any revision to SET document
ET/11	Environmental objectives are good. More notice needs to be taken of flooding risk in allocation of housing sites.	Noted comment(s) in support
ET/12	There are no real guarantees.	Noted comment(s) in support
ET/13 Chapman Lily Planning Ltd for	Environmental Targets Table: This is further explained in the 'Environmental Targets' section but it's not cross referred to in the main body of text.	Noted comment Take account of view expressed in any

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
Bellway homes		revision to SET document
ET/14	I see no concrete must do's; they are generalities that we all know will be bought out at a later stage. This section is misleading in that it gives the impression that these statements will be adhered too. There has to be concrete directions given as to how this will be done and not left to be detailed on hopes in a later section which never comes !!!	Noted comment Take account of view expressed in any revision to SET document
ET/15	Objective 1, 1 - ,8 Objective 2, 9-21 Objective 3, 22 -25 Objective 4, 26-31 This should be changed to "Comply with the standards set out in the Building Regulations and other Directives which the Government decree from time to time as necessary as to meet their objectives.	Noted comment Take account of view expressed in any revision to SET document
ET/16	Reference in plan: Objective 1, 1 -8 Objective 2, 9-21 Objective 3, 22 -25 Objective 4, 26-31 This should reflect the standards and regulations set out by Government rather than any other body.	Noted comment Take account of view expressed in any revision to SET document
ET/17	We are in a climate emergency and that should inform everything. This is an essential and one of the most encouraging parts of the plan. Backed up with a set of Targets in Appendix A on Page 162, This is definitely a way in which we can address the urgent challenge of reducing our dependence on the use of fossil fuels. I would like to see the targets set in policy but appreciate that current legislation restricts what can be included.	Noted comment(s) in support
ET/18	'set' needs to be capitalised as 'SET' Map 4 Landscape types is from DERC and is out of date and doesn't represent development in Weymouth area in the last 50 years or so. For example it does not show the Urban areas of Overcombe, Southdown, Preston and settlement in Sutton Poyntz or Upwey. Or new developments in Broadway.	Consider how to avoid confusion between "set" and 'SET' and use as appropriate
ET/19	point 12 of objective 2 "Prioritise refurbishment/re-use over new build". Is this a pipe dream given that Dorset Council couldn't be convinced to do this with its own offices at North Quay, even though the original proposal was to do just this, and the building is a perfect example of re-use, re-purposing over demolish and re-build.	Noted comment
ET/20	Point 31 of Objective 4 "Facilitate sustainable transport use" seems extremely loose. Those look like weasel words and certainly don't read like a target which should be measurable.	Noted comment
ET/21	Entirely support	Support Noted
ET/22	Fully support these.	Support Noted
ET/23	it would be nice to see the targets not dis-guarded at the benefit of profits and interested parties where the community in its entirety does not benefit	Noted comment(s) in support
ET/24	The effective management of environmental sustainability is hugely important, and I have grandchildren who I want to preserve our world for. However, there are no specific targets mentioned in the plan, merely aspirations. With regard to housing although developers are advised to take account of Strategic Environmental Targets (whatever they are) (7(12)) there seems to be no way of enforcing this. Once a developer is given permission to build it is very difficult for a local authority to insist on compliance unless the issue is enshrined in law.	Noted comment Take account of view expressed in any revision to SET document
ET/25	There is no requirement for house builders to commit to the environmental objectives. they will continue to put profit above environmental considerations. The council should make these considerations a requirement.	Noted comment(s) in support
ET/26	Without doubt the effective management of environmental sustainability is paramount if we are to save our planet. I'm 70 years of age and will probably not be that affected by significant changes in my lifetime by I am sure my grandchildren will if we are not very careful. The aims to maintain such sustainability are again sound but there are no specific targets mentioned in the plan merely aspirations. We can all aspire. I would argue with regard to housing although developers are advised to take cognisance of Strategic Environmental Targets (whatever they are) (7(12)) there seems to be no way of enforcing this. Once a developer is given permission to build it is very difficult for a local authority to insist on compliance unless the issue is enshrined in law. I would argue that if further significant housing was allowed in the Preston area we will suffer with significant drainage and flooding issues. When I raised this at the recent consultation meeting was told this would be managed but no explanation as to how and at who's expense.	Noted comment Take account of view expressed in any revision to SET document
ET/27 The Ramblers (Dorset Area)	Reference: Objective 4: Climate Change Management No.31 Suggest that this be amended to read: "Facilitate sustainable and active transport". [Reason: so that it covers walking and cycling as well as trains and buses.]	Add "and active" to Obj. 4: 31 when making revisions to SET document
ET/28	Again, largely meaningless statements which are out of the control of the residents as they do not build the houses or control the building process. National house building companies will build houses they want, and which maximize profit. Even now, certain chairman of large house building companies will not commit to these environmental	Noted comment Take account of view expressed in any

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>objectives knowing that they will win as the alternative is no house building. They continue to put in gas boilers etc. Paragraphs 7.7 and 7.12 only advise, and nothing is mandated so the whole section is a farce. Targets are there to be missed. Objective 3 will be achieved at minimal cost and then these green spaces will be left unmanaged in subsequent years unless developers are required to provide ongoing funding.</p> <p>Objective 4 - SuDS – SuDS needs to extend beyond the development site to the end of any discharge system otherwise it just creates problems outside of the development site.</p>	<p>revision to SET document</p>
<p>ET/29 Turley for Morrish Homes</p>	<p>Environmental Objectives (Section 7)</p> <p>My client is broadly supportive of the environmental targets and related objectives. These are set out as within national policy. It is noted that each policy of the NP refers back to these targets and objectives, and further comments on related policies are referred to below.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
<p>ET/30</p>	<p>Para. 6.4 Strongly agree that the Environmental Sustainability theme should underpin the whole of the plan</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
<p>ET/31</p>	<p>Carbon neutrality</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan contains many admirable aims, which are necessary to help avert a climate and biodiversity crisis. But developers and others will generally do the absolute minimum required (if that). The houses currently being built in Littlemoor have solar panels on the roofs, but most only have 2 on each roof, when there is room for many more. The climate crisis is too far advanced to make such token gestures. There need to be far more ambitious requirements for all new building to maximise the use of renewable energy sources, such as solar panels on roofs, as well as other energy saving measures such as high levels of insulation.</p>	<p>Noted comment Take account of view expressed in any revision to SET document</p>
<p>ET/32</p>	<p>New builds must be fitted with alternative power for heating such as solar, wind/wave generated, and heat pumps. Until this becomes mandatory the UK will not meet its reduction of Co2 targets.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
<p>ET/33</p>	<p>Target 24 on trees is fantastic.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
<p>ET/34</p>	<p>Flooding and, indeed, worsening extreme weather and, therefore, the need to consider our resilience are the elephants in the room as I mention above ("resilient coastal community"). The Strategic Environment Targets go some way in this respect, but they are not mandatory and therefore should, where possible, be better incorporated into policy wording. I also don't believe this plan can proceed to the next stage until the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, in progress at Dorset Council, has been received. If there is the possibility that a report could recommend a "managed retreat" for the town (making our plan academic) then we have to wait for it.</p>	<p>Ensure maximum synergy between NP policies and SETs</p>
<p>ET/35</p>	<p>The underpinning of all the plan with the environmental sustainability objectives is a platitude at best. The objectives themselves are weak and the inclusion of plans such as residential development on Lodmoor illustrate the naivety of the council in its declaration of a climate emergency. A declaration makes no difference if all the objectives call for are expectations that developments "minimise the emissions of greenhouse gases and be as near to carbon neutral as is reasonably possible". What will define "reasonably possible"? Obviously, this will be cost and obviously that means no consideration will be made. This will similarly apply to the "expectation" that flood risk will be minimised.</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
<p>ET/36 Lichfields for Haven Leisure</p>	<p>Many if not most of the draft policies in the emerging plan reference the need to align with the environmental objectives and targets.</p> <p>The representations are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In relation to environmental objectives and targets in general: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If there are requirements from the objectives and/or targets that need to be met, these should be set out clearly within a policy or series of policies. At the moment they have a 'half and half' role that goes beyond what is required of policies but are required to be 'aligned'. b. Reference to 'alignment' is not clear nor precise. c. There is a need to ensure that any such policies are based upon evidence, are consistent with national policy and have regard to strategic local policies. d. Any such policies need to be positively framed. e. The policies should not repeat Local Plan policies. f. Helpful guidance arising through the NP plan-making process could be included in the supporting text, but it needs to be clear where this is guidance rather than policy. There is uncertainty in how the objectives/targets are drafted at this time. 2. With specific reference to the environmental objectives and targets set out in the draft plan: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Any such policies need to recognise that caravans are different to buildings and policies surrounding for example, adoption of electric based heating and hot water systems, need to provide flexibility for development that is not a standard brick building. b. Policies need to be land use related e.g. target 29 (equipment) requires equipment to be Class A energy-rated. This falls outside of the planning system. All targets that fall outside of the planning system should be deleted from the emerging NP. 	<p>Noted comment Take account of view expressed in any revision to SET document</p>


No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>c. The summary table on Page 165 is not fully consistent with the detail set out in the subsequent pages e.g. reference to Zero Carbon.</p> <p>d. The targets and means of reaching targets should not exceed national requirements and should focus on planning-related matters only. Such requirements, whilst attractive, become challenging to meet and risk undermining the ability to deliver sustainable development.</p> <p>e. The target policies need to be realistic and supportive. For example, specific requirements for retrofitting may put off applicants seeking approval to retrofit if the development cannot meet all of the listed requirements. It would be better to ensure some improvements if a proposal is submitted rather than no improvement at all.</p> <p>f. The requirement for a minimum 20% BNG in target 23 should not be pursued. This relies on representations to a draft Local Plan consultation, which has not been included in the Local Plan to date. There is insufficient evidence provided to justify this requirement. Seeking greater requirements than those contained in national legislation risks undermining the delivery of other aspects of sustainable development. The imminent national legislation requirement of 10% net gain should be retained.</p>	
	8 Landscape and Greenspaces	
	Section 8 - Introduction	
L/1	Para. 8.1 - Green and Open spaces need to be protected. They are vital for people's mental and physical well-being. Any future developments would be catastrophic and detrimental to the environment and its ecology. Brown field sites must be considered as a priority before destroying our beautiful landscape.	Noted comment
L/2	Para. 8.1. - All greenspace, and any additional spaces, must be valued and protected from future development.	Noted comment
L/3	Para. 8.2. - WNP23 would fall within the 500m boundary of a SSSI	Noted comment
L/4	Para. 8.4 with reference to Sutton Poyntz There is a need to be more specific about the protection of the AONB around Sutton Poyntz. In practice, we see a trend towards an expansion and urbanisation of the village in concentric circles.	Add a sentence to para. 8.4 relating AONB objectives to the area covered by the SPNP.
L/5	Para. 8.3 'It is one of the purposes of the Neighbourhood Plan to protect and enhance our unique environments and sustain the distinctive landscapes and coastline.' I agree with this statement but believe it be at odds with the large-scale housing development proposed for Preston.	Noted comment
L/6	Para. 8.5 I fully agree it is very important that green open spaces are retained as outlined in the plan for the benefit of everyone.	Support Noted
L/7	Yes, building adjacent to a nature reserve	Noted comment
L/8	As mentioned, there is very little woodland around the area, and we definitely should not lose any of it. Areas accessible to the public for walking are gradually shrinking too. We should make sure that everyone has a chance to enjoy the countryside now and in future with plenty of public footpaths and rights of way.	Noted comment
L/9	Para. 8.7 & 8.9 Greenspaces and rights of way very important as are ways to get to these areas - ideally on foot!	Noted comment
L/10	Para. 8.8 Areas of woodland and hedge rows are few and far between. The hedge rows located on the land would be destroyed thus damaging habitat for the current wild life population.	Noted comment
L/11	Para. 8.10 Although the existing farm land is possibly not the most fertile, its mere existence has a beneficial impact on quality of life in the area. Its destruction would be of profound significance. Peoples' connection with nature would be curtailed. The provision of new trees and hedge rows would take years to take shape.	Noted comment
L/12	Para. 8.11 Green spaces are important to residents and must not be reduced. Planting of Trees hedges and maintaining field crops is essential to reduce future increased rainfall and food security.	Noted comment
L/13	Para. 8.11 The need to retain and develop green spaces to support flood alleviation is very much supported. However, this is not developed further in the plan at WNP24 - Budmouth Avenue development which already has a floodwater issue and the plan to develop this important green space is contrary to policy 8.11	Noted comment
L/14	Para 8.11 says the lake 'gets shallower' it would be more accurate to say the lake is 'silting up'	Change wording in para. 8.11 to read: "is silting up"
L/15	Para. 8.12 WNP23 falls within an acknowledged flood area and can only exacerbate the problems by covering over land currently vital to absorb heavy rainfall	Noted comment
L/16	Para. 8.12 No mention is made of flood risk to Preston Brook into which Wyke Oliver stream flows.	Noted comment
L/17	Para 8.12 should not strictly include Upwey as it is considerably above the High-Water Tide and there are significant flood relief areas between it and Radipole	Check accuracy of first sentence of para. 8.12 and amend as necessary.
L/18	The text is sound and appropriate.	Support Noted

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
L/19	Non-compliance with developments close to SSSI sites. No consideration of 2050 sea rise flood warnings to access roads in Weymouth.	Noted comment
L/20	The Lodmoor tip development is a missed opportunity. We have a fantastic Lodmoor country park which is small and ideal for expansion. Building here will lose a once on a Lifetime opportunity to create a wellbeing resource and combat climate change. It's the wrong site for housing business and commercial	Noted objection to aspect(s) of the Plan
L/21	Weymouth does indeed have good green spaces but these need to be fiercely protected and should be enhanced not developed. There are good cycle paths but these lack being joined up and one often has to cycle on roads to get from one cycle path to the next such as from Lodmoor to Radipole Park Drive. Also, much of this land acts as a flood plain following extensive rain and any developments along this would just aggravate this situation. Rather than be a separate part of the plan each component should come with an environmental objective and all decisions made for the town should encompass environmental considerations. Clearly, we need to protect our coastline, and this includes any further development along this stretch - clearly bad planning decisions have been made in the past such as the flats at the end of Preston end Preston Beach Road but our Harbour should be maintained as it is important part of the town and needs to ensure future opportunities for commercial use remain viable.	Noted comment
L/22	The principles of green space are vital to human wellbeing, mental health, physical health via exercise and wildlife conservation. What I object to is the concentration of proposed housing development between Preston and Littlemore, given the extensive developments in Littlemoor already. Why is there not more development of brown field sites elsewhere in Dorset.	Noted objection to aspect(s) of the Plan
L/23	Sustainable Environment - Flooding Work with relevant agencies and other third parties to assess the potential adjacent farm land and natural features such as water meadows (e.g. Nottingham) being used to mitigate downstream flooding and at the same time enhance their biodiversity value. Seek to avoid any further development close to the river Wey in areas which may be able to assist with flood prevention in the future. Particularly through Radipole, Nottingham, Broadway and Upwey to allow future restoration of land to assist with flood management. Could this form part of a new River Wey protection zone or River Wey Flood Improvement Zone (as conservation is not what is required but active improvement) Plan may seek for council or private purchase of farm land (particularly grade 3 as stated 8.12) immediately against the river particularly those with straightened sections. Every section that can be improved in the near or distant future should be looked into. Following the river on Google Earth is saddening to see the lack of variation in habitat and the limitations for wildlife that provides. It has been great to see some of this coming into effect with the refusal within SHLAA 2021 review of sites like WEYM/009.	Noted comment
L/24	Land and green space. The Ridgeway has absolutely to be protected from any further encroachment and development.	Noted comment
L/25	Flood Alleviation We cannot afford to have more land concreted over or built on which just puts more pressure on run off especially e.g. when heavy rain as recently.	Noted comment
L/26	The plan needs to consider better the impacts of Climate Change, especially the changes to temperature, rainfall, and flooding. As well as understanding the impacts from rising sea levels, the recent heavy rainfall has shown how poorly prepared we are for the increased risk of flooding. We need to consider mitigations to reduce CO2 emissions, e.g. instead of using greenfield sites for housing, why not build a solar farm or wind farm? The plan would impact the wildlife diversity by building on greenspaces, especially Budmouth, Brackendown and Wyke Oliver, effectively is cutting off RSPB Lodmoor from the AONB countryside to the east, removing the only wildlife corridor by building so many houses between Preston and Littlemoor.	Noted objection to aspect(s) of the Plan
L/27	The newts will be delighted. Newts don't vote.	Noted comment
L/28	As long as current green space kept as overall there is not a lot of actual green space	Noted comment
L/29	No comments other than, let's all keep the vandals miles away, and let's keep what green spaces we can.	Noted comment
L/30	Cut grass less and let us wilder places where possible in the town.	Noted comment
L/31	The greenspaces around Weymouth are precious, they should not be built on. They are the lungs of Weymouth. The Lorton Meadows area should be extended all the way to Littlemoor Road, and with no new building developments. The Landscape of the coast and views inland should be preserved and not built upon. The plan as described will destroy the landscape view, especially around Overcombe with the Budmouth Ave development.	Noted comment
L/32	flooding is not just restricted to low lying areas. Surface water runs off higher land when the ground is saturated (which is happening more frequently with global warming), this causes water to stream through some properties even when land is agricultural, if land is built on the problem will be worse. I agree there is a good network of wildlife corridors. I appreciate the public open spaces currently available.	Noted comment

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
L/33	The proposal to allow development adjacent to a SSSI and nature reserve will not protect and enhance these unique environments but have the potential to extensively and irreparably damage them. Additionally, the coastal wetlands within the SSSI currently absorb the water running off the fields. Any SUDS system would have to be extensive to deal with the amount of surface water currently pouring down the hill so as not to damage and overwhelm and destroy the biodiversity of the wetlands.	Noted comment
L/34	I would like to add that there are beaches in Weymouth and Portland where dogs can roam off a lead all year round but there are no beaches in Weymouth and Portland where one could walk all year-round dog free. I would like to see at least some section of Weymouth Beach remain dog free all year round. I would also like to see a bigger presence by the dog warden tackling dogs out of control and dog mess.	Noted comment
L/35	Green space and flood alleviation statement I am aware of two locations that suffer significant flood waters when the rain, such as this year (potentially more with global warming). One has been more troublesome with Higher end housing estate going on up greenfield spaces the other is suggested potential site in the future in this plan. The evidence is there to suggest that more greenspace is required to assist in soaking up water, or are new housing needing to be built up on stilts like Venice?	Noted comment
L/36	Farmland and woodland, as well as open downland, should be cherished, as should all footpaths and public rights of way. (paras. 8.8 - 8.10).	Noted comment
L/37	refer to the importance of green space which I fully support, yet the proposals to develop the Budmouth Avenue and Wyke Oliver Farm sites are inconsistent with this policy.	Noted comment
L/38	Para. 8.11 - Green space and alleviation of flooding. There is already excessive run off of ground water from the fields above Brackendown and Budmouth Avenues. In the winter months the fields are sodden and muddy water spills onto Budmouth and floods back gardens on both roads. Will developers provide sufficient large bore drains to take away this rain water once 500+ house are built and the land paved over? Will we end up with the same issue that Preston Downs suffered from, insufficient drainage, requiring remedial work. Where will this water be release? Lodmoor marshes?	Noted comment
L/39 Dorset Council	28. Para. 8.4 – This paragraph states that the Neighbourhood Plan provides an opportunity to embed AONB management plan objectives and policies into the statutory development plan. However, this statement implies the local plan doesn't; and does not acknowledge that the Neighbourhood Plan only covers a very small part of the AONB, so it seems a misleading statement anyway.	Add a sentence to para. 8.4 relating AONB objectives to the area covered by the SPNP.
L/40 Dorset Council	29. A general Biodiversity Policy - The Council's NET have made the following general comment regarding policies WNP02, 03, 05. There is overlap in the wording of these policies and it is recommended that they are combined into one general biodiversity policy covering the hierarchy of protected sites, the mitigation hierarchy and policy requirements referring to protected species. This would then leave statutory BNG to be written into a separate policy stating the intent of the neighbourhood plan to require developers to achieve minimum 20% BNG where possible.	Review number and scope of wildlife and habitat policies after considering all policy additions, subtractions and amendments.
Section 8 - General		
L/41	Very important to protect habitat, wildlife, maintain ecological balance. Also ensure that ASB is firmly dealt with; police, etc. must take appropriate action. Weymouth is short of green space partly due to crammed overdevelopment in Mid-late Edwardian eras. Agree by and large with recommendations	Noted comment
L/42	More priority should be given to green spaces in the town centre. Its worrying how little notice is begin taken of the inevitable rise in seal levels during the life of this plan	Noted comment
L/43	Plant more trees within the urban space to tackle heat islands Less mowing and more rewilding of all public spaces. Planting for the future climate	Noted comment
L/44	There will be no recreational and any preserved named Green Spaces left as you have named several marked for building or roads. E.g. a Traditional Orchard at the rear of my house at 65a Brackendown now marked to build a totally unnecessary road there!!! If this plan goes ahead Weymouth will become a concrete town which no one will want to visit or live in!!	Noted objection to aspect(s) of the Plan
L/45	I support all the draft policies 1 -16 listed relating to environmental matters.	Support Noted
L/46	This section is far too long and complex. It mixes 'motherhood and apple pie' statements about existing open spaces and their usage with flood defences and proposals for a new nature conservation area. Most of the supporting information needs to go into an appendix leaving just the proposals for protecting and/or developing open space	Ensure Introduction to 'Landscape and Greenspaces' has relevance to land use planning and the policies that follow in section 8
L/47	Less housing is the only way we can protect our county.	Noted comment
L/48	Strongly support	Support Noted
L/49	Landscape and Greenspace - This is good	Support Noted

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
L/50	<p>I fully support each of these policies which are consistent with the aims and objectives. In particular I welcome the wildlife protection policies which adopt a balanced approach, particularly WNP03, 05 and 06.</p> <p>I strongly support the 'right tree right place' policy in WNP06 and the need to retain green infrastructure including established hedges and dry-stone walls within new developments. The retention of traditional orchards as priority habitat is a critical inclusion in the policy. It is encouraging that the value of our coastal recreation areas has been recognised in WNP08, particularly those at the Nothe, Bincleaves and Bowleaze.</p> <p>The continuing erosion of the green gaps between settlements is a major concern and if the character and identity of our communities is to be retained as demanded by residents we must prevent further destruction of these gaps which are also vital to wildlife and people's health. WNP10 is therefore very strongly supported.</p> <p>As a resident who has visited each of the proposed Local Green Spaces in WNP11 (map 13 page 48) I strongly support the designation of each of these sites which are important to local communities. Based upon community support I strongly commend sites at Map ref. 13, 12, 22, 7, 6, 1, 8, 20, 5, 3, 9, 16, 2, 25, 26, 34, 35, 36, 37, 15, 18, 39b on pages 46 and 47.</p> <p>I welcome the inclusion of the sites from the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan (Map ref 40 to 46 inclusive).</p> <p>It is encouraging that blue infrastructure is supported in policy WNP14 on Riversides particularly in relation to green corridors along the River Wey and River Jordan.</p> <p>I strongly commend the views in policy WNP15.</p>	Noted comment
L/51	More parks for children needed	Noted comment
L/52	<p>WNP01 to WNP15</p> <p>This section is comprised of worthwhile aims of which I approve.</p>	Support Noted
L/53	<p>As already stated, green spaces are important, not only to wildlife but also to the physical and mental wellbeing of the human population. On both counts, I find I personally benefit. Also, the population swells significantly during the summer months -the season seems to be extending due to climate change and varying weather patterns. A lack of green spaces would result in some of such being too crowded.</p>	Noted comment
L/54	Generally good summary and policies	Support Noted
L/55	<p>Section 8</p> <p>Development for human occupation does not enhance biodiversity, reduce risks of flooding or improve wildlife corridors. The scheme is actually about building houses on sites which prevents nature from thriving. A wildlife corridor is not a tarmac road.</p>	Noted comment
L/56	Some development will be on the skyline on existing farmed land.	Noted comment
L/57	I think WNP 01 to WNP 15 have been well thought out. However, I do not feel the additional housing can possibly keep the area in a long-term sustainable environment.	Noted comment
L/58	<p>I am very supportive of the need to maintain landscapes and green space however; this is again contrary to WNP24 which advocates the development of land which is within 500m of a SSSI. If this were to be taken forwarded details of any propose mitigation should be approved by a body which includes local residents.</p>	Noted comment
L/59	In general terms I do not object to the objectives set out.	Support Noted
L/60	I agree with the aims of section 8. A greener solution for the land at Wyke Oliver Farm would be to create a woodland and allotments. This would help with drainage problems.	Noted comment
L/61	The principles of this section seem to be OK. However,	Noted comment
L/62	Section 8 Having a specific landscape and greenspace section with its aims and objectives is real progress in my view.	Noted comment
L/63	<p>Unfortunately I don't have enough time to do this section justice. But I would say that it is good to have such a comprehensive and impressive documentation of important greenspaces and how they should and will be protected. The important thing is for this to follow through in policies, actions on the ground and enforcement, rather than being forgotten.</p>	Noted comment
L/64	I agree with all the policies.	Support Noted
L/65	<p>This section is another triumph for the plan. My only comment, referring back to my comment about evolving plan content being reflected in the "higher level" vision, aims and objectives, the higher level could be amended to include something about our plan recognising and promoting nature-centricity in land use (perhaps over and above the current building-centricity in land use prevalent in Dorset and nationally in practice).</p>	Noted comment
L/66	Support, especially WNP 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 09, 11, 12, 14	Support Noted
L/67	Overall this section of the NP is poor and contradicts itself with defined policies that are then ignored at later points in the NP.	Noted comment
L/68	<p>The extent of the investigation and narrative you include in this section (page 25 - 56) is exhaustive and commendable. We are fortunate to enjoy the Jurassic coast and coastal access with many panoramic views. While you make reference to ramblers, I fail to see any reference to the enjoyment that may be had from off-road cycling. This is to emphasise, that I am not describing vehicular off-road activities but merely alerting to you that reference to responsible grass and gravel routes may be added in a similar way that</p>	Add reference to off-road cycling to para. 8.9.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	'Moors Valley Country Park and Forest have achieved in facilitating joint walkway and cycling access.	
L/69	Fully support these	Support Noted
L/70	Impression being given is that somehow after detailing land outside of the Defined Development Boundary for Housing and designating greenspace areas, there will be a net gain of greenspace. This is a little like 'clever' smoke and mirrors to obfuscate the fact that current green fields comprising usable arable, grazing and 'recreational' land will overall diminish.	Noted comment
L/71	Section 8 - The greenspaces around Weymouth are so important to the local communities, they should not be built on. Only consider building on brownfield sites! The landscape of the coast and the views inland from the beaches should be preserved and not built on. The plan as it is, would destroy the landscape view around Overcombe, especially with the Budmouth Ave development.	Noted comment
L/72	That's there has been a concerted effort to protect green spaces is highly commendable - let's have more and let's plant more trees in built up areas/town centre/ esplanade /in urban green spaces please-this would be positive for wellbeing of public, good for environment, help with flood risk. New developments should also have to plant new trees and design in meaningful green spaces as part of their planning conditions on the site they are developing - not hundreds of miles away	Noted comment
L/73	<p>This letter is on behalf of the Secretary of State for Defence in connection with the above consultation.</p> <p>Firstly, we would like to thank the Town Council for the opportunity to comment on the emerging plan. As they will be aware the MOD owns land within the Neighbourhood Plan area. A plan showing the extent of that land is included with this representation. In line with the need to ensure matters of National Security are considered and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)i it is important that planning authorities and development plans recognise that MOD Establishments are of strategic military importance to the UK. As such operational development on MOD establishments should be supported. In turn, due to the need to maintain operational capabilities, development in proximity of MOD Establishments should be required to demonstrate that they align with the 'agent of change' principle found in paragraph 187 of the NPPFii. As such their development won't lead to the need for mitigation from MOD activities.</p> <p>We would therefore suggest that the emerging policies in the Neighbourhood Plan reflect that position in respect of the MOD owned land.</p> <p>If you have any questions arising, please contact me on the above email address in the first instance.</p> <p><i>i NPPF paragraph 97. Planning policies and decisions should promote public safety and take into account wider security and defence requirements by:</i></p> <p><i>a) anticipating and addressing possible malicious threats and natural hazards, especially in locations where large numbers of people are expected to congregate. Policies for relevant areas (such as town centre and regeneration frameworks), and the layout and design of developments, should be informed by the most up-to-date information available from the police and other agencies about the nature of potential threats and their implications. This includes appropriate and proportionate steps that can be taken to reduce vulnerability, increase resilience and ensure public safety and security; and b) recognising and supporting development required for operational defence and security purposes, and ensuring that operational sites are not affected adversely by the impact of other development proposed in the area.</i></p> <p><i>ii NPPF paragraph 187:</i></p> <p><i>Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development can be integrated effectively with existing businesses and community facilities (such as places of worship, pubs, music venues and sports clubs). Existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. Where the operation of an existing business or community facility could have a significant adverse effect on new development (including changes of use) in its vicinity, the applicant (or 'agent of change') should be required to provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed.</i></p>	<p>Noted significance of comment.</p> <p>Ensure land use policies have no negative impact on operational matters relating to MOD land in the neighbourhood area</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
		
<p>L/74 Turley for Morrish Homes</p>	<p>Landscapes and Greenspace (Section 8) The significance of the sensitive landscape designations and greenspaces within the NP is rightly highlighted. My client agrees that it is important to ensure that these areas are suitably safeguarded, and that adverse impacts are minimised, particularly those areas of national and/or international significance. My client acknowledges and supports the necessary balance that the NP sets out in the approach to securing vital affordable and market housing delivery and safeguarding local landscape and ecological designations. It is noted that the identification of housing allocations can in themselves provide opportunities for securing land for benefit of public open space and ecological enhancements. To this end, my client supports the allocation of land as a significant extension to Lorton Valley Country Park as part of the wider allocation of the site at Wyke Oliver Farm North within Policy WNP25. This balance should be applied consistently throughout the policies of the NP.</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
	<p>WNP01 & paras 8.13-8.17</p>	
<p>01/1</p>	<p>How is the neighbourhood plan going to specifically address and call to account the large polluters who are destroying the shoreline and marine life and making our waters less safe to enter. This includes our inland waterways</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
<p>01/2</p>	<p>No development on any land that is at risk of flooding or that will disturb the natural habitat of wildlife.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
<p>01/3</p>	<p>Typo - para 8.27, reference to Map 6 on p33 is incorrect.</p>	<p>Correct typo when drafting next version</p>
<p>01/4</p>	<p>Para. 8.16. WNP23 will increase existing flooding</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>
<p>01/5</p>	<p>WNP01: Support.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
<p>01/6 Dorset Council</p>	<p>WNP01 It is noted that this approach is similar to Policy PORT/ENV1 of the made Portland Neighbourhood Plan (June 2021). 30. NPPF, paragraph 171 explains “Plans should reduce risk from coastal change by avoiding inappropriate development in vulnerable areas and not exacerbating the impacts of physical changes to the coast” and that plans should identify Coastal Change Management Areas (CCMA) in locations that are likely to be affected by physical changes to the coast. Paragraphs 172 and 173 continue by explaining that development in CCMA’s will only be appropriate in specific circumstances and that Local Planning Authorities should consider temporary permission and restoration conditions where necessary to reduce future risk. Further guidance is contained in the Government online guidance resource Flood risk and coastal change - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) 31. Policy ENV7 of the adopted Local Plan explains that “The councils will identify Coastal Change Management Areas (CCMA) through a policy document, based on the Shoreline Management Plan and supporting evidence.” This work continues through Policies ENV16 and ENV17 of the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan. The Council has suggested that both emerging policies should be treated as strategic. As drafted the Council does not consider that emerging policy WNP01 is likely to create conflict with the approach to defining CCMA, the adopted West Dorset and Weymouth and Portland Local Plan and emerging Dorset Council Local Plan policies. 32. We would also draw the group’s attention to the Coastal Risk Planning Guidance, which is currently the most up to date evidence for the area in terms of coastal change, and as such, would inform, along with the SMP and other evidence, any designation of a CCMA in the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan. The document can be viewed by searching for reference CD/ENV8- Evidence base for adopted West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan - Dorset Council. 33. Policy WNP02 – Suggested re-wording for clarity. “Development proposals specifically to prevent coastal erosion or flooding, and protect property and businesses, in areas designated by the South Devon and Dorset Shoreline Management Plan to be protected (‘hold the line’), specifically to prevent coastal erosion or flooding, and protect property and businesses will be supported.”</p>	<p>Change wording of policy in line with suggestion by DC to read: “Development proposals specifically to prevent coastal erosion or flooding, and protect property and businesses, in areas designated” Include definition/explanation of “hold the line” in the supporting text. Up-date para. 8.16 date reference to the Weymouth Strategic Flood Risk Assessment’ in last sentence</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>34. Hold the line - It would be helpful to clarify the reference to 'hold the line' and whether this means in the short, medium, or longer term as set out in the SMP.</p> <p>35.Paragraphs 8.13-8.17 – The supporting text includes an acknowledgement of the issues and risks to Weymouth, but the policy lacks any approach for addressing existing development that is at risk from coastal erosion (i.e. where there is an SMP policy of no active intervention/managed realignment in any of the time epochs) – i.e. through adaptation/relocation of properties.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.16 – Revised wording '2nd Level 2 Weymouth Strategic Flood Risk Assessment'.</p>	
	<p>WNPO2 & paras 8.18-8.23</p>	
02/1	<p>Map 6 - Nothe Gardens and the Underbarn need to be considered for greater ecological rating than a corridor.</p>	<p>Noted comment.</p>
02/2	<p>WNPO2 Policies 1 and 2 and maps 6 and 7</p> <p>I support having areas of nature conservation and the new Wey Valley water meadows designation - (I would be very happy to see this designation extended from Radipole through Nottingham and Broadway up to Watery Lane in Upwey to include the historic water meadows and its channels and sluices).</p> <p>I also support the wildlife habitats and areas WNPO3 policies 1, 2 and 3.</p> <p>Ecological networks and wildlife corridors on map 8 are an excellent proposal to help wildlife and nature. Hedges and copses, including scrubby land are a vital part of this habitat for cover for birds and small mammals and for food chains. 8.31, 8.32 and 8.33 are very important.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
02/3	<p>I support the new Wey Valley water meadows and protecting the whole area adjoining the river Wey, so that it is a nature corridor and part of the ecological network (maps 7, 8 and 9).</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
02/4	<p>I am very glad to hear protection will be given to areas of nature conservation, and that there will be a new nature conservation area at Wey Valley Watermeadows. These areas are exceptionally important and should be given every protection.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
02/5	<p>Para. 8.20 - The Lorton SSSI will be impacted by WNP23</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>
02/6	<p>Para. 8.21 - There are many animals living in the fields adjacent to the Water Meadows with most of the wildlife mentioned here being seen in fields right up to Dorchester Road. The Water Meadows alone would not be a large enough area to support the abundance of animals in this area. This area is very popular with walkers and with the number of houses being built at Nottingham Lane there is going to be even more people to enjoy this area.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
02/7	<p>Para. 8.21 - Wey Valley Watermeadows</p> <p>While environmental protections are always welcomed why are there only two new fields identified in this plan for the whole of the Weymouth area? What about adjacent fields to these that have the same characteristics as those defined in 8.21? What about fields on the other side of the river Wey? What about fields north and south along the river Wey? It seems like the only reason these are identified is because developers wanting to develop adjacent fields were trying to get good favour and made this recommendation? We should be looking Landscapes and Greenspace holistically and not be just driven by developer plans.</p>	<p>Review area included in Map 7.</p>
02/8	<p>WNPO2 - WNP23 will impact the Lorton SSSI and decrease habitat for birds, especially those in transit by decreasing their feeding habitat</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>
02/9	<p>WNPO2: Areas of Nature Conservation – I support this commendable policy</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
02/10	<p>The policy refers to map 6, should it be map 7?</p>	<p>Ensure Map references in policy are correct.</p>
02/11	<p>WNPO2 – Partial Support.</p> <p>The policy says protected from any detrimental negative effects likely to arise from development. This is too severe without some qualification of detrimental negative effects. It could be softened to from significant detrimental effects. The point in case is the reference to the Lodmoor Country Park which has no habitat / nature designations and is an area set aside for leisure activities comprising hotel, car park, rides, sea life centre, crazy golf, Sandcastle Activity centre, 9-hole pitch and putt and open space used for concerts and is within the area in the LP WEY9.</p>	<p>Delete the word "any" in first clause of policy WNPO2.</p>
02/12	<p>Para. 8.21 Could this area be extended further south and north where the floodplain watermeadows continue. Noting that this would involve additional landowners to the north and west. See floodplain map in Dorset Explorer.</p>	<p>Review area included in Map 7.</p>
02/13	<p>WNPO2 – With the identification of Wey Valley Watermeadows. Plan states: The policy is permissive of minor works to ensure its status is recognised, such as signage, and improvements and additions in the interests of accessibility and interpretation. Such measures could be secured through developer contributions in the interest of increasing</p>	<p>Include reference in para. 8.23 on how developer contributions for BNG and site</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>biodiversity. I believe a site assessment should be carried out with independent parties, for example Dorset Wildlife Trust, River Restoration Centre et al. I believe the site needs and deserves more than signage and access to warrant the extent of building 150 homes in this area of questionable suitability. This should seek to not maintain the status quo of the fields but actively seek to improve habitat and ensure money is available for a time period to complete this from the developer. The Water Meadow site needs to be actively improved and actively managed along with ensuring This could involve spreading of local green meadow silage to improve plant diversity and the seasonal mowing / post mow grazing by low density cattle. Possibility of pond and / or bund creation and removing drainage if after the site assessment this would improve the access. I believe the wording "could be secured through developer contributions" could be improved to "if approved SHALL be secured through developer contributions" along with a fixed term period of upkeep or contributions to local organisation who will actively manage the site for example a 10-year period post completion with clear milestones and responsibilities. Although I believe this is more planning related if site is found suitable, however I feel it is worth mentioning at the plan stage. It is noted that some of the requested wording is covered with WNP26 section 6.</p>	<p>enhancements can be secured (with reference, if possible, to policy WNP26).</p>
02/14	<p>WNP02 has been very selective in areas it has picked and appears to be driven by developers rather than the local community. The 2015 Local Plan clearly identifies areas as important local gaps and details the future inclusion of these into existing areas such as Lorton Meadows. This neighbourhood plan has ignored these. The picture on page 30 does not align with the map</p>	<p>Ensure photos are relevant in all instances to the topic/policy.</p>
02/15	<p>WNP02 must retain existing features and areas without any development other than maintenance of services.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
02/16 Chickerell Town Council	<p>Para. 8.23 Fully support and especially point 2. Compensation (often as mitigation) is to offset a loss. Same point in 8.30 but developers will be quick to argue no practical alternative. The alternatives could also include don't build it or build elsewhere.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
02/17 Dorset Council	<p>WNP02: Areas of Nature Conservation The relevant WDWPLP policies are ENV2, WEY8 and WEY16. The policy seeks to protect existing country parks, nature parks and nature reserves and supports interpretation. 37. Criterion 1 – The NET has made the following comment. This policy combines country parks (designated for public access as well as wildlife and therefore more relevant to greenspace/public open space policy) with nature reserves (designed for wildlife) and is potentially confusing because of this. It would be better to include the country park element in policy WNP09 or WNP11 and incorporate the nature reserve element into a general biodiversity policy (see general comment above) or policy WNP03.</p>	<p>Review scope of wildlife and habitat policies after considering all policy additions, subtractions and amendments and the area they are to cover.</p>
02/18 Dorset Council	<p>38. Criterion 2 – The criterion refers to the recognition of a new nature conservation area at Wey Valley Watermeadows shown on Map 6 (Map 7). It is assumed that this land will be transferred through the allocation of Redlands Farm (Policy WNP26). As this appears to be a linked site-specific proposal to a land allocation elsewhere in the Plan it is advised that this criterion is deleted and the issue discussed in Policy WNP26, Criterion 6. In addition, we would note that simply supporting such a proposal would be considered an action and not a policy, so should appear in the supporting text. The phrase Nature Conservation Area is also not recognised in National Policy or guidance and is considered confusing as it sounds like other recognised designations such as Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) or Local Natural Reserve (LNR). To avoid confusion, it is advised the area is referred to as simply a 'wildlife area'. We would also question why the proposed area depicted on Map 7 (referred to as map 6 in the policy) does not align with the blue outline in Map 23?</p>	<p>Review title of policy and ensure it is fit for the purpose of the areas covered by the policy. Reconcile, and explain as appropriate, the areas shown on map 7 and Map 23.</p>
02/19 Dorset Council	<p>39. Paragraph 8.21 - Definitive Map Team suggest using the term "open access" in a literal sense is misleading due to officially designated Open Access land.</p>	<p>Replace term "open access" in para. 8.21 with "public access".</p>
02/20 Dorset Council	<p>40. Paragraph 8.23 – This paragraph states "The policy is permissive of minor works to ensure its status is recognised, such as signage, and improvements and additions in the interests of accessibility and interpretation. Such measures could be secured through developer contributions in the interest of increasing biodiversity. Part of the area is within the Radipole Conservation Area." However, this criterion has been moved to Policy WNP9 (3).</p>	<p>Include reference in para. 8.23 on how developer contributions for BNG and site enhancements can be secured (with reference, if possible, to policy WNP26).</p>
02/20A Dorset Council	<p>Also suggest using the term walkers instead of rambles.</p>	<p>Replace in para. 8.21 "ramblers" with "walkers"</p>
02/21 Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>Lorton Valley Nature Park is listed as a designated area of nature conservation, but this is not mapped along with other designations on Map 6 (as far as can be identified given the resolution of the map!). It would be useful to have an explicit map of the LVNP boundary as currently understood as it seems to differ somewhat from the original extent</p>	<p>Consider mapping issue when drafting next version</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>established or envisaged in 2013 when it was set (see https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/file/5267861)</p> <p>It would be helpful to know what boundary has been used when assessing sites for the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan given two of the proposed allocations appear to lie within the LVNP.</p> <p>A boundary is provided in the Dorset Council Local Plan (p205 in the Options Consultation document dated January 2021) which appears to confirm this, and it is stated: "two areas of land (to the east of the park & ride site at Mount Pleasant and land to the east of the Lorton Meadows) provided as a result of the relief road construction. A further area of open undeveloped land located to the north of the civic amenity and composting sites and immediately adjacent to the RSPB reserve is linked." (Emphasis ours where is it clear these refer to areas included within two of the proposed allocations.)</p>	
<p>02/22 Dorset Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>It is not clear what status is being proposed for the Wey Valley Watermeadows area under this policy and what protection and responsibilities designating an 'area of nature conservation' delivers and who is responsible for the management and enhancement of the site.</p> <p>It is assumed that the meadows are privately-owned, and the proposal appears to be for funding to be sought for improved signage and access. Although these can be valuable in aiding understanding and appreciation of the natural value of a site, increasing levels of access may result in a net negative impact to the wildlife of the site in the absence of conservation management changes which will mitigate this by further enhancing habitats and boosting biodiversity.</p>	<p>Review scope of wildlife and habitat policies after considering all policy additions, subtractions and amendments and the area they are to cover.</p> <p>Include reference in supporting text to potential to enhance habitats and boosting biodiversity in Watermeadows if the proposed recognition of the area remains.</p>
	<p>WNP03 & paras 8.24-8.33</p>	
<p>03/1</p>	<p>I support the environmental policies, especially those protecting woodlands and rights of way along the river Wey. It is important not to build on the areas near the river which increases flooding risk. It is important to protect natural habitat including woodland and hedges.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
<p>03/2</p>	<p>I think Weymouth has a great deal to offer to Ecological tourists with two RSPB reserves in the town and two Dorset Wildlife reserves close by. It would be interesting to try and develop that idea to counter the "kiss me quick" image of the old seaside, there is a great deal to build on.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
<p>03/3</p>	<p>There is reference to degraded land in 8.10 description of neighbourhood farmland and Environmental Target 2: photovoltaic electric creation. I believe a site map of degraded land within the town and surrounding area should be created. The plan should seek to either work with farmers with regenerative agriculture or look into other ways the land can be improved or used for nature. This could be with Electricity production as mentioned or nature-based solutions to improve soil or habitat health. We have a duty to support our local farms and farmers and if unwilling moving (via force sale or force lease) the land into other uses using nature-based solutions to meet the towns and climate goals and providing protection and enhancement of the River Wet chalk stream. Leasing land from owners for habitat restoration would likely be a very cost-effective way of improving habitats and reducing flooding along with engaging local community and increasing our green space along the river.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
<p>03/4</p>	<p>This sounds good, in theory, but in practice how much protection is there for wildlife? I have personal experience of seeing a local businessman cut down trees and fill in ponds BEFORE submitting planning applications. He then got a biodiversity report from a private company to support his application. As he was paying for the report, unsurprisingly it was done at a time of year and time of day when much of the wildlife known to be present was not seen - such as Barn, Tawny and Little Owls, various bat species, adders, grass snakes and great crested newts. Objections from local residents were ignored and the planning permission was granted. I expect it is common practice for developers to remove evidence of trees and wildlife BEFORE submitting planning applications and for them to commission biodiversity reports favourable to their aims. This practice needs to be eradicated in order for the fine words about protections for wildlife habitats and areas to have any effect whatsoever. Biodiversity reports need to be commissioned by the Council from reputable organisations which will give a true picture of the wildlife value of the area, before ANY work is done on the site; views of local people need to be listened to; developers and businessmen cannot be allowed to profit from destroying wildlife and hiding evidence (sufficiently punitive measures must be employed to stamp out the practice); if a planning application is accepted, subject to mitigating the adverse effects, there need to be robust checks and enforcement to ensure the mitigation is sufficient (but</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	planting a few new saplings is in no way mitigation for cutting down a mature tree or hedgerow).	
03/5	Para. 8:31 - I support the importance of wildlife corridors.	Support Noted
03/6	I support this commendable policy	Support Noted
03/7	There must be no exceptional circumstances that allows development of natural animal sanctuaries other than upgrading costal defences for benefit of all. Development history has often proved promises to minimise pollution by individuals or commercial activities fail and no recompense or blame will restore what is lost.	Noted comment(s) in support
03/8	Wildlife Habitats and Areas – requires site specific assessment and habitat protection on developed land. Support. Should condition 2 be 'financial' compensation. Para 8.30 talks of compensation or offset which is not equivalent to condition 2.	Noted comment.
03/9	has been ridden all over with the recommended development areas. Land that should be protected by this policy to support wildlife and bird migration routes has been identified as land for development. This land is clearly shown in Map8 as part of the areas ecological network.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
03/10	it would be hoped and perhaps required to state what the statement "unavoidable due to exceptional circumstances" actually means and covers, by giving a guide on what is exceptional. Making sure that building firms and interested parties do be given the chance to "sweeten the deal" to get development plans processed under its an exceptional circumstance.	Include an example of "exceptional and unavoidable circumstances" in para. 8.29.
03/11	Don't agree with para. 8.30 I am concerned re WNP06 that if right tree right place wasn't really carefully considered (and with money to maintain) we could be causing future problems. I look at sycamore trees near me that are no longer managed (Dorchester ones generally are!) meaning large amount of leaf litter blocking drains, which in turn puddle on the roads and destroy the surface. Also trees that were lovely 20 years ago have become too large in pavements and their roots damage/ lift surfaces making it a trip hazard p40 very important these areas are protected	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
03/12	strongly agree para. 8.31	Support Noted
03/13	These intentions must be adhered to.	Support Noted
03/14 Chickerell Town Council	Support WNP03 but recommend amending 2. to 'may be permissible as a very last resort'. With an aim to not encourage payments to 'buy' planning approvals where the damage (loss) will be permanent.	Refer in para. 8.29 to an intention not to encourage payments to 'buy' planning approvals where the damage (loss) will be permanent.
03/15 Lichfields for Haven Leisure	The representations are: 1. Part 1 of the emerging policy is not positively framed, contrary to plan-making requirements set out elsewhere in these representations. 2. Part 1 of the draft policy is not clearly worded1. Whilst the thrust of the emerging policy is generally understood, it will not be possible for decision-makers to consistently apply the draft policy as currently worded. 3. The information available from the Dorset Environmental Records Centre presented in Map 8 refers to Existing Network. It is not clear how this information has been put together. Areas of land, within our client's ownership, have limited contribution to the network. This is not reflected in the mapping that is referenced in the draft policy. 4. Reference is made in paragraph 8.33 to the regular updating of the maps. Using up to date information available from data sources is a core part of undertaking an ecological assessment but it is important that mapping used in policy is fixed so that there is no ambiguity surrounding the application of the policy. 5. Terminology in this emerging policy is not sufficiently clear. For example, there is no definition or explanation of what might comprise an "exceptional circumstance". 6. The recognition of the ability to provide compensation in part 2 of the draft policy is endorsed and is consistent with national policy and guidance. 7. Support for proposals that restore or create new wildlife habitat features in part 3 of the emerging policy is endorsed.	Consider policy text amendments in the light of comments. Describe what forms the Ecological Network in para. 8.24. Include a better Map 8 with clear reference to source(s). Ensure Map 8 has a date, and the categorisation is recognised as current at that date but subject to up-dating. Include reference in para. 8.33 to how and where an up-to-date map can be consulted. Include an example of "exceptional and unavoidable circumstances" in para. 8.29.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
03/16 Dorset Council	<p>Relevant policies are the NPPF, paragraphs 174 – 182, and WDWPLP polices ENV1 and ENV2. The policy is well laid out, seeks to protect ecologically sensitive sites, and outlines the ways in which ecology can be protected.</p> <p>43. Approach - The NET notes the wording in this policy appears to refer to a mix of sources: Habitats Regulations wording ('significant adverse effect', 'integrity', 'exceptional circumstances') but mixes this with more general wording about flora and fauna and landscape features. It is recommended that the policy is reworded to reflect the hierarchy of international, national and local sites and their relevant protection.</p> <p>44. The Policy Team add that it is not clear whether it would be appropriate to apply policy tests around integrity or continuity of landscape to the areas defined in Map 8. National planning policy refers to significant harm to biodiversity and provides separate guidance in respect to SSSI and irreplaceable habitats.</p> <p>45. Landscape features – The NET suggests the reference to landscape features should be included in a landscape policy to avoid confusion between these two legislative areas. Policy conflates issues relating to landscape and habitats. Legislation and planning policy relating to landscape and habitats is different.</p> <p>46. Mitigation hierarchy – The NET advise clear reference should be made to the mitigation hierarchy (avoid, mitigate, compensate, enhance) and then this policy would stand alongside a separate policy on statutory BNG.</p> <p>47. Criterion 3 – The NET recommends that part 3 is reworded to encourage development which achieves these objectives, rather than supporting it.</p> <p>48. Paragraph 8.24 – The supporting text refers to the Dorset AONB and reads as a policy. This text could be combined into landscape policy as suggested above.</p> <p>49. Paragraph 8.26 – Reference to NPPF, paragraphs 175 and 176 are the wrong way around.</p> <p>50. Paragraph 8.27 - Noting reference to DERC biodiversity rating and different habitat function (designated sites, locally important sites ['good natural/semi natural habitat] and wildlife corridors), further evidence is required to justify the 'local' habitat/species designations ('high potential areas') identified in Map 8.</p> <p>51. Paragraph 8.29 - Query whether this approach is consistent with national planning policy and has been properly justified?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPPF, paragraph 180 a) refers to 'significant harm to biodiversity' and introduces a mitigation hierarchy involving: Avoidance (i.e. re-locating to an alternative site); Adequate mitigation; Compensation. • NPPF, paragraph 180 b) contains separate policy guidance around SSSI and states "development which is likely to have an adverse effect" should normally be refused other than where benefits clearly outweigh adverse effects and irreplaceable habitats. • NPPF paragraph 180 c) continues "development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats" should be refused other than where there are wholly exceptional reasons, and a suitable compensation strategy exists. 	<p>Consider policy text amendments in the light of comments.</p> <p>Review and amend quotes and references to NPPF in para. 8.26 Provide more evidence of the value of 'high potential areas' in para. 8.27, or reference to other documents.</p> <p>Review para. 8.29 and ensure mitigation hierarchy reflects that in NPPF.</p>
03/17 Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>DWT suggest that Paragraph 2 should read "Where impacts to biodiversity are identified, proposals must apply the mitigation hierarchy and do everything possible to firstly avoid then to minimise impacts. Compensation measures will be permissible as a last resort only."</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording to clause 2 in the light of comments received.</p>
	<p>WNPO4 & paras 8.34-8.36</p>	
04/1	<p>WNPO4 policies 1,2,3 and 4 also relate to wildlife corridors with map 9 are also important and I support these. The disruption to these corridors by development should now be permitted only exceptionally due to the value of the habitats and network of corridors, much of which has been lost in recent years by development in former greenspace and the importance of preserving and enhancing natural species locally. The links to the valued wildlife reserved and to all wetlands and rivers, ditches, and ponds.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
04/2	<p>Typo - p34 para 8.35 "Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol (DPAP)" should be DBAP</p>	<p>Correct typo when drafting next version</p>
04/3	<p>Wildlife corridors should be maintained. Green areas mental wellbeing and health should be maintained</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
04/4	<p>WNPO4: I support this commendable policy</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
04/5	<p>Wildlife corridors must be maintained allowing insects to pollinate gardens where residents grow own food and on local allotments.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
04/6	<p>but I saw a heading WNPO4 Wildlife Corridor on a notice somewhere. I would like to suggest the Underbarn behind Old Castle Rd and Belle Vue Rd is added as a Wildlife Corridor. It is a nesting ground for many birds from wrens to kites to buzzards to black birds. It should be encouraged as a nature "refuge" space where not only birds but also the foxes, badgers and deer can relax away from the restlessness of human activity. It would be handy to be able to see the whole document you produced.</p>	<p>Review number and scope of wildlife and habitat policies after considering all policy additions, subtractions and amendments.</p> <p>Consider how Underbarn behind Old Castle Rd and Belle Vue</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
		Rd is most suitably protected.
04/7	protects and enhances areas of importance to wildlife movement from harmful impacts of development. Support. Condition 4 is a necessary compromise.	Noted comment
04/8	Para. 8.36 the picture is too specific and relates to Redlands Farm which is a site allocation.	Ensure photos are relevant to the topic/policy
04/9	Should a scheme be looked to increase buffer zones and Riverside biodiversity up the River Wey. Where the potential to purchase or rent areas from farmers. These zones be created within a distance of the river to encourage farmers to allow riparian bio diverse habitat to be created and potentially remove the straightened sections of certain parts. This may include seasonal flooding ponds. Helping to absorb flood water, the land remaining flourishing in drought, reduce run off and increasing the excitement of any riverside walk. Although these could of course be negotiated privately I believe having these ideas acknowledged in the local plan gives strength, commitment and support from the council. The plan should seek to engage land owners not just during development. (related to be point Environmental Target 2 degraded land)	Review number and scope of wildlife and habitat policies after considering all policy additions, subtractions and amendments. Consider whether and how riverside areas of R. Wey are suitably protected.
04/10	has again been ridden all over with the recommended development areas. Land that should be protected by this policy to support wildlife and bird migration routes has been identified as land for development. This land is clearly shown in Map9 as part of the wildlife corridor.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
04/11	has enough space been given to wildlife corridors, many are being constricted and a hedge along the road is a good start but as the area has many large wildlife (deer, foxes, badgers), as well as the Birds of prey, wouldn't they need more distance from "human life" to get to the AONB areas and nature parks. Wider Dorset nature parks due to being enclosed on all sides by development are known for the mutations in the wildlife now presenting. I personally would like to see where the unfortunate natural area is impacted by development that developers are made to construct and put in place its proposals to protect the natural area in the early stages of its development, developers can then not choose to not commit to what it has promised.	Noted comment(s) in support
04/12	I support strongly the protection of wildlife corridors.	Support Noted
04/13 Chickerell Town Council	8.31 regarding connectivity and recognition that corridors traverse boundaries. Corridors should not be blocked. We would encourage our corridor referred to in the plan, join yours.	Noted comment(s) in support
04/14 Chickerell Town Council	agree in principle although regarding minimising the disruption to a wildlife corridor, it may prove difficult to decide how much minimisation is acceptable. The full purpose of a corridor surely needs to remain.	Noted comment(s) in support
04/15	Wildlife corridors make no reference to buffer zones associated with these corridors. Birds don't adhere to designated corridors.	Noted comment(s) in support
04/16 Lichfields for Haven Leisure	The representations are: 1. Part 1 of the emerging policy is not positively framed, contrary to plan-making requirements set out elsewhere in these representations. 2. Part 1 of the emerging policy places an in-effect blanket restriction against development across the majority of our client's land, without sufficient evidence to justify this. 3. The information available from the Dorset Environmental Records Centre presented in Map 9 refers to Wildlife Corridors and Stepping Stones. It is not clear how this information has been put together. Areas of land, within our client's ownership, have limited contribution to the corridor. This is not reflected in the mapping that is referenced in the draft policy. 4. Reference to the wildlife corridors and stepping stones in Map 9 should not be used as the basis for restricting development within the emerging NP. 5. The policy must allow for site specific analysis to be undertaken for planning applications in order to determine the contribution that the parcel makes to the ecological network and how any emerging proposals might support the enhancement of those networks. 6. The emerging policy is at odds with Local Plan Policy ENV2 (Wildlife and Habitats) which allows mitigation and/or compensation of significant harm to nature conservation	Describe source of Map 9 in Para. 8.35. Include reference to mitigation hierarchy in para. 8.35

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>interests at locally identified wildlife sites where significant harm cannot be avoided. Policy ENV2 is considered to be a strategic policy by Dorset Council.</p> <p>7. The draft policy is at odds with the NPPF. Paragraph 180 allows significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development to be avoided, adequately mitigated or as a last resort compensated for.</p> <p>8. The reference to the Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol (DBAP) contradicts the rest of the policy as the DBAP incorporates the mitigation hierarchy which Part 1 of emerging Policy WNP04 fails to do. WNP04 ought to be redrafted to be consistent with the NPPF and planning guidance and to have regard to the Local Plan's strategic policy.</p> <p>9. As a note, when emerging Policy WNP04 is layered with other constraint-related policies in the emerging NP (e.g. WNP 03, WNP08, and WNP10), the NP seeks to prevent development across the majority of the NP area and as such risks preventing the opportunity to contribute to sustainable development.</p>	
04/17 Dorset Council	<p>The relevant policy in the WDWPLP is ENV2 in addition to the Dorset AONB Landscape character assessment document. This policy seeks to enhance and protect the wildlife corridors.</p> <p>53. Approach - The NET is generally supportive.</p> <p>54. Paragraph 8.36 – NET advise developers that BNG units delivered closer to the development site are calculated at a higher value in the statutory biodiversity metric than those delivered further away. This incentivises BNG within the wildlife corridor.</p>	Include reference in para. 8.36 to the added value of investing BNG within the wildlife corridors because of proximity
04/18 Turley for Morrish Homes	<p>WNP04 seeks to protect (wildlife corridors) from development, other than that required to maintain, enhance, or interpret their landscape or wildlife purposes. The Policy and supporting text do clarify that 'where wildlife corridors are disrupted as an unavoidable consequence of adjacent or nearby development, developers will be required to minimise the impact.' More specifically, para 8.36 confirms that Development that takes place within, or has an impact on, the landscape and wildlife corridors should minimise damage and disruption and take every opportunity to enhance and/or extend the network of Landscape and Wildlife Corridors.</p> <p>These corridors are identified on Map 9 of the NP.</p> <p>The allocation at Wyke Oliver Farm within Policy WNP25 (note the same applies to the Policy WNP24 allocation) includes part of the area identified as Wildlife Corridor on Map 9. It should be noted that the development area itself does not include any local, national or international ecological designations.</p> <p>Given the above, my client would recommend that the wording of Policy WNP04 is amended. Bullet point 1 should be updated to reflect the text within para 8.3, and specifically refer to the relevant allocation(s). Map 9 should also be updated to identify these allocations.</p>	Consider policy rewording to clause 1 in the light of comments received.
04/19 Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>It would also be desirable to see reference to the use of the ecological network mapping to target the Statutory requirement for biodiversity net gain to areas with best potential for enhancing connectivity and corridors for wildlife locally.</p>	Include reference in the supporting text to the value of directing biodiversity net gain to enhancing the biodiversity and connectivity of wildlife corridors identified on map.
	WNP05 & paras 8.37-8.40	
05/1	WNP05 is supported.	Support Noted
05/2	WNP05: I support this commendable policy	Support Noted
05/3	WNP05: Support.	Support Noted
05/4	perhaps stronger wording of developers will be made to include in proposals and enforced in planning permission with penalties that return to the environmental charities, those ecological enhancement examples given in this policy.	Noted comment.
05/5	We shouldn't be building new housing within 500m of our nature reserves. Also the area behind Bracken down AVE, Preston already floods into existing gardens. Further developments will exasperate this and shouldn't be allowed	Noted comment(s) in support
05/6	We need to think carefully where we build houses. Who is this best for - public, prospective homeowners or the building companies???	Noted comment(s) in support
05/7	We should not allow any building on any green field or farm land. Not everyone has access to be able to get out of town to enjoy real open space. We are killing the character of Weymouth and the surrounding area. I used to have owls and bats in my garden but due to a recent development site cutting down the trees these have all gone. The development is meant to insert new Owl/bat boxes but due to the lack of fields to hunt and the increase in the light pollution will they actually be used. As buildings and roads absurd heat, so the more you build the more this will increase the temperature of the local area.	Noted comment(s) in support
05/8	There is no guarantee associated the statements saying that developers will be asked to mitigate any destruction of natural habitat and will be left to the developers' discretion.	Noted comment(s) in support

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
05/9 Dorset Council	<p>The relevant policies in the WDWPLP are ENV2 and ENV8 and paragraph 180 of the NPPF. This policy seeks to ensure that biodiversity enhancements are considered from the initial phases of a planning application and refers to Biodiversity Net Gain improvements.</p> <p>56. Approach – NET recommend that this policy could be incorporated into a wider biodiversity policy, with reference to BNG in a standalone BNG policy. This policy appears to restate some of the intent of policy WNP03 (compliance with national legislation and the requirements of the LPA), but also mentions BNG and other ecological enhancements. It is recommended that the section on national legislation is incorporated into policy WNP03, along with species specific ecological enhancements which do not form part of statutory BNG.</p> <p>It is recommended that the policy is re-written as a BNG policy, to ensure that it reflects the intention of the Neighbourhood Plan to require development to achieve minimum 20% BNG if possible (Target 23).</p>	Review number and scope of wildlife and habitat policies after considering all policy additions, subtractions and amendments.
05/10 Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>As well as direct ecological impacts it is essential that all residential development proposals identify and address the indirect impacts resulting from an increase in recreational pressure in the local area. This includes impacts to the existing sites comprising the Lorton Valley Nature Park including DWT's Lorton Meadows and the RSPB's Lodmoor and Radipole Lake. Suitable mitigation is likely to include financial contribution towards management of the affected sites which will address increases in levels of access and ensure that the impacts on habitats and species for which the sites are managed are minimised. Current discussions in relation to the urban extension at Littlemoor have included calculations to estimate impacts and identify appropriate contributions towards mitigation measures. This must be considered and addressed separately from any proposals for extension of the Lorton Valley Nature Park.</p>	Include reference in supporting text to the application of BNG recognising the impacts that residential development will have on nearby wildlife sites from an increase in recreational pressure in the local area.
WNP06 & paras 8.41-8.47		
06/1	<p>Para. 8.41 - Expanding the tree canopy (12.8 to 38%) in an area brings about a multitude of environmental, social, and economic benefits. Trees play a crucial role in mitigating climate change by absorbing carbon dioxide during photosynthesis and releasing oxygen, contributing to improved air quality. Increased tree coverage helps combat the urban heat island effect, providing shade and reducing surface temperatures in developed areas. The presence of trees enhances biodiversity, serving as habitats for various species, and contributes to overall ecological resilience. Moreover, a well-designed urban forest fosters community well-being, providing spaces for recreation, reducing stress, and enhancing the aesthetic appeal of neighbourhoods. Lastly, trees aid in managing stormwater runoff, preventing soil erosion and reducing the risk of flooding. To augment tree canopy cover in the short term, community-driven initiatives can play a pivotal role. Organising local tree-planting events is a proactive approach, encouraging residents and community groups to participate in planting saplings in public spaces. Implementing tree preservation policies during construction projects is another immediate strategy, ensuring the protection of existing trees and preserving mature specimens. Additionally, integrating tree planting into ongoing green infrastructure projects provides a swift and effective means to enhance canopy cover within the community.</p>	Noted comment(s) in support
06/2	<p>WNPO6 relating to trees and hedges is very important - it should be taken into consideration when these are removed prior to any application for development so that this type of cynical act is not rewarded by permission for development.</p>	Noted comment(s) in support
06/3	<p>I support protection of woodland and hedgerow habitat particularly, for birds and bats and their food chains.</p>	Support Noted
06/4	<p>Fully support tree planting but you also need to ensure that the trees are maintained and watered and money allocated to do so.</p>	Noted comment(s) in support
06/5	<p>Paras 8.41 and 8.42 seem to refer respectively to Weymouth tree canopy of 5.6% and 9.8%. Which figure is correct?</p>	Reconcile and correct % in paras. 8.41 and 8.42
06/6	<p>Policy WNP06 Should include a positive requirement for developers to increase tree cover wherever possible. The policy as currently worded only prevents removal of trees.</p>	Noted comment.
06/7	<p>I feel it is simply not enough to replace mature trees on a 2 for 1 basis when developers rip them out as part of their building projects. Mature trees are in short supply across the neighbourhood and need to be protected in law for the sake of diversity and the town's resilience against climate change e.g. heat islands). Developers are not deterred by TPOs because they just stump up the money for the fine. I feel the plan should be much tougher in this regard. Should trees be removed as part of development (God forbid) they should be replaced on a ratio nearer 1:4 or 5 and only with other mature specimens, not 2-3 maiden plants which will most likely fail.</p>	Noted comment.
06/8 Chapman Lily Planning Ltd for	<p>There is reference to appropriate replacement planting for trees, but this ought to be extended to include hedgerows. It is required in any even as part of the BNG assessment process.</p>	Reword clause 3

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
Bellway homes		
06/9	Land outside the Development Boundary should not be developed for housing. The protection of Countryside – Trees, woodland, hedgerows and wildlife are of the utmost importance.	Noted comment(s) in support
06/10	WNP06: Don't support – is this necessary given ENV policies in WDW&P LP.	Noted objection to policy
06/11	Trees are good as water absorption and thus greenspaces enhanced with trees, could assist with earlier policies on protecting those developments in place.	Noted comment(s) in support
06/12	WNP06 - Point 2: essential that this is implemented.	Noted comment(s) in support
06/13	AONB are now National Landscapes. Again there is no safeguarding of statements made with this section and it is left to developers' discretion with regards in WNP06. History shows that this will not be in the community's interest.	Noted comment(s) in support
06/14 Lichfields for Haven Leisure	The representations are: 1. The thrust of the draft policy recognises that the loss of trees, woodlands and hedgerows should be avoided but sometimes it is necessary. This is welcomed. 2. However, the majority of emerging Policy WNP06 appears unnecessary as it provides no additional requirement to the Local Plan and national policy, save for the reference to replacement planting on a two-for-one basis and the need to demonstrably increase the canopy cover on site. 3. The emerging policy should be refined to avoid repetition.	Noted comment.
06/15 Dorset Council	57. Approach – NET support the intent of this policy, but the policy wording may be overly detailed. Developers will be required to follow the guidance set out in the Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol, and Dorset Council local validation checklist, which sets out such things as submission of tree surveys, method statements and replacement planting in detail. The policy wording could give greater weight to protection of hedgerows. 58. Criterion 2- This criterion does not appear to add any additional protection to ancient, protected, or veteran trees above national policy and legislation and can be deleted. 59. Criterion 4 - The requirement for a Tree Survey repeats the Council's validation checklist. 60. Para. 8.41 – The first part of paragraph 8.41 repeats the same text as paragraph 8.8.	Reword clause 3 of policy WNP06 as follows: <i>"3. Where loss or damage to trees, woodland, orchards, or hedgerows is unavoidable,"</i> Delete clause 4. Change policy text in the light of comments received.
WNP07 & paras 8.48-8.52		
07/1 The Ramblers (Dorset Area)	There is much to be applauded and we are pleased to see reference to our Charter in paragraph 8.51.	Noted comment(s) in support
07/2	I support WNPO7	Support Noted
07/3 CG Fry and Son	The NP notes footpath routes, rights of way and bridleways should be protected from development and whilst this sentiment is agreed, a degree of flexibility should be incorporated into the wording of Policy WNP07. Often housing developments are built on land which benefits from various existing formal walking routes and whilst it is never intended to fully extinguish these routes, it can often be necessary to formally alter the exact route of them. Where footpaths and development footprint are at odds, the developer should be permitted to alter the route appropriately. For example, this could include re-routing existing footpaths through areas of new open space or new 'green lanes' throughout the development. In extreme circumstances, footpaths may need to be re-routed onto estate footways for short sections and where this is kept to an absolute minimum, the NP should permit this to ensure usable walking routes and points of sustainable connection are achievable.	Noted comment.
07/4	Linking the existing networks with supplementary safe "passages", regular maintenance and signage is essential if the neighbourhood plan is truly going to provide an outstanding active travel option for the residents of this town. It gives people a genuine alternative form of transport rather than clogging the streets and polluting the area with cars. Many existing bridleways, footpaths are poorly maintained with no regular conservation and maintenance plan in place, poorly lit and not fit for purpose. (Every year I have to write to the council asking then to cut back the bridlepath north of Nottingham which links the village to Broadway. If kept in good condition a prime example of a 'safe passage' taking people from the congestion and pollution of Dorchester Road). You are currently denying people of a right to choose an alternative form of transport for moving around this town. The neighbour plan should remain resolute to addressing this if they are truly committed to meeting 3 out of 4 of their overarching objectives to address carbon reduction, efficient use of resources, protecting wildlife.	Noted comment(s) in support

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
07/5	WNP07 – Don't support – is this necessary given ENV policies in WDW&P LP.	Noted objection to policy
07/6 The Ramblers (Dorset Area)	We are unsure why you have chosen to use the words "Footpaths, Rights of Way, and bridleways" as the heading for this policy. This is confusing. The map on p.39 uses the words "Public Rights of Way" in the key and then sets out the four classes of right of way (footpaths bridleway, restricted byways and byways open to all traffic). It may be that you are seeking to cover non-definitive routes in the title, but we suggest that this could be more clearly explained by changing the title of this policy to read "Public rights of way and other routes used by the public on foot, cycle and horseback."	Change policy title (see 07/09 below)
07/7 The Ramblers (Dorset Area)	Para 8.49 - Amend to read: "The rights of way network in the area is shown on Map 10."	Change first sentence of para. 8.49 to read: " <i>The rights of way network in the area is shown on Map 10</i> "
07/8 The Ramblers (Dorset Area)	Para. 8.52 This paragraph makes the welcome statement that "New development should ensure that rights of way are incorporated into the layout whenever possible." However, Defra Rights of Way Circular 1/09 (Guidance for Local Authorities) is more explicit saying at paragraph 7.8 that "any alternative alignment should avoid the use of estate roads for the purpose wherever possible and preference should be given to the use of made-up estate paths through landscaped or open space away from vehicular traffic." We suggest therefore that the statement in paragraph 8.52 should be expanded to cover that point. Also, we wonder if this matter should be covered additionally in Section 9 (Development and Homes) or moved that section.	Consider when drafting next version
07/9 Dorset Council	<p>61. Approach – The definitive map team explain legislation already exists to protect recorded Public Rights of Way from development as developers are required to apply to stop up or divert routes affected. The policy team add the council accepts that the impacts of development on a public right of way should be treated as a material planning consideration. The weight attached to this should be left to the discretion of the council as part of the decision taking process. Criterion 1 of this policy could therefore be deleted.</p> <p>62. Terms - The definitive map team request the reference to footpaths, rights of way and bridleways be replaced with Public Rights of Way (as listed in Section 14 Glossary page 160)</p> <p>63. Criterion 2 – We are unsure of the benefit that this criterion brings other than accessibility as biodiversity is considered in other policies. The policy further simply states that 'consideration should be given' with no detailed requirements. A developer could simply consider accessibility in a statement and decide not to implement it and would still be compliant with the policy. This policy criteria should be removed, reworded or combined with another policy.</p> <p>64. Criterion 2 – The NET advise that the final sentence could simply refer to impacts on biodiversity.</p> <p>65. Paragraph 8.49 - The Definitive Map Team request footpaths, rights of way and bridleways are replaced with Public Rights of Way (as listed in Section 14 Glossary Page 160)</p> <p>66. Paragraph 8.50 - The Definitive Map Team note the brief reference to horse riders but no action to improve access. Improvements to public rights of way should be inclusive – for walkers, cyclists and horse riders – the aim should be for multi-user routes, beneficial to all users.</p>	<p>Change title of policy to 'Public Rights of Way'</p> <p>Consider policy rewording to clauses 2 and 3 in the light of comments received.</p>
	WNP08 & paras 8.53-8.61	
08/1	I support WNPO8	Support Noted
08/2	WNP08: Coastal Green Recreation Areas – I support this commendable policy	Support Noted
08/3	WNP08: restricts development on coastal recreation sites e.g. Bowleaze. Support these areas are critical to residents and visitors in Weymouth as they provide open access to the cliffs and coasts with views out to sea.	Noted comment(s) in support
08/4	Para. 8.59 Strongly support reopening and maintaining of the Underbarn, it is a key element in the corridor of coastal access connecting Weymouth to Portland.	Noted comment(s) in support
08/5	Return to the original use of Alexander Gardens as a green and quiet use. Move the funfair to the Peninsular.	Noted comment(s) in support
08/6	<p>Para. 8.59: Bincleaves Open Space and Underbarn: "... Re-opening the Underbarn will increase the use of the space and enable the English Coastal Path to be re-routed along the coast" Comment: the above statement is misleading and does not give relevant facts so the public could make informed decisions as to whether or not in reality there is any added benefit to reopening this part of the Underbarn: (a) firstly, there is no evidence that closure of this part has reduced the use of the space; (b) crucial to note that this part was reevaluated in 2011/2013 and was decided it was not safe for public use until works were undertaken to improve drainage and stabilise the undercliff; there is a TRO to this effect.</p>	Delete or amend last sentence of para. 8.59 referring to the re-opening of the Underbarn.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>(c) thirdly and most importantly there is a safe and convenient access to this part of the coast and a convenient trail for walks along the shore which the public already uses and enjoys.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <p>1) When is the Council going to carry out the works required to stabilise the undercliff between Castle cove beach and Bingleaves Open Space? and</p> <p>2) when is Council going to produce its strategy for coastal erosion management on this undercliff?</p> <p>3) without completing (1) and (2) on what basis it is suggested that "re-opening the Underbarn" is viable, sustainable and a safe option?</p>	
08/7 The Ramblers (Dorset Area)	<p>Paras. 8.59 and 8.62</p> <p>The references to the English Coastal Path should be amended to read the King Charles III England Coast Path</p>	<p>Change references to the <i>English Coastal Path</i> to read the '<i>King Charles III England Coast Path</i>'</p>
08/8 Dorset Council	<p>68. Approach - It is noted that a significant amount of this area is restricted for reasons other than recreation such as statutory designations and therefore this policy may be unnecessarily restrictive for reasons of recreation.</p> <p>69. Evidence - There is no specific evidence or policy reasons backing up this policy or for the boundaries of these areas shown on the map. We also note that the Local Green Space policy may seek to conserve these areas for recreation in other ways.</p> <p>70. There is a degree of overlap between the scope of Policies WNP08 and WNP09 in addition to policy WNP11. Consideration should be given to rationalising these policies and reducing them to one policy. Unsure what additional benefit that this policy provides as the exceptions written are covered in the local green space policy.</p> <p>71. Site specific comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site 1 includes land within the western relief road, see emerging Dorset Council Local Plan, section 24, Paragraphs 24.6.48-51, and would be contrary to a strategic policy. Part of this land is already protected by the 'Heritage Coast' under policy ENV4 Criterion VI. See responses by the Dorset Wildlife Trust, Portland Port and Weymouth Civic Society to the Dorset Council Local Plan. • Site 2 or 3 – Includes LA/WEYM/026 – Former QinetiQ Site Part of sites 2/3 is allocated for employment or mix-use re-development through Policy WEY9 Bingleaves Cove. • Site 4 and 5 – No comments • Other sites - Has consideration been given to Weymouth Sea front and The Peninsula as these are also coastal recreation areas? 	<p>Ensure there is no overlap of policies or policy areas in the submission version of the NP.</p> <p>Review and revise boundaries of sites 1, 2 and 3 on Map 11.</p>
08/9 Weymouth Civic Society (P&E Cttee)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothe Fort - the importance of recognising the significance of the Nothe Fort in the life of Weymouth, as the resort's main attraction, and giving it due acknowledgement in the Neighbourhood Plan. 	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
	<p>WNP09 & paras 8.62-8.64</p>	
09/1	<p>I support WNPO9</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
09/2	<p>WNPO9 I support this commendable policy</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
09/3	<p>WNPO9 - Don't support – is this necessary given ENV policies in WDW&P LP.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
09/4	<p>WNPO9 - very important and areas that are motor vehicle free etc but with good accessibility for those with children / disabilities</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
09/5 Dorset Council	<p>72. Criteria 1 and 3 are read as community aspirations as opposed to specific planning development issues. Consideration should be given as to which situations or planning applications that this would apply to. If none are found, the criteria should be moved to a project implementation section. If there are specific locations where access is limited these could be mapped and specified in an implementation section.</p> <p>73. Criterion 1 – The Definitive Map Team note that this should include bridleways not just footpaths – wider access for walker, horse riders and cyclists.</p> <p>74. Criterion 2 – The wording is similar to policy WNP07. Consideration should be given to combining these policies.</p> <p>75. Criterion 3 – Clarification is needed on the terms used. What is meant by interpretation? Can this be defined? It is recommended that more detail is given to the term 'measures' outlining exactly how this should be addressed. e.g. through a biodiversity plan.</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording to clause 2 in the light of comments received.</p> <p>Add examples of interpretation to para. 8.64</p>
	<p>WNP10 & paras 8.65-8.68</p>	
10/1	<p>I support WNPO10.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
10/2	<p>Map 12. Allocation of Development in Green space 1 is not appropriate.</p>	<p>Consider when drafting next version</p>
10/3	<p>I support the green gap policy on map 12 and all the Local Green Spaces listed.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
10/4	<p>I agree with and support para. 8.65 regarding the safeguarding of open green spaces.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
10/5	I agree with and support para. 8.65 regarding the safeguarding of open green spaces.	Support Noted
10/6	WNP10 - Open spaces ...these are being eaten up by development e.g. Bincombe Park - which is an awful cheap looking development - with inadequate solar panels - The green spaces are also being absorbed by the ridiculously large expansion of Waterside Holiday Park which has become an eyesore on the world heritage landscape. It also is a horrible welcome to Weymouth as you come down White Horse Hill filling the once open spaces.	Noted comment(s) in support
10/7 CG Fry and Son	WNP10 is broadly agreed with. The supporting wording to the policy notes that several developments have already taken place within green gaps and the NP allocates a further three sites within green gaps. One of these developments is Redlands Farm. However, the NP correctly notes that a significant element of the allocation will be used for purposes including public open space. In addition, this land will give greater protection to the remaining green gap on the western side of the development which serves more effectively as a buffer than the eastern side which abuts existing and consented housing development. On the basis that the NP recognises that the Redlands Farm development will develop a small element of less effective green gap designation, this policy is supported.	Noted comment(s) in support
10/8	WNP10: Green Gaps - I support this commendable policy	Support Noted
10/9	WNP10 Green gaps - All heritage assets should be recognised – remove the word 'important' in 3. ii.	Consider policy rewording to clause 3 in the light of comments received.
10/10	WNP10 - Partial Support – I would prefer that criteria were more objectively based to define the extent of the Green Gap. The existing WDW&P Green Gaps are merely the gaps between the different development areas in Weymouth. Stopping this becoming one homogenous urban sprawl is a good idea. But how big should the gaps be? There is internal conflict with the WNP 24, WNP26 and WNP26 Site Allocations.	Review all criteria in the light of the final set of proposed green gap areas including 'exceptions'
10/11	WNP10 has been ignored in the allocation of building land. Within the 2015 local plan areas that are identified as Important Local Gaps have been ignored with no substantive assessment or reason for the reallocation. The picture on page 50 bears no relation to the map Policy WNP13 does not clearly show the development boundary, however the NP recommends building on land that is outside the current development boundary. The recommendations for building does not align with this policy.	Ensure photos are relevant to the topic/policy
10/12	Green gaps, the gaps as they exist today are being pinched to supply more development space. For an area that has minimal jobs, the inability to fill the retail park at New Look/Sainsburys, and sale of the Jurassic roundabout development, there is not the work to support the development in the area increasing the environmental impact of workers traveling further for jobs. Should there be a push back to Dorset Council to say current greenspaces will remain as they are and work to increase the use of the green gaps more community assets to the areas they are in.	Noted comment(s) in support
10/13 Dorset Council	76. Further evidence - The supporting text refers to the need for a buffer or local green gap to safeguard the land around the settlement from development. The supporting text notes that the principle of a green gaps policy was considered and supported in responses to the consultation. Whilst the consultation may mean that the inclusion of such a policy is considered, it is not sufficient evidence for this policy in isolation. More evidence is required in order to restrict these areas of land under a 'green belt' style policy. The historic evidence refers to the impact on the openness of these areas, however, more evidence is needed detailing why this openness is important, why they remain relevant in policy, not just public opinion. Evidence should be provided for each of the gaps individually outlining why they are important and to be retained. 77. The policy needs to specify the reason to prevent coalescence e.g. landscape or character studies, or otherwise. This could be due to being a protected wildlife area, wildlife corridor continuation as per Chickerell NP policy, landscape reasons (as per Chickerell NP policy CNP10), urban character reasons. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), wildlife study, or characterisation study could be undertaken to support this policy and its boundaries. 78. Without this evidence the spaces are essentially being designated as Local Green Spaces, as per policy WNP11 of the NP, without having assessed each of the sites against the set criteria for Local Green Spaces. If no further evidence is gathered to restrict these areas of land in their own right, consideration should be given to restricting these areas of land under Local Green Spaces policy. Any sites that may not comply should be removed from the Neighbourhood Plan. Please note that CPRE have produced guidance on what constitutes a large swathe of open space. On average these have been 1.8 Ha but have gone up to 46.5Ha depending on the population to which they relate Feb-2022_CPRE_Local-Green-Spaces-full-report-1.pdf 79. Mapping - The Plan should clearly identify, in a revised map 12, areas that are proposed to be retained as areas that were WDWPLP important open gaps, previously open gaps but have been allocated, areas that were previously open gaps and have	Ensure supporting text adequately explains the purpose and function of the green gaps Address map issues

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>approved consents and areas that are seeking to be retained as open gaps. All but the final point has been illustrated in the plan. The preference would be to simply map the areas that are seeking to be retained as open gaps.</p> <p>81. Paragraph 8.68 - The policy text of WNP10 does not include an exception for development which must be in the Green Gap or because of the need for the development.</p>	
<p>10/14 Turley for Morrish Homes</p>	<p>Policy WNP10 identifies Green Gaps which are 'fundamental to retaining and protecting the special character and setting of local settlement areas and preventing coalescence', and where 'development proposals in the designated green gaps will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that the development is for: i. measures to prevent flooding; or, ii. improvements to access to the countryside; or iii. enhancement of recreation activities; or, iv. for essential agricultural uses.</p> <p>Similarly, Policy ENV3 of the adopted West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan 2015 includes the site as part of the Green Infrastructure Strategy. This policy confirms that 'development that would cause harm to the green infrastructure network or undermine the reasons for an area's inclusion within the network will not be permitted unless clearly outweighed by other considerations.'</p> <p>Para 8.68 of the NP qualifies the above policy by stating that 'At the same time it has been necessary to allocate 3 sites which fall within these Open Gaps in order to impact the shortfall of Affordable Housing in the existing and emerging Local Plans. The areas affected result from Policies WNP24, WNP25 and WNP26 and are shown on Map 12.'</p> <p>Given the above, my client would recommend that the wording of Policy WNP10 is amended. Bullet point 1 should be updated to reflect the text within para 8.68, and specifically refer to the relevant allocation(s).</p>	<p>Review the purpose, location and extent of green gap areas in the light of other policies</p> <p>Ensure there is no overlap of policies or policy areas in the submission version of the NP.</p> <p>Re-word para. 8.68 deleting the 1st three sentences.</p>
	<p>WNP11 & paras 8.69-8.74</p>	
<p>11/1</p>	<p>I agree with Castle Cove being made a Green Space</p>	<p>Support Noted for LGS designation</p>
<p>11/2</p>	<p>My only concerns are for the policies as listed</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. WTCLGS009 WTCLGS010 WTCLGS015 Area of recreational land south of Elm Close Play area and grassed recreational area with woodland wildlife habitat 2. WTCLGS033 Green area btw Enkworth Road and Oakbury Drive, Preston Recreational green space with mixed protected trees adj. to residential properties 3. WTCLGS034 Woodland area off Oakbury Drive, Preston Publicly accessible woodland area providing important wildlife habitat <p>I support any application submitted to keep these areas as green protected spaces. There is so much wildlife in these areas, the grassed recreational area on Elm Close is used highly by young families throughout the year, especially in the summer. Many parent groups seem to meet socially, there are yoga groups, so many dog walkers meet to exercise their pets here and all appear to try to keep it clean. There is rarely litter around and the play equipment is looked after by the public using it. If this area was built on, families would have a severe lack of recreational areas and especially the wildlife. As quoted in the plan, applications for housing must not '1. Development proposals should avoid the loss of or damage to trees, woodland, orchards, or hedgerows that contribute positively to the character, biodiversity, and amenity of an area.' It is a scenic and enjoyable area for all who use it. The large population of wild rabbits, there is a den with 6 foxes living in it and every year they raise cubs which can be seen playing on the lawn. There are badgers and a small herd of deer that can be seen regularly. To destroy this area purely for housing would be senseless and greedy."</p>	<p>Support Noted for LGS designations</p>
<p>11/3</p>	<p>Ref WTCLGS033, WTCLGS034.</p> <p>I object to any building on the land between Oakbury Drive and Enkworth Road. I have lived here for 50+ years. The piece of land supports lots of wildlife and allows the animals to move from one area to another easily. We get deer, foxes and badgers on a regular basis. Building there would remove the semi-rural feeling of the area. I am strongly opposed.</p>	<p>Support Noted for LGS designations</p>
<p>11/4</p>	<p>I support WNPO11 and the proposed local green spaces</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
<p>11/5</p>	<p>I fully support Radipole Park and Gardens becoming a protected green space</p>	<p>Support Noted for LGS designation</p>
<p>11/6</p>	<p>I agree with and strongly support Draft Policy WNP11. Specifically, I support Hurdlemead site in Upwey (map 12) being protected for future generations and the present-day community. It has historically been used for events, and walking.</p>	<p>Support Noted for LGS designation</p>
<p>11/7</p>	<p>I also support Map 7 field adjacent to Hurdlemead being protected as a local green space.</p>	<p>Support Noted for LGS designation</p>
<p>11/8</p>	<p>WTCLGS033 This area continues to show evidence of foxes, badgers, bats and birds supported by an understory of shrubs beneath a canopy of mature trees which have TPO's assigned to them. The area provides a wild life corridor for these mammals moving from the woodland off Oakbury Drive through to the fields above Enkworth Road. It also serves as a recreational area for local residents and their children.</p>	<p>Support Noted for LGS designation</p>
<p>11/9</p>	<p>Good to protect additional open spaces</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
11/10	I support Castle Cove being designated a green space	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/11	I agree with Castle Cove being made a Green Space	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/12	I agree with Castle Cove being made a green space	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/13	I agree with Castle Cove being made a Green Space	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/14	I support Castle Cove Beach being designated a Green Space so that it can continue to be enjoyed by the public as a beautiful recreational space	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/15	Yes, to Castle cove green space	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/16	I agree with Castle Cove being designated as a green space	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/17	I agree with Castle Cove being made a green space	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/18	I agree with Castle Cove being made a Green Space	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/19	I agree that Castle Cove should be designated a green space	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/20	Castle Cove beach should be a designated green space with free access to all. The Underbarn Walk should be re- opened in full and maintained for future use.	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/21	We agree with Castle Cove beach becoming a green space	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/22	Castle Cove should be a green space	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/23	I agree with Castle Cove becoming a green space	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/24	I support Castle Cove being a Green Space	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/25	I feel strongly that current green spaces should be maintained for the future, they are necessary for the wellbeing of all ages and should be looked after. Developers should be encouraged to plan for green spaces in new development.	Support Noted for LGS policy
11/26	I agree with and strongly support Draft Policy WNP11. Specifically, I support Hurdlemead site in Upwey (map 12) being protected for future generations and the present-day community. It has historically been used for events, and walking.	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/27	I also support Map 7 field adjacent to Hurdlemead being protected as a local green space.	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/28	WTCLGS033 Enkworth Road area, WTCLGS034 Oakbury Drive site. Both sites are highly important green spaces. Both sites are wildlife havens and are home to and/or used by many species including bats, badgers, foxes and numerous birds and insects. The Enkworth Road area has had active badger setts for at least the last 30 years. The site has an area of shrubs providing important cover and shelter for wildlife and also a number of mature trees with TPOs. The Enkworth Road site provides an important wildlife corridor between the woodlands off Oakbury Drive and the fields above Enkworth Road. There is also an area of grassland which provides a recreational area for local residents and their families.	Support Noted for LGS designations
11/29	We agree with Castle Cove being made a Green Space ref WTCLGS001	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/30	WTCLGS033 and 34. These areas are heavily used by families like us and all other local residents. We can safely let our kids play here. There is no other safe outside space. Wildlife is very active here. Foxes, badgers and deer are regularly in these areas.	Support Noted for LGS designations
11/31	WTCLGS001 I agree with land adjacent to Castle Cove Beach becoming a designated green space	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/32	WTCLGS001 I agree with land adjacent to Castle Cove Beach becoming a designated green space	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/33	WNP11: Local Green Space – I support this commendable policy	Support Noted for LGS policy
11/34	WNP11: Local Green Space – I strongly support the inclusion in Schedule 1 of the Field adjacent to the top end of Southill Garden Drive. It is very well used by walkers.	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/35	WNP11: Local Green Space – I strongly support the inclusion in Schedule 1 of the interconnecting strips of grass verge between streets at Southill.	Support Noted for LGS designation

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
11/36	I query why those at the northern part of the garden village are not shown on Figure 1, appendix C, page 80 as they serve the same purpose. Can these be reconsidered for inclusion, please	Consider whether land in question should be covered by WNP12
11/37	WTCLGS033 - WTCLGS034 This woodland area contains an abundance of wildlife, including birds, foxes, badgers and bats. Surrounded by protected, mature trees. As well as being a recreational area for residents, including my grandchildren.	Support Noted for LGS designations
11/38	As long as current green space kept as overall there is not a lot of actual green space	Support Noted for LGS policy
11/39	WTCLGS033 WTCLG034 This area continues to show evidence of foxes, badgers and deer. There are many shrubs beneath mature trees many of which have TPO's. This area gives homes and a thoroughfare for wildlife. It also provides a recreational area for local residents.	Support Noted for LGS designations
11/40	WTCLGS033 - Enkworth Road I have lived directly opposite this area of green space for the past 9 years. In that time, I have been delighted to observe a variety of insect, birds, and mammals. They are attracted by the bushes and mature trees. Some of these animals use the space as a corridor between other nearby green spaces, others, live there more permanently. This space is also used by residents and their children for recreational purposes.	Support Noted for LGS designation
11/41	Lodmoor Country Park is omitted from the Local Green Spaces lists but Radipole Park and Gardens is included as are the Nothe Gardens. This is an unacceptable omission, particularly as it is mentioned in para 2.21 as contributing to the important 'green' character of Weymouth. WNP11 pages 46,47 Para 2.21	No change required.
11/42	"A good job been done on section 8. Be good to see the protection of the environment as a default first principal i.e. that all landscape, greenspace, open space, coastlines, waterways not be open to development. All land use development become subject to careful consideration in order to halt the degradation of habitat and reverse the decline in biodiversity loss. Reference Das Gupta Report 2021 The Economics of Biodiversity: The Dasgupta Review (publishing.service.gov.uk) Specifically a green space application for DC land at Chapelhay Heights to be protected for use as growing space by local residents pending.	Support Noted for LGS policy
11/43	WNP11: Local Green Space - protects 48 areas Support. LGS are critical to protecting estate developments which have limited local green spaces for the nearby community.	Support Noted for LGS policy
11/44	WPN11 - Policy applies to items included in List 1. This list is incomplete. Greenhill Gardens is omitted.	No change required.
11/45	WNP11 - Local Green Spaces – Integrity of these designations is essential for the environment and local communities.	Support Noted for LGS policy
11/46	WTCLGS001 Questions: (1) is this land not privately owned? and (2) On what legal basis is this land described as "amenity space"? and (3) what does "providing a setting for the beach" mean? and how does it justify designating as "Local Green Space"?	No change necessary.
11/47 Dorset Council	WNP11: Local Green Spaces 82. Size of land - The third part of paragraph 102 requires that the site is not an extensive tract of land. There is no definition of what can be considered local in size, it is not defined specifically and there is not maximum size. This could vary depending on the settlement size. As Weymouth is a larger settlement the provision of a larger area of land could still be considered local in character, it should be proportionate. However, the blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements would not be appropriate. The size of sites in Hectares could be provided in the Local Green Space evaluation and a definition of how each of the sites has or has not been determined to be an extensive tract of land. As a guide CRPE have assessed LGS designations with an average of 1.8 Hectares in size but the sizes do vary dramatically Feb-2022_CPRES_Local-Green-Spaces-full-report-1.pdf 83. Mapping - The supporting Map 13 identifies the broad location of sites, however, does not specifically identify the site boundaries and scale on a map. More detailed maps are provided in Appendix C with an outline boundary of each individual green space. This provision of Appendix C goes some way to overcome this issue. However, Appendix C is not referred to in the supporting text and there is no way for the reader to know it is available for reference. The appendix should be referenced in the supporting paragraphs. 84. Map 13 - Increase the size and resolution of the map presented in the document as it is currently illegible. 85. Existing consents - In accordance with paragraph 008 of the NPPG, any sites or land with an existing planning consent should not be included unless there are exceptional reasons to include the land. Each site should be reviewed and evidenced to ensure that this criterion can be met.	Consider advice when preparing final LGS candidate list

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>86. Other designations – NPPG Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 37-011-20140306 states “Different types of designations are intended to achieve different purposes. If land is already protected by designation, then consideration should be given to whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designation as Local Green Space.” If the land has other designations, such as AONB, highways land or conservation area status, this does not necessarily preclude or support designation as local green space. However, the additional designation as a Local Green Space may require its retention in situ or perpetuity, not afforded by the existing designation. Any sites with existing designations should therefore justify why the additional designation as Local Green Space is required. If this cannot be provided then the spaces that are protected under other legislation should not be included, e.g. public parks, public rights of way or highways land. The land should also not be linear in form covering a footpath as footpaths are designated under other legislation.</p> <p>87. Council Land - Dorset Council has responded separately, as a landowner to the Local Green Spaces in Dorset Council ownership, on the 17 May 2023. As the group feel the objection to the inclusion of some proposed sites was not always clear, a further assessment and policy justification is provided in an Annex A.</p>	
<p>11/48 Dorset Council Planning Policy</p>	<p>WNP11 This response has been prepared by the Planning Policy Team and seeks to provide constructive comments relating to the Local Green Spaces at this informal consultation stage. The comments provided are based upon the requirements to meet the ‘basic condition’ tests relating to the production of the neighbourhood plan. This response contains specific advice from Assets as a landowner, however, also seeks to provide the stance as a planning authority. Officers seek to encourage an on-going dialogue with the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan Group regarding finalising the submission version of the proposal. In the meantime, we hope that these comments are useful in progressing your plan towards meeting the basic conditions and eventually being ‘made’ part of the Development Plan for Weymouth. Policy background Draft policies and allocations have been assessed against the National and Local Planning Policy framework, principally the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) September 2023 and West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (WDWPLP) 2015. National Policy on Local Green Spaces can be found in paragraphs 101-103. Planning practice guidance on Open space, sports and recreation facilities, public rights of way and local green space - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) expands on National Policy. Site Assessment The NPPF is specific in relation to the criteria that Local Green Spaces should be assessed against. These criteria are a combination of NPPF paragraphs and NPPG notes. • Longevity The NPPF paragraph 101 requires that a LGS should only be designated if the site can endure beyond the end of the plan period. In addition to paragraph 101 requires that any designation should not preclude Weymouth's ability to provide development but should instead be part of the strategy for a sustainable town including complementing investment in sufficient homes, jobs, and other essential services. This is in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requirement for plans to be positively prepared as mentioned in paragraphs 26 and 35 of the NPPF. Each site should be assessed for compliance with this criterion. • Consistent with sustainable development In addition to paragraph 101, NPPG Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 37-007-20140306 states “Designating any Local Green Space will need to be consistent with local planning for sustainable development in the area. Plans must identify sufficient land in suitable locations to meet identified development needs and the Local Green Space designation should not be used in a way that undermines this aim of plan making.” Therefore, any designation should not preclude Weymouth's ability to provide development but should instead be part of the strategy for a sustainable town including complementing investment in sufficient homes, jobs, and other essential services. This is in line with NPPFs requirement for plans to be positively prepared as mentioned in paragraphs 26 and 35 of the NPPF. • Reasonably close proximity Paragraph 102 of the NPPF discusses proximity and outlines that this dependant on local circumstances and why the site is special. Ideally the location of the development should be within easy walking distance of the community that it serves and not be isolated from the community. Schedule 1 needs to ensure consistency and compliance with the criteria, in some instances, for example St Johns Garden, does not detail its proximity to the community it serves. • Demonstrably special and local Significance The second part of the criteria in paragraph 102 requires details of why the space is demonstrably special to the community and holds local importance, (for example because</p>	<p>Include evidence into NP not supporting document.</p> <p>List the size of each site.</p> <p>Ensure maps are accurate.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife) is required to be designated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local in character and not an extensive tract of land <p>The third part of paragraph 102 requires that the site is not an extensive tract of land. There is no definition of what can be considered local in size, it is not defined specifically and there is not maximum size. On average sites are 1.8 Hectares but this could vary depending on the settlement size. As Weymouth is a larger settlement the provision of a larger area of land could still be considered local in character, it should be proportionate. However, the blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements would not be appropriate. The size of sites in Hectares should be provided.</p> <p>The supporting Map 13 identifies the broad location of sites, however, does not specifically identify the site boundaries and scale on a map. More detailed maps are provided identifying the outline boundary of each individual green space in Appendix C. Appeal Decision APP/D1265/W/22/3311560 criticised the Portland NP (Neighbourhood Plan) policy as it did not define what an 'incidental open space' is and there was no map identifying them. This provision of Appendix C goes some way to overcome this issue. However, Appendix C is not referred to in the supporting text and there is no way for the reader to know it is available for reference. The appendix should be referenced in the supporting paragraphs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing consents <p>In accordance with paragraph 008 of the NPPG, any sites or land with an existing planning consent should not be included unless there are exceptional reasons to include the land. Each site should be reviewed and evidenced to ensure that this criterion can be met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other designations <p>NPPG Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 37-011-20140306 states "Different types of designations are intended to achieve different purposes. If land is already protected by designation, then consideration should be given to whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designation as Local Green Space." If the land has other designations, such as AONB or conservation area status, this does not necessarily preclude or support designation as local green space. However, the additional designation as a Local Green Space may require its retention in situ or perpetuity, not afforded by the existing designation. Any sites with existing designations should therefore justify why the additional designation as Local Green Space is required. If this cannot be provided then the spaces that are protected under other legislation should not be included, e.g. public parks, public rights of way or highways land. The land should also not be linear in form covering a footpath as footpaths are designated under other legislation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with Green belt policy <p>The relevant policy in the WDWPLP is ENV3. Paragraphs 103 of the NPPF states: "103. Policies for managing development within a Local Green Space should be consistent with those for Green Belts."</p> <p>Policy 11 seeks to designate Local Green Space in Weymouth. The policy wording should therefore be consistent with those set for Green Belt, in line with NPPF paragraphs 147 to 151. Specifically defining 'minor' and 'special circumstances' would be beneficial to the policy to ensure that it complies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sites allocated as LGS <p>The policy currently identifies sites that are under consideration for designation as Local Green Space. Each of these sites have been assessed against some of the above criteria. However not all. What is not clear is if the longevity of the site has been considered whether it is consistent with sustainable development,</p> <p>Dorset Council owned sites</p> <p>Dorset Council has undertaken an initial assessment of sites in their ownership. The below response outlines the suitability and ability of the site, to meet the basic conditions test.</p>	
<p>11/49 Dorset Council Assets</p>	<p>WTC LGS009/010/015 Elm Close, Preston Weymouth</p> <p>Assets response to sites Identified for Local Green Space</p> <p>Dorset Council (DC) own the North-Eastern part of this identified area adjacent to Preston Road. We have looked at two schemes to provide housing on this site which is complicated by drainage issues. The area that DC own is currently scrub land and provides little amenity value as is very overgrown. Therefore, DC would request that the area identified as Local Green Space (LGS) is amended to remove the area owned by DC (Ref WTC LGS009/10/15)</p> <p>Summary of Policy Position</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Longevity and sustainable development – The site is not allocated for strategic uses and the most northerly part has been assessed in the SHLAA as being unsuitable for development due to flood risk. Therefore, its allocation is consistent with sustainable development and has prospects of being retained beyond the end of the plan period. 2. The site is adjacent to the community it serves and therefore in proximity. 3. The site is special for its recreation, wildlife and tranquillity value, evidence is provided in the document Weymouth NP LGS Assessment Report July 2023. It is therefore demonstrably special and has local significance. 	<p>No change necessary. Site to be designated.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>4. The site is a reasonable size, local in character and not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>5. Existing consents – Planning application WP/19/00024/OUT was withdrawn. There are no consents on site.</p> <p>6. Other designations – Part of the site is designated as a Public Park and therefore is protected under other legislation.</p> <p>Summary – The site is protected under other legislation and no justification is provided outlining why additional protection is required. Not suitable for allocation as a Local Green Space.</p>	
<p>11/50 Dorset Council Assets</p>	<p>WTC LGS003/007/008 Grove Avenue / Beaumont Avenue</p> <p>Assets response to sites Identified for Local Green Space</p> <p>DC assets team objects to this site being put forward as a LGS and requests that it is removed. There is the possibility that this site could be developed for housing.</p> <p>Summary of Policy Position</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Longevity and sustainable development – The site is not allocated for other strategic uses. Therefore, its allocation is consistent with sustainable development and has prospects of being retained beyond the end of the plan period. 2. The site is adjacent to the community it serves and therefore in proximity. 3. The site is special for its recreation, wildlife, and tranquillity value. It is therefore demonstrably special and has local significance. Evidence is provided in the document Weymouth NP LGS Assessment Report July 2023. 4. The site is a reasonable size and local in character and not an extensive tract of land. 5. No existing consents. 6. Other designations – Higher Value Ecological network on part of the site. <p>Summary – Dorset Council as landowner objects, however there are no planning issues restricting designation.</p>	<p>No change necessary. Site to be designated.</p>
<p>11/51 Dorset Council Assets</p>	<p>WTC LGS01 Field adjacent to Southill Garden Drive</p> <p>Assets response to sites Identified for Local Green Space</p> <p>Adjacent recreational area and Field</p> <p>Dorset Council objects to these sites being put forward as a Local Green Space and requests that they are removed. Dorset Council would not want specific areas on this site designated as Local Green Space because this could hinder wider development of the entire site. This is the rationale behind only leasing the play area to Weymouth Town Council, so that in the future the entire site could be cohesively developed which may see the location of the play area / green space moving within the site.</p> <p>Summary of Policy Position</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Longevity and sustainable development – The site is allocated under WEY 15 Tumbledown Farm for a community farm use. The community group have no plans for this piece of land under the recently approved masterplan document and so it is assumed that this is surplus land. <p>Land to the south of the site has been assessed as unsuitable in the SHLAA due to its shape and proximity to a pipeline. Therefore, its allocation as Local Green Space is suitable and consistent with sustainable development. The site has prospects of being retained beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The site is adjacent to the community it serves and therefore in proximity. 3. The site is special for its wildlife and tranquillity value. The report Weymouth NP LGS Assessment Report – 20.11.2022 sought to reject the allocation. Evidence is provided in the document Weymouth NP LGS Assessment Report July 2023 also seeks to reject its allocation due to WEY15. 4. The site is a reasonable size and local in character and not an extensive tract of land. 5. No existing consents. Adjacent land at Tumbledown Farm P/FUL/2022/03899 did not include this parcel of land. 6. Other designations – Higher Value Ecological network on part of the site and Radipole Conservation Area. <p>Summary – The site is allocated under WEY15 Tumbledown, but the Weymouth Town Council as Leaseholders have no intention for the land as they are in discussions with Neighbourhood Plan group who have allocated this site. The site is protected under the Radipole Conservation Area and no details have been provided outlining why the site requires further protection.</p> <p>The Weymouth NP LGS Assessment Report – 20.11.2022 and July 2023 seek to reject the allocation. Dorset Council, as landowner objects. The site should be removed, or a revised evidence base should be provided.</p>	<p>No change necessary. Site to be designated.</p>
<p>11/52 Dorset Council Assets</p>	<p>LGS033 Green Space between Enkworth Road and Oakbury Drive</p> <p>Assets response to sites Identified for Local Green Space</p> <p>Dorset Council assets team has reservations regarding the identification of this land as Local Green Space. Part of the site has previously been considered for housing. Dorset Council would have no objections if the boundary was amended.</p> <p>Summary of Policy Position</p>	<p>No change necessary. Site to be designated.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>1. Longevity and sustainable development – The site is not allocated for strategic uses. Its allocation could be considered contrary to sustainable development as part of the site could be suitable for infill housing within the plan period.</p> <p>2. The site is adjacent to the community it serves and is therefore in proximity.</p> <p>3. The group have defined that the site meets all the criteria of what makes the site demonstrably special and local significance to the community.</p> <p>4. The site is a reasonable size and local in character and not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>5. No existing consents.</p> <p>6. No other designations.</p> <p>Summary – Dorset Council as landowner objects due to including a piece of land that could be considered for housing. It could be argued that removing the ability to provide infill housing in sustainable locations is contrary to sustainable development, however there are no other planning issues restricting designation.</p>	
<p>11/53 Dorset Council Assets</p>	<p>LGS034 Woodland off Oakbury Drive</p> <p>Assets response to sites Identified for Local Green Space</p> <p>Dorset Council assets team supports this small coppice land being identified as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Summary of Policy Position</p> <p>1. Longevity and sustainable development – The site is not allocated for strategic uses its allocation is consistent with sustainable development and has prospects of being retained beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <p>2. The site is adjacent to the community it serves and therefore in proximity.</p> <p>3. The group have not defined what makes the site demonstrably special and local significance to the community.</p> <p>4. The site is a reasonable size and local in character and not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>5. No existing consents.</p> <p>6. Other designations – Higher Value Ecological Network.</p> <p>Summary – There are no planning issues restricting designation.</p>	<p>No change necessary. Site to be designated.</p>
<p>11/54 Dorset Council Assets</p>	<p>WTCLGS047 Springfield Copse (Junction of Springfield Road and Dorchester Road)</p> <p>Assets response to sites Identified for Local Green Space</p> <p>There are several constraints to the site. It is an established coppice / wooded area and is in a conservation area. There are flooding issues in the north-west corner of the site, with the main river culverted across part of the site.</p> <p>There are no highways schemes planned at this location. A small part of the footway appears to have been safeguarded in 1983 for road widening. However, as this was pre the Weymouth Relief Road, the scheme is now no longer required.</p> <p>Dorset Council therefore has no objection to this land being designated as “Local Green Space,” if there is no impact on the footpath / footways.</p> <p>Summary of Policy Position</p> <p>1. Longevity and sustainable development – The site is not allocated for strategic uses its allocation is consistent with sustainable development and has prospects of being retained beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <p>2. The site is adjacent to the community it serves and therefore in proximity.</p> <p>3. The group have defined what makes the site demonstrably special and local significance to the community.</p> <p>4. The site is a reasonable size and local in character and not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>5. No existing consents.</p> <p>6. Other designations – Broadway Conservation Area.</p> <p>Summary – The site is protected under the Broadway Conservation Area and no details have been provided outlining why the site requires further protection. The site should therefore not be included, or further evidence should be gathered.</p>	<p>No change necessary. Site to be designated.</p>
<p>11/55 Dorset Council Assets</p>	<p>WTC LGS016 Remembrance / Memory Garden, Littlemoor</p> <p>Assets response to sites Identified for Local Green Space</p> <p>This is Highways land and includes attenuation ponds for relief road. Dorset Council would not want any definition of Local Green Space of this area to restrict ability to make any amendments in the future to the highway (not aware of any planned changes). We would also like to propose an alteration to the area identified as Local Green Space as per the plan below.</p> <p>Summary of Policy Position</p> <p>1. Longevity and sustainable development – The site is allocated for strategic use as highway land. Its allocation is not consistent with sustainable development and has prospects of being amended beyond the plan period.</p> <p>2. Proximity – Close proximity to the community.</p> <p>3. The site is said to be demonstrably special and local significance to the community. No evidence of special use provided.</p> <p>4. The site is a small in size at 0.25 Hectares, local in character and not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>5. There are no outstanding consents on site.</p>	<p>Consider re-defining the extent of the site to omit any land that may be required for future highways work.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>6. Other designations – The site is highways land and should not be designated under other designations.</p> <p>Summary – The site is highways land and should not be designated under other designations, the site may be required for highways purposes in the future.</p>	
<p>11/56 Dorset Council Assets</p>	<p>WTC LGS017 Community Orchard and Pond area adjacent to Littlemoor Road</p> <p>Assets response to sites Identified for Local Green Space</p> <p>This is Highways land. Dorset Council would not want any definition of Local Green Space of this area to restrict ability to make any amendments in the future to the highway (not aware of any planned changes).</p> <p>Summary of Policy Position</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Longevity and sustainable development – The site is allocated for strategic use as highway land. Its allocation is not consistent with sustainable development and has prospects of being amended beyond the plan period. 2. Proximity – Close proximity to the community. 3. The site is said to be demonstrably special and local significance to the community. 4. The site is small at 2.7 Hectares, local in character and not an extensive tract of land. 5. There are no outstanding consents on site. 6. Other designations – The site is highways land and should not be designated under other designations. <p>Summary –</p> <p>The site is highways land and should not be designated under other designations, the site may be required for highways purposes in the future.</p>	<p>No change necessary. Site to be designated.</p>
<p>11/57 Dorset Council Assets</p>	<p>WTC LGS021 Green Strip between The Finches and A354</p> <p>Assets response to sites Identified for Local Green Space</p> <p>This is Highways land. Dorset Council would not want any definition of Local Green Space of this area to restrict ability to make any amendments in the future to the highway (not aware of any planned changes).</p> <p>Summary of Policy Position</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Longevity and sustainable development – The site is allocated for strategic use as highway land. Its allocation is not consistent with sustainable development and has prospects of being amended beyond the plan period. 2. Proximity – Close proximity to the community. 3. The site is said to be demonstrably special and local significance to the community. 4. The site is a small in size at 2.7 Hectares, local in character and not an extensive tract of land. 5. There are no outstanding consents on site. 6. Other designations – The site is highways land and should not be designated under other designations. <p>Summary –</p> <p>The site is highways land and should not be designated under other designations, the site may be required for highways purposes in the future.</p>	<p>No change necessary. Site to be designated.</p>
	<p>WNP12 & paras 8.75-8.76</p>	
<p>12/1</p>	<p>I support WNPO12</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
<p>12/2</p>	<p>WNP12: Incidental Open Space</p> <p>I support this commendable policy. I support paragraph 8.75, which gives sound justification for the policy at Southill.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
<p>12/3</p>	<p>WNP12: Incidental Open Space – Support.</p> <p>The principle is good in that these estates were subject to a design approval which included provision of green open space for residents that is now under threat. But the area in Littlemoor covers perhaps 7 phases of development the amount of included green space and need for community space given the size of gardens has changed. This could address each phase of development.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
<p>12/4</p>	<p>WNP12 – if there were opportunity to have more social housing on these green spaces, I would favour that.</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>
<p>12/5</p>	<p>Incidental Open Spaces</p> <p>I agree that it is vital that these spaces be retained, and more created as new developments take place. Those spaces played a vital part in keeping people safe and able to exercise during the pandemic and will always be essential for good mental health.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
<p>12/6 Dorset Council</p>	<p>WNP12: Incidental Open Spaces</p> <p>88. Approach - There is overlap between some of the land which it is proposed to define as local green space and some of the land which it is proposed to define as incidental open space. It should be made clear, which site is covered by which policy.</p> <p>89. Evidence - The policy restricts infill development in inherently sustainable locations. Whilst the policy is not specifically related to Local Green Spaces, it is similar. Paragraph 101 requires that any designation should not preclude Weymouth's ability to provide development but should instead be part of the strategy for a sustainable town including complementing investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. There</p>	<p>Ensure there is no overlap of policies or policy areas in the submission version of the NP.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>does not appear to be any clear evidence justifying or defining incidental open space in these areas. The supporting text justifies it as an intrinsic part of the character however no character study has been submitted in support of this.</p> <p>90. Map 14 - The mapping of estates with protected green spaces is welcomed. Portland policy Port/CR4 identifies areas of incidental open space. An appeal Decision APP/D1265/W/22/3311560 however criticised the policy as it did not define what an 'incidental open space' is and there was no map identifying them.</p>	
	<p>WNP13 & paras 8.77-8.80</p>	
13/1	I support WNPO13	Support Noted
13/2	Para 8.80 By the time you get to the end of the bullet point list, there doesn't seem to be any protection afforded to the intended areas. How does this policy protect the countryside?	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
13/3	This policy seems to allow development boundaries to effectively bypass the good policies of this section. If a developer wants to build houses in an open area, it gets included within the development boundary and the environmental protections are relaxed. How does this protect Landscapes and Greenspaces?	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
13/4	I support this policy. It is, however, disheartening when applications for open market housing outside the DDBs in the county are approved when clearly contrary to policy.	Noted comment(s) in support
13/5	WNP13 Support – but is this necessary given ENV policies in WDW&P LP.	Noted comment(s) in support
13/6 Lichfields for Haven Leisure	<p>The representations are:</p> <p>1. emerging policy WNP13 (Countryside) should be deleted to avoid repetition with Policy SUS2 (Distribution of Development) of the Local Plan.</p>	Consider merging with WNP16
13/7 Dorset Council	<p>The relevant policy in the local plan is Policy SUS2 Distribution of Development. As drafted, Policy WNP16 seeks to control development outside the defined development boundary (DDB).</p> <p>91. Criterion 1 relates to the DDB and should be moved next to policy WNP16 or preferably combined to create a spatial strategy policy.</p> <p>92. Criterion 2 and paragraph 8.80 is duplicating policy found in the Local Plan and other parts of the Neighbourhood Plan and should be removed. Requirements relating to development outside defined development boundaries could be combined with policy text for WNP13 if not duplicating the Local Plan.</p>	Consider merging with WNP16
	<p>WNP14 & paras 8.81-8.85</p>	
14/1	I support WNPO14	Support Noted
14/2	Support WNP14 – but is this necessary given ENV policies in WDW&P LP.	Noted comment.
14/3	I am particularly pleased to see policies WNP14 for the reference to a riverside walkway from Upwey to Weymouth Town Centre, and a green corridor to the River Jordan, WNP15 to panoramas, vistas and views, and to Local Green Space. Given the reduction in local government staffing, finance and staffing I do however have concerns as to how effectively the local planning authority will be able to understand the detail and ambition of the Neighbourhood Plan and be able to support it in determining applications and defending planning appeals	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
14/4 Dorset Council	<p>93. Criterion 1 - It is unclear in what scenario a planning application would be influenced by this policy. It may be better to move this policy to an implementation and monitoring section of the Neighbourhood Plan. Particularly if there is a specific project in mind. If the aim is to duplicate Sutton Poyntz BNE1.3 but also encourage recreational development, consider rewording the policy in line with the Sutton Poyntz policy.</p> <p>94. Criterion 2 – Unsure where the phrase 'natural river process' part of the criterion would apply. Water compatible development relating to flood risk and coastal change is a national requirement as part of the NPPF and NPPG and is strictly controlled with categorisations of different types of development. There are concerns that this policy does not add any value and should be deleted. If there is a particular project or location that is inaccessible for maintenance perhaps this would be better added to a monitoring and implementation section.</p>	Explain in the supporting text what is meant by natural river processes e.g. Erosion, Transport and Deposition
	<p>WNP15 & paras 8.86-8.89</p>	
15/1	I support WNPO15	Support Noted
15/2	This seems to be a very restricted list of panoramas/vistas. What about Sandsfoot Castle Gardens and the view from the Peninsula or Stone Jetty across the bay as a minimum? There is nothing which covers views across the Fleet. The plan itself includes a picture of the Sandsfoot Gardens vista.	Review examples of views cited in the supporting text and how they are presented in map form
15/3	<p>WNP15: Panoramas, Vistas and Views Do not Support.</p> <p>This policy lacks specificity and could block needed development on the Peninsula Site which lies in the V9 view from the Nothe across the Harbour... This could also apply to V8</p>	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	where the Peninsula is a prominent feature of the skyline. These two views should be removed, and the policy reduced to supporting the already agreed SP Views	
15/4	WNP15 – I don't see how this can be enforced.	Noted comment(s) in support
15/5	WNP15 does not consider the currently protected view (2015 local plan) from the seafront by Café Oasis looking North and North West Paragraph	Review examples of views cited in the supporting text and how they are presented in map form
15/6	developers are likely to want to develop those areas that have those views. What is proposed to restrain/block those developers to uphold the policy.	Noted comment(s) in support
15/7	Map16B. The origin of view V8 is NOT on the 'Lookout Cafe' as written in the description. The northern view line should be shifted north to include the green spaces behind and beyond Brackendown Avenue and Budmouth Avenue	Review examples of views cited in the supporting text and how they are presented in map form
15/8 Wyke Regis Society	I couldn't find any mention of the views from Wyke Regis, which should be respected in any developments. Lanehouse Rocks and the footpaths there overlook the Chesil Beach. The allotments at Rylands Lane overlook Portland Harbour and Island, as does the ruined Coast Path all the way along to the Camp. I would like to point out that the resolution of the charts and maps is generally very poor online, so that even magnifying them greatly is no use. Also roads are illegible in many of the green space maps.	Review examples of views cited in the supporting text and how they are presented in map form
15/9	Map 16A This Map is taken from the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan, of which it is considered to be an essential element. It is therefore important that it is retained within the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan.	Support Noted
15/10 Weymouth Civic Society (P&E Cttee)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views and Vistas - the protection of special viewpoints (see below); Panoramas, Vistas And Views (Draft Policy WNP 15, Maps 16 A-C) <p>We are pleased that panoramas, vistas and views are included in the draft plan, and would like to stress how important it is that they should be protected from obstruction. Weymouth's coastal location makes it particularly critical that the magnificent views around its shores should be safeguarded. The consultation document lists only a limited number of viewpoints. We strongly recommend that the following should be added.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The view from the Lookout (above Newton's Cove) to Portland – an important historic view. • The view of Weymouth Bay from the beach and Esplanade, extending from the nearer cliffs and the White Nothe towards Portland, including the Nothe Fort. • Top of Nothe Steps across the Harbour, towards Weymouth Esplanade; the gap between the Round House and Pavilion Theatre is important, linking the harbour and beach. • Bowleaze Cove way Open Space eastwards towards Bowleaze Cove and Redcliff Point; • Nothe Fort south-westwards towards Bingleaves; • Nothe Fort and Nothe Peninsula towards Portland; • Bingleaves Open Space, north-east towards Newton's Cove and Nothe Peninsula; • Bingleaves Open Space, south towards Portland; • Smallmouth Cove towards Portland; 	Review examples of views cited in the supporting text and how they are presented in map form
15/11 Lichfields for Haven Leisure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The clause "but not limited to" should be removed from the emerging policy. Important panoramas, views and vistas should be identified at the plan-making stage to provide certainty for applicants, the community, and the decision-maker. Any views, vistas or panoramas in the plan set out need to be fully supported by evidence. 2. The emerging policy should include the ability for an applicant to include measures to mitigate any adverse impacts of a proposed development. 	Consider policy rewording to clause 1 in the light of comments received.
15/12 Dorset Council	<p>96. Approach - A landscape visual impact assessment (LVIA) should be commissioned on the identified views. Evidence around landscape sensitivity of the historic and built environment has been based on 'walkabouts' and one community consultation. The engagement and consultation should inform the commissioning of professional studies of the views (LVIA) that would be used as evidence to back up the public opinion found. Without this evidence the policy may not succeed at examination.</p> <p>97. Criterion 2 – Dorset Council object to the policy requirement that there should be 'no significant negative impact'. The test is considered too onerous, particularly based on the evidence. It is suggested the test should be 'New development should respect key views'.</p> <p>98. Viewpoints – We assume the vistas / views are as shown on Maps 17A and 1B and are accessible and public viewpoints.</p>	Consider policy changes to clauses 1 and 2 in the light of comments received.
	9 Development and Homes	
	Section 9 General	
H/1	I believe it is vital that we avoid turning Weymouth into one huge low-cost housing estate, just in order to satisfy short-term needs. Instead, we need to ensure that Weymouth continues to be an attractive holiday resort, as tourism is the major source of income for the town.	Noted comment

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
<p>H/2 Turley for Morrish Homes</p>	<p>Section 9 My client notes the significant evidence that has been prepared in support of the NP approach to maximising the delivery of affordable housing. This builds on the existing evidence of significant need. The Housing Needs Assessment (2021) in particular outlines the challenges with affordability (average house prices vs average income) , the extent of people on the affordable housing register, and in temporary accommodation. It estimates that up to 2,649 new affordable homes are required over the period 2021 to 2038. In addition, my client notes historical challenges of meeting this level of provision-based development plan policy that relies upon 35% affordable homes on all sites of 10 dwellings or more to secure the vast majority of affordable housing. Against this backdrop my client is fully supportive of the delivery of affordable housing being a key priority of the NP. Specifically, that the NP 'endorsed the Affordable Homes Paper produced by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group which seeks to maximises the provision of affordable homes, giving primacy to the needs of the local community.' It is noted that the Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) commissioned by the Steering Group in 2021 concluded that there was a chronic need for affordable homes in Weymouth, estimating that up to 2,649 new affordable homes are required over the period 2021 to 2038. However, as identified within the NP, the adopted Local Plan requires 35% of new homes, on sites of 10 dwellings or more, to be 'affordable'. Even if this were viable on all sites (which is not the case particularly on brownfield sites), it would only deliver 1,129 affordable homes over the plan period.</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
<p>H/3</p>	<p>Effective management of the environment is without doubt very important. With this in mind allowing housing to be built in the Preston area will cause significant drainage and flooding issues. I asked at the recent consultation and the reply was that they could not guarantee that the builders would be able to deal with this issue. This is undoubtedly worrying especially as numbers of houses will no doubt vary once the builder has the go ahead and with no enforcement of dealing with flooding and drainage this seems very careless with regards the environment.</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
<p>H/4</p>	<p>The Aims and Objectives of the Plan are very laudable but are not reflected in the development proposals in Section 9; specifically, the Environmental Sustainability Plan fails to meet the aim to 'preserve or enhance our unique environment' by proposing to build on land outside the development area</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
<p>H/5</p>	<p>The principles of green space are vital to human wellbeing, mental health, physical health via exercise and wildlife conservation. What I object to is the concentration of proposed housing development between Preston and Littlemore, given the extensive developments in Littlemoor already. Why is there not more development of brown field sites elsewhere in Dorset instead of removing green space and wildlife habitat</p>	<p>Noted objection to policies</p>
<p>H/6</p>	<p>Whilst all the aims set out to protect wildlife etc. If you're intent on building on green areas around my area ...Brackendown/ Budmouth and other areas in Weymouth, you are totally going against your aims of protecting the environment and wild life, which many of us have come to Weymouth to live and enjoy as with many visitors too.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policies</p>
<p>H/7</p>	<p>I strongly object to building on any land outside of the development boundary and the land at Lorton Meadows should be protected for the benefit of the environment and wildlife</p>	<p>Noted objection to policies</p>
<p>H/8</p>	<p>I strongly object to building on any land outside of the development boundary and the land at Lorton Meadows should be protected for the benefit of the environment.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policies</p>
<p>H/9</p>	<p>I strongly object to building outside of the development boundary defined in the 2015 Local Plan. We need to protection the open spaces</p>	<p>Noted objection to policies</p>
<p>H/10</p>	<p>Agree to objectives, but some proposed developments fail to protect special habitats and biodiversity, countryside and green spaces. They also fail to protect the character of the existing houses, and certainly destroy the landscape and visual impact.</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
<p>H/11</p>	<p>Good luck with Preston! Lol</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
<p>H/12</p>	<p>Section 9 Policies: There is no Policy that specifically addresses Social Housing and yet the plan states on page 66: 'The Local Plan consultation recently suggested, in 2021, that the provision of affordable homes for rent should be split 50:50 between 'social rent' and 'affordable rent'. Local needs, identified in the Housing Needs Analysis suggest a 60:40 split in favour of homes for social renting'. This rather suggests that there should be greater emphasis on the provision of Social Housing. Figures from the 'Inside Housing' magazine and website, state that from 2022, there has been a Net Annual loss of around 14,000 Social Rent Housing in the UK: 21,600 homes have been either sold off under right to buy or demolished and only 7,500 new social rent homes have been built, so stock is decreasing year on year. Extrapolating leads to the conclusion that over the last decade there has been a net loss of around 165,000 social rent homes, which leaves 4 million remaining or about 17% of total housing stock. The number of people needing Social Rented accommodation has not gone away; in fact it is probably increasing. These families are either living in the private rented sector or in bed and breakfast accommodation. In the case of those on low incomes who are unable to afford the ever-increasing cost of private</p>	<p>Noted comment.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	renting, councils have to top up rent with benefits. This is the proverbial 'Elephant in the Room' and is largely being ignored by councils and regrettably, the proposed Neighbourhood Plan falls woefully short of addressing this issue. There is no policy that specifically addresses Brownfield Development, affording it priority over Greenfield Development Land outside of the Defined Development Boundary (DDB) is already being developed at Markham and Little Francis WEY 10 and Lodmoor Gateway and Country Park Area WEY 8. This is infilling Greenspace and when viewed from an aerial perspective creates the impression of marked urbanisation, or as some may describe it, urban sprawl. The proposed plan to develop on further Greenspace is a serious erosion of the area's character.	
H/13	I shall leave that challenge to yourselves. But as long as people are randomly turning up as it's near the sea or the extra bodies the government forces on the town and county, I feel the housing issue war will never be won. The local families that have been around the area all their lives, should get local housing priorities over any of us. We will never have enough houses to live in for more reasons than one. Sad to admit.	Noted comment
H/14	Section 9 Homes for rental may be needed, but you are building the wrong sort of housing for sale for what is a predominantly elderly population. Unless you start building a lot more bungalows, Not apartments (most of us want a garden to potter in) then family houses will not be released onto the market. New homes developments generally in Weymouth are so boring, no character and tiny gardens, not screened from the road, landscaping is poor, insufficient open spaces for relaxing or leisure. No infrastructure such as community hubs, new schools or GP surgeries. Already waiting weeks for GP appointments which will get worse unless councils pull their finger out and get tough with developers on 106 agreements. Overall councils in the area are very weak in getting deals and let developers get away with doing very little for the community they will be impacting on resulting on a detrimental effect on that community.	Noted comment
H/15	Needs to be a far greater requirement to build housing in most areas to rid the area of homelessness furthermore assisted living needs to be extended so more people have the opportunity learning disabled and otherwise to live independently with support to a degree	Noted comment
H/16	Unable to read the specific policy whilst on mobile app but high price housing will only add more obstruction and destruction to the town	Noted comment
H/17	WNP 15 to WNP 42, the area can only be considered already overloaded during the summer holiday periods. More local residents will only cause extra problems with overcrowded parking and traffic hold-ups in the town.	Noted comment
H/18	Section 9 Generally I applaud the recognition and emphasis on providing more "affordable" homes. Planning authorities must be empowered to enforce developers to deliver the required number, i.e. 50%. Developments must include an emphasis on providing and promoting active transport, e.g. by way of safe walking and cycling routes particularly to and from schools. Get the young actively travelling, offset obesity and its likely complications and pressures on the NHS in a young person's later life. Building Regs via central and local government, needs to enforce the installation of renewable energy systems on all new-build projects and soon!	Noted comment
H/19	I support the Homes Policies as we need to address the housing crisis in Weymouth for local people. I support the inclusion of social housing within mixed estates. I would like to see greater emphasis on brownfield sites. The council could do more to bring empty homes back into use such as Compulsory Purchase.	Noted comment
H/20	This is the most controversial and difficult part of the plan for me. Our planning system is not fit for purpose and has consistently failed to deliver on homes for all since social housing was deconstructed by 1980's government policy. Whilst understanding the arguments for allocating homes I am deeply concerned that the plan is continuing to provide a vehicle for developers and land owners whose principal concern is their profit margin (I mean 20% profit for developers for "risk" is baked into site viability studies!). "Affordable" homes, energy efficient homes (e.g. solar and heat pumps), local infrastructure (e.g. sewage systems) and biodiversity net gain / "green" and "blue" infrastructure, are not of genuine concern to these chasing profit. For all the talk of "affordable" homes in our plan and nationally, today very few people can afford a new home or possibly even the home they are already in. Co-housing schemes are not given the primacy they need because they genuinely provide affordable homes and actually also tick many of our objectives. The elephant-in-the-room barriers, as mentioned above, are private land ownership and property development for profit. Weymouth Town Council and / or Dorset Council have the power to intervene in both these barriers through investment and their own ownership.	Noted comment
H/21	Support, especially WNP 18, 22, 23, 31, 37	Noted comment

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
H/22	<p>This the largest section of the plan should be subject to annual review, since the commitments to redevelopment should be subject to public scrutiny annually given the dynamics of the environment and economy. It is noted that this section was also supported by numerous walking surveys around each of the areas for development or redevelopment of existing sites. I encourage the strengthening in historical importance of the harbour-side properties including the brewery square re-enablement of the main brewery building as joint commercial and residential occupants. I would encourage you to consider other coastal / sailing locations such as Cowes (IoW), Lymington and Rye where they have succeeded in creating a mixed economy in balancing the many choices of coffee bar, charity shop but including sailing arts and crafts within a leisurely, largely pedestrianised with some limited access for vehicles. The last remaining comment on this section highlights an oversight insofar I do not see any reference to planning for residential homes. With the increasing number of the elderly, the legacy of the baby boom in the 50's/60's increasing numbers will be in need of social care. I see this not just a threat to how we may cope with these numbers but an opportunity for were we take the suggestions made by Camilla Cavendish in her book '10 lessons for living longer better', we may see the numbers of public houses as being the centre of our support for housing the elderly as part of a community that also includes affordable 'lets' for students and young adults who also may be encouraged to act as carers in support of digital health initiatives and stimulus to prevent 'loneliness' and risk of 'falling' by promoting regular exercise within the community. Perhaps WNP59 should be extended to reflect this opportunity.</p>	Noted comment
H/23	<p>For this section in general (no specific reference) no consideration seems to have been given to the impact on local services. The implementation of so many new homes will inevitably lead to an increase in population with new people moving to the area. I am concerned about the pressure this will put on our public services such as health services, waste management, emergency services to name just a few. Many of these services are already struggling and not being provided with additional resources to cope with the rise in demand.</p>	Noted comment
H/24	<p>We need to look at sustainable communities, community shared living spaces, second home buyers, having enough infrastructure to support the growth in population.</p>	Noted comment
H/25	<p>Paras 9.6, 9.8 and generally. The Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan cannot hope to make any significant difference to the supply of affordable homes if the supply, in large part, is left to private housing developers whose primary function, entirely reasonably, is to make a profit. The provision of housing in this country has always been subject to Central Government policy. For at least the last 30 years that policy has been to privatise the provision of market housing and affordable housing and to prevent Local Authorities from making a meaningful difference. It would be more effective for the WNP to set out enhanced policies for WTC via DC to purchase properties either vacant or on the open market which can then be made permanently available for those in need of affordable housing. Funding could be partly from central government (i.e. taxation), partly from new build developer financial contribution direct to a ringfenced LA scheme, and partly by significant increase in council tax rates on second homes/ holiday lets. This general approach is being taken by other LA's such as Plymouth and has had some limited roll out by Dorset Council already. Could the potential for this approach as the primary route to the provision of affordable housing be included as a specific policy? It would mean an enlargement in DC housing departments but could increase the provision and control of affordable housing.</p>	Noted comment
H/26	<p>Fails to ensure that proposed developments are suitable for the locations, are not outside the Development Boundary, and has an appropriate mix of dwellings for the location. Essential to have significant investment in developing the appropriate infrastructure, in addition to increasing the necessary facilities such as Doctors, Dentists, Schools, etc.</p>	Noted comment
H/27 The Ramblers (Dorset Area)	<p>We wonder if the statement that "New development should ensure that rights of way are incorporated into the layout whenever possible" which appears in paragraph 8.52 would be better incorporated into Section 9 (see comment on paragraph 8.52 for more detail).</p>	Include reference to protecting and incorporating public rights of way in the supporting text to WNP20
H/28	<p>The Plan should not be using greenfield sites for housing development. More use of brownfield sites should definitely be considered, using existing urbanised spaces, reusing derelict land, especially land owned by the Council. Like redeveloping the land cleared by demolishing the North Quay Council buildings near the town bridge, this would make an ideal site for social housing and could be quickly developed on that space. I object to the development above Budmouth, Brackendown and Wyke Oliver. The land is unsuitable for development. It floods and has numerous springs hence it's nickname by Locals '7 Springs'. The land is clay on top of a hard rock layer. With the excess rain water runoff, created by new housing on that site, there would be more landslips like the one that occurred at 41 Enkworth Drive. The residents of 55 to 61 Budmouth Ave are constantly</p>	Noted objection to policies

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>having flooded gardens, by the springs on the land proposed for the new housing. The water cascades off the fields in heavy rain, creating a muddy river down Bodkin Lane. The local road network could not support the increased road traffic created by these developments, especially during the build phase, how will the large heavy vehicles get access to the top of the hill. The roads are too narrow, it will be dangerous. The previous neighbourhood plan (created before the pandemic in 2017) concluded that Budmouth, Brackendown and Wyke Oliver development (Wey14) was unsuitable for development. Why is it now suitable, is it because a developer has purchased the land? The BVA report dated 27th September, concludes that the Budmouth and Brackendown development is unviable for social housing. This contradicts the aims of the plan to have 50% social housing!</p>	
H/29	<p>If the housing as predicted is built at present, there is not enough year-round jobs now what is going to be different in the future. Should we not be looking at providing housing near to the jobs. Trying to get to Dorchester and beyond takes a long-time morning and evening and in the tourist season it gets worse. If people do not have a car the public transport system will need to be overhauled and fares lowered to make it worthwhile to travel.</p>	Noted comment
H/30	<p>The overall effect of the plan is to build on areas that are precious to the local communities. Weymouth is made up of a number of unique villages, the plan is developing on greenfield sites between the villages, it is closing the green spaces and corridors between them, and not preserving the character of Weymouth for future generations. Effectively Weymouth will over time become one large urban sprawl. I cannot support this plan.</p>	Noted comment
H/31	<p>What plans are in place to meet the increased housing stock with increased services and infrastructure? Why are we not doing more to repurpose existing derelict building and the land they sit on? How many additional houses are really required. Where is the evidence that quantifies this demand and are we at risk of building an excessive number of houses which will never be occupied?</p>	Noted comment
H/32	<p>We should push for the area north of Dorchester to be the principal housing site for West Dorset. It is closer to jobs</p>	Noted comment
H/33	<p>Until we have more businesses and jobs coming to the area it is ridiculous to even consider building more homes. This town currently relies heavily on the leisure and holiday business because it's a beautiful area but building more and more homes will not help that.</p>	Noted comment
H/34	<p>Your proposed plan doesn't seem to have taken into account:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The massive amount of building already taking place around Weymouth and Littlemoor. If this building had been regulated to actually be affordable housing, you would have already achieved your aim of providing affordable and low-cost housing. 2. Weymouth's young population is falling, and projections show that this fall (which is mirrored nationally) will continue, the housing that is being proposed is actually just dragging new people into Weymouth many of whom are retired and economically inactive. 3. Preston is a unique area and would not be enhanced by housing that would change its character. 4. The proposed housing in the plan would exacerbate the traffic especially as Preston does not have particularly good bus routes. The direct bus to Dorchester is infrequent and takes 47 minutes. 5. Walking to central Weymouth from Budmouth Ave takes 40 mins for a fit person and so doesn't meet your aim of providing housing near to towns. In fact all the housing would inevitably bring much more traffic to all the roads around Weymouth. 	Noted objection to policies
H/35	<p>The Weymouth and West Dorset Plan which was adopted in 2015 decided that the proposed Preston sites were unacceptable and that the existing development boundaries should remain. Unlike this current plan it was produced after much public consultation. The suitability of the two Preston sites has not changed since then.</p>	Noted objection to policies
H/36	<p>An overall comment relating to Housing and Development. The Neighbourhood plan omits to justify why/why not the development areas are selected. If challenged by a developer at a later date for a development outside the designated areas, it is not clear on what grounds the Council can object - particularly is the Neighbourhood plan does not achieve its full target of new housing. All the selection of the Old Lodmoor Tip and suitable for development may be objected to on the grounds of gas, etc. Does the Neighbourhood plan prevent this sort of objection</p>	Noted objection to policies
H/37	<p>WNP 16 – WNP 37. This is building more homes for retired people to move in to the area putting more pressure on the health services. Alternatively they will be purchased for second home owners and change the community in to an Airbnb Neighbourhood in the summer and a ghost town in the winter.</p>	Noted comment
H/38	<p>Weymouth is superbly sited. It would be a tragic shame if its natural beauty and that of its satellite areas were allowed to be swamped still further by developers. Of course, people</p>	Noted comment

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions														
	need decent housing, but the impact of each potential site must be carefully assessed and the whole thing sensitively handled.															
<p>H/39 Dorset Council</p>	<p>Chapter 9 sets out the housing context in Weymouth including a chronic shortage of affordable housing as evidenced by a housing needs assessment (HNA). An assessment of the known supply of future housing concludes future commitments are unlikely to address this in-balance in the housing market.</p> <p>Housing Requirement</p> <p>National policy requires local plans to set out a housing requirement figure for designated neighbourhood areas. No methodology is prescribed but figures should take account of factors such as the latest evidence of local housing need, the population of the area, and most recent planning strategy.</p> <p>Section 2.10 of the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan (2021) proposed that the housing requirement figures for neighbourhood areas are the sum of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • completions since the beginning of the plan period; • extant planning permissions; • housing allocations; • capacity on major sites (of 10 or more dwellings) within development boundaries as evidenced through the SHLAA; and • a windfall allowance on minor sites (of less than 10 dwellings) <p>Under this methodology, paragraph 9.7 of the Neighbourhood Plan explains the housing requirement for Weymouth, was calculated as 3,225 dwellings. This methodology assumed a Plan period until 2038 and a base date 1 April 2021.</p> <p>Now that more than two years have elapsed, since these figures were originally calculated they can be updated using the latest monitoring data, which is dated 1 April 2023. These updated figures are set out in the table below and continue to assume a Plan period April 2021 to April 2038. Consequently two years of completions data has now been recorded.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 927 1182 1211"> <thead> <tr> <th>Source of supply</th> <th>Number of Dwellings</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Completions (1 April 2021-31 March 2023)</td> <td>314</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sites with Planning Permission at April 2023</td> <td>1396</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Site Allocations without Planning Permission (both current & proposed)</td> <td>550</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Large Site Windfall Allowance (based on sites identified in the SHLAA)</td> <td>150</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Small Site Windfall Allowance (based on past completion rates)</td> <td>708</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>3118</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Source of supply	Number of Dwellings	Completions (1 April 2021-31 March 2023)	314	Sites with Planning Permission at April 2023	1396	Site Allocations without Planning Permission (both current & proposed)	550	Large Site Windfall Allowance (based on sites identified in the SHLAA)	150	Small Site Windfall Allowance (based on past completion rates)	708	Total	3118	<p>Up-date housing demand and supply tables in the Introduction to Section 9 prior to publishing the Submission Version of the NP</p>
Source of supply	Number of Dwellings															
Completions (1 April 2021-31 March 2023)	314															
Sites with Planning Permission at April 2023	1396															
Site Allocations without Planning Permission (both current & proposed)	550															
Large Site Windfall Allowance (based on sites identified in the SHLAA)	150															
Small Site Windfall Allowance (based on past completion rates)	708															
Total	3118															
<p>H/40 Dorset Council</p>	<p>Para. 9.13 - The sentence that states the Neighbourhood Plan will 'extend the influence' of the local plan on housebuilding' is unclear. This needs to be rephrased.</p>	<p>Change para. 9.13 to read: "extend the influence of the development plan on housebuilding"</p>														
<p>H/41 Dorset BID</p>	<p>I understand housing is needed but feel rural areas are best suited for plans, away from town centres. We need to continue to support the town centres and make them attractive for visitors, not discouraging them. If we continue to have high density housing within the town centre it will become a residential town and both residents and holidaymakers will go elsewhere, shop out of town, and leave Weymouth a less desired town to visit. This will impact on the councils' resources to invest or maintain Weymouth. Weymouth is an asset for Dorset and both councils should be planning for the future of more visitors and high spending in our much-loved award-winning businesses, this will all be lost if these plans get approved.</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>														
Section 9 Introduction																
<p>H/41</p>	<p>If further significant housing was allowed in the Preston area, we will suffer with significant drainage and flooding issues. There have been severe issues with the recent heavy rain for example, a deluge or water can be seen coming from houses along Budmouth Avenue that border a field earmarked for development.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policies</p>														
<p>H/42</p>	<p>We should concentrate on derelict buildings and not green field sites</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>														
<p>H/43</p>	<p>Para. 9.12 Most people want their personal environment to remain unchanged. That's why they select certain communities that meet their aspirations. Forcing change in society only creates unrest, and anger and curtails enjoyment, and less cooperation with local and general government.</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>														
<p>H/44</p>	<p>I am glad that it is acknowledged that 7000 new homes is unachievable. There needs to be much more provision of social and affordable housing - not just lip service to it.</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>														
<p>H/45</p>	<p>We desperately need more affordable homes for local people and need to stop purchase of second homes and stop more holiday homes being acquired</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>														

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
H/46	I think the Council should look into developing the empty and unused buildings as a matter of urgency. The main ones being, the Old Guildhall, the unused bowling alley in St Nicholas Street, the empty Methodist church and the old council offices on North Quay.	Noted comment
H/47	Section 9 intro. Whilst identifying the housing need has been done, are there any statistics on how many properties are vacant across the plan area? We shouldn't be building new accommodation if there is actually adequate (but misused) accommodation already available.	Noted comment
H/48	9.11 states a site options assessment was conducted, the assessment had none of the due diligence of the multiple previous SHLAA's conducted for this area and areas that have been repeatedly thoroughly assessed as Unsuitable for Development are now identified as suitable sites with no assessment. One can only assume these sites have suddenly been reclassified under pressure from developers.	Noted comment
H/49	Para 9.8 What guarantees are in place to ensure that 35% of new builds would be affordable? What guarantees are in place to prevent 2nd home owners purchasing these properties? The price of the land coupled with the development/ building costs would, I feel, be commercially unviable.	Noted comment
H/50 Weymouth Civic Society (P&E Cttee)	We have concerns at the very high figures for new housing required, determined from above, and outside the control of the Neighbourhood Plan. We consider that the proposed development of greenfield sites for housing is most regrettable, eating away at the green agricultural fringes of the town. However, we reluctantly accept that new sites will have to be found, including greenfield land, to fulfil these high demands, despite the very large tracts of land already in the pipeline for housing in the local area, including especially at Littlemoor and Chickerell. Within the limited Neighbourhood Plan area, there is little additional land which could be developed further without impinging on areas of high landscape value or other unsuitable sites.	Noted comment
H/51 Public Health Dorset	We note that in the emerging Dorset Local Plan, good design in respect of its influence on people's lives and its ability to enhance health and wellbeing (3.8.2. of the consultation document for the Dorset Local Plan) is recognised, and this is reflected in the draft neighbourhood plan and very much welcomed (point 9.14). PHD would like to suggest a requirement for developers to demonstrate residential housing has adequate ventilation and space to dry clothing, recognising the impact this can have on indoor air quality and, for example, the production of damp and mould within the home.	Add paragraph to supporting text to WNP20 to include the call from Public Health Dorset for developers to be cognisant of "the need for adequate ventilation and space to dry clothing"
WNP16 & paras 9.15-9.18		
16/1	I support WNPO16	Support Noted
16/2	WNP16 recommendations for development in this plan have ignored the current development boundaries and assumed a future local plan will move the development boundary. This assumption has no support or basis in fact and therefore the NP has to operate within the current development boundaries. Again this is another policy that has been ignored by the NP.	Noted comment(s) in support
16/3	WNP16: Development Boundaries – It seems like all the proposed housing developments fall within the development boundaries of this section making them non-significant areas as far as environmental protections go. What are the criteria for defining extensions to these development boundaries? It appears to be a summation of all the new development proposals. I understand that building new houses is critical for the future but why spend so much time on the environment, landscapes, green spaces etc. in this plan, when the new development proposals are all identified as non-significant areas with respect to these issues?	Noted comment(s) in support
16/4 Chapman Lily Planning Ltd for Bellway homes	Para. 9.18 Amendments to the Defined Development Boundary are deferred to the emerging Dorset Local Plan to take into account the allocations including that promoted by Bellway Homes (i.e. WNP24). The Neighbourhood Plan should incorporate an amended DDB as the first adopted document make those changes itself, rather than wait for the LP to catch up.	Consider in the light of the policy approach whether the NP should redefine the DDB
16/5	WNP16 I fully support that the new development boundaries should be restricted to the existing development area without exception. The lack of available housing for people on low incomes demonstrates that the current system of it being provided by developers has failed and therefore an alternative is required. Following the 2nd World War there was an enormous need for what is now termed "affordable housing" which was met by implementing substantial schemes of "social housing" by local authorities, I consider there is a strong case to repeat this to meet Weymouth's needs and that suitable sites would be 2 off Littlemoor Road and 2 off Chickerell Road, adjacent to the Football Stadium, which are development areas in the Chickerell Neighbourhood Plan. In addition the following paragraph in the Chickerell Neighbourhood Plan suggests land adjacent to	Noted comment.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	Southill as suitable for development: - "10.5 A site off Radipole Lane adjoining Southill was identified during the Local Plan review 2018 Preferred Options Consultation, for some 350 dwellings. Although not actively promoted through this Neighbourhood Plan in the absence of any identified local need, it is accepted this site could be developed. However, this is not a policy of the Chickerell Neighbourhood Plan. "I also consider that the performance of the Housing Association contracted to deal with the provision of Affordable Housing in Weymouth should be subject to review by the Housing Authority, Dorset Council.	
16/6	WNP16: Development Boundaries development to take place within the defined development boundary. Support: Shouldn't this say development is preferred on Brownfield sites ...	Noted comment(s) in support
16/7 Lichfields for Haven Leisure	WNP16 Development Boundaries The representations are: 1. It is not clear as to whether this emerging policy relates only to housing development or not. It appears to, given the preceding text but this needs to be clarified. 2. If it is intended to relate to all development, this draft policy needs to be reviewed as it does not have regard to the general policies of the adopted Local Plan e.g. Policy SUS2 (Distribution of Development). 3. If the intention is for the policy to apply to all development, this element of the Regulation 14 consultation ought to be carried out again so that an appropriate opportunity is given for the draft policy to be considered and representations made.	Add a paragraph after 9.14 explaining which of policies that follow in Section 9 are housing only and which apply to development of most types.
16/8 Dorset Council	WNP16: Development boundaries In general, Dorset Council is supportive of communities who wish to update and amend their DDB. Paragraph 3.5.4 of the WDWPLP, explains that "Neighbourhood development plans have the potential to deliver a step-change in the level of growth in the plan area. They can make significant changes to the policies in this plan, so long as they do not undermine its strategic objectives and approach. Examples of changes could include: extending existing defined development boundaries, or adding them to settlements that do not currently have a boundary" Therefore the principle of this policy is accepted. 99. Approach – It is noted that Policies WNP13 Countryside and WNP16 Development Boundaries work together to guide development to sustainable locations within the DDB of Weymouth. It is suggested that these two policies are combined. 100. Paragraph 9.18 recognises that since the Local Plan was adopted in 2015 some development has been permitted outside the DDB. The supporting text anticipates Dorset Council will review and amend the DDB as part of the preparation of the Dorset Council Local Plan. The Local Plan timetable set out in the Local Development Scheme could see a lengthy gap between the making of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan and the adoption of the Dorset Council Local Plan. It is therefore recommended that that Neighbourhood Plan amends the DDB to reflect major development proposals outside of the DDB such as the allocations in this draft Neighbourhood Plan. 101. Paragraph 9.18 – Please amend, Dorset Council is not intending to undertake a comprehensive review of all existing settlement/development boundaries as part of the process of preparing the Dorset Council Local Plan.	Merge policy WNP13 with this policy Consider policy rewording to clause 3 in the light of comments received. Consider in the light of the policy approach whether the NP should redefine the DDB. Re-word para. 9.18 to record that it is not the intention of Dorset Council "to undertake a comprehensive review of all existing settlement / development boundaries as part of the process of preparing the Dorset Council Local Plan." Seek clarification from DC as whether it may choose to revise Weymouth boundaries in the light of NP and new LP policies.
	WNP17 & paras 9.19-9.23	
17/1	Design – should also apply to developments close to heritage assets not within a conservation area. Reference in Plan: WNP17	Consider policy rewording to clause 2 in the light of comments received.
17/2	WNP17 This policy should be extended to incorporate a commitment to producing local character area assessments. in co-operation with local residents. equivalent to that included in the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan. The current Character Area assessment (referred to in 9.20, page 61) is a desk top study which is considered both inadequate and unrepresentative of the character areas in Weymouth.	Noted comment.
17/3	WNP17 point 2 - is weak and should commit to producing a detailed and comprehensive Conservation Area appraisal for each area.	Noted comment.
17/4	WNP17: Design	Noted

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	No houses should be being built without solar panels and other alternative non fossil fuel forms of power and heating. The plan does not go far enough.	comment(s) in support
17/5	WNP17: Support Design – development to be of high quality and sympathetic to the surrounding buildings and environment.	Noted comment(s) in support
17/6 Lichfields for Haven Leisure	WNP17 Design It is not clear as to whether this emerging policy relates only to housing development or not. It appears to, given the title of this chapter and the preceding text and draft policies but this needs to be clarified.	Add a paragraph after 9.14 (see 16/7 above)
17/7 Dorset Council	WNP17: Design The Landscape and Urban Design team welcome the inclusion of a Design policy. 102. Criterion 1 – The Landscape and Urban Design team have concerns with the phrase “harmonise with the recognised local character”, because in a scenario where the local character was poor, it would be inappropriate to repeat this poor design. The following extract from the North Dorset Local Plan – Part 1, Policy 24 resolves this scenario and could inform the wording of a revised policy. “In places that already have a positive image or character, the design of new development should respond to and reinforce locally distinctive patterns of development, landscape and culture. In places where positive elements are lacking, proposals should seek to create a distinctive and coherent sense of place through the use of intelligent and imaginative design solutions.” In this context it is important to understand the baseline you are measuring against. 103. Criterion 2 – The policy team note that the drafting of criterion 2 is inconsistent with the statutory obligation on the planning authority that arises from Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. When exercising their planning functions councils should ensure that ‘special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.’ The phrase conserve should be removed and replaced with preserve. 104. Criterion 3 – The Landscape and Urban Design team are concerned with the term “innovative design” and what’s meant by this phrase. Can more detail be given in the supporting text? 105. Criterion 4 – The criterion repeats National and Local Plan policy and would not add any additional value. The criterion could be deleted. 106. Paragraph 9.21 – We note that the supporting text mentions that design statements should accompany major development. The Council’s Validation Checklist refers to a wider type of applications that must submit a design and access statement. The wider list includes one or more dwellings and buildings with a floor space of 100 sqm in a designated area such as a Conservation Area or an application for a listed building. It is recommended the paragraph is updated to refer to ‘design and access statement’ required by the Council’s Validation Checklist.	Consider policy rewording to clauses 1, 2, 4 in the light of comments received. Add reference in para. 9.21 to the ‘design and access statement’ requirement by Dorset Council’s Validation Checklist.
	WNP18 & paras 9.24-9.27	
18/1	WNP18 I understand the desire to keep retrofit measures in keeping with the local setting, but I worry that this may add more expense to what an expensive undertaking is already. Reducing carbon emissions and heat loss through retrofit measures is fundamentally more important than the look of a building and we mustn't deter people from doing it by forcing them to incur unnecessary extra costs	Noted comment.
18/2	WNP18: Extensions and Alterations - energy efficiency related improvements to align with the character of the area. Support: But is it necessary given building regs and WDW&P LP.	Noted comment(s) in support
18/3 Lichfields for Haven Leisure	WNP18 Extensions and Alterations The representations are: 1. It is not clear as to whether this emerging policy relates only to housing development or not. It appears to, given the title of this chapter and the preceding text and draft policies but this needs to be clarified.	Change title of WNP18 to read: <i>Policy WNP18: Building Extensions and Alterations</i>
18/4 Dorset Council	WNP18: Extensions and alterations 107. Alterations - The Landscape and Urban Design team are concerned that the policy is seeking to cover too much by including alterations. For example, solar panels could not comply with this policy. The policy could instead be broken up into two separate sections such as extensions, as a point and alterations as a separate point. 108. Criterion 1, first sentence - ‘Retrofit measures’ needs defining or perhaps use ‘environmental improvements’ instead if this is what is intended. The ‘prevailing character of the area’ would also benefit from further explanation. 109. Criterion 2 - The Landscape and Urban Design team would query which design guidance the policy is referencing? This should be clarified in the supporting text. 110. Openings - The Landscape and Urban Design team have suggested that the policy could refer to ‘void to solid’ ratios and / or building ‘detailing’.	Consider policy rewording to clause 1 in the light of comments received. Add reference in para. 9.27 the appropriate current design guidance for the area.
	WNP19 & paras 9.28-9.34	
19/1	WNP 19	Noted comment.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	should include a commitment to create a Local List of non-designated heritage assets facilitated by Weymouth Town Council.	
19/2	WNP19 Agreed.	Support Noted
19/3	Conservation Areas (Map 18 p 64) The recognition that Sutton Poyntz falls within a Conservation Area (shown on Map 18, number 5) is important and features highly in the SPNP.	Noted comment(s) in support
19/4	WNP19 Heritage Assets – development proposals not to cause harm to heritage assets or their setting. Support:	Support Noted
19/5	Para. 9.34. There is a well-established system for inspecting and grading buildings of architectural merit by people who are trained and experienced to do so. I do not think it is desirable for "the community to nominate assets that will have protection within the planning system." Who is to do the nomination? Do they have any experience? Once nominated, how are they "protected" by the NP? As an example, if I had nominated the former Council offices on North Quay as a building of some contemporary architectural and townscape interest, as well as a significant part of Weymouth's development history, would this proposed policy have protected it? If not, the policy seems meaningless and should be removed.	Noted comment.
19/6 Lichfields for Haven Leisure	WNP19 Heritage Assets The representations are: 1. The requirements of the emerging policy should be consistent with the NPPF. 2. In this case, there is nothing in the emerging policy as currently drafted that adds to the NPPF and its accompanying national guidance. 3. With reference to paragraph 9.31 of the emerging NP, the community understandably would like the NP to appreciate the value of the heritage assets but this does not mean Policy ENV4 (Heritage Assets) of the Local Plan needs to be restated. 4. The draft policy can be deleted.	Noted comment.
19/7 Dorset Council	WNP19 Heritage Assets The following comments have been received from the Conservation Team. 111. Approach - Overall, the intention of statements should more closely reflect those established under ENV4 of the Local Plan. Statements should be more concise and pertinent in emphasising an informed commitment toward protecting designated and non-designated heritage assets. 112. The policy team would add that the draft policy is not consistent with statutory legislation and the policy requirements in the NPPF which create conflict and uncertainty to apply. 113. Criterion 1 - The principal objective, in heritage conservation terms, is that all proposed development should be aligned to causing 'no harm' to heritage assets and their setting. The narrative above, should clearly reflect this understanding. "Development proposals should demonstrate, where relevant, that they respect and will cause no harm to heritage assets and their setting." 114. Criterion 2 - The statement is overly wordy, comprising one sentence to highlight its intention. Consider restructuring. 115. Criterion 3 – This statement reflects the made Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan policy HE1 Protecting Archaeology where there were known areas of 'archaeological potential'. Such an approach however may not be appropriate Weymouth wide. It is suggested that an approach that reflects the validation checklist (1 October 2022) would be more flexible. The checklist advises "For all applications involving the disturbance of ground within an Area of Archaeological Potential as defined in the development plan or in other areas in the case of a major development proposal or significant infrastructure works, an applicant may need to commission an Archaeological Desk-based Assessment, geophysical survey and/or trench evaluation and submit relevant conclusions as part of the heritage statement." 116. Criterion 4 - Development should always aim to present as an opportunity for enhancement. Consider adding the text 'and enhance'. "Where appropriate, development should take opportunities within the setting of any heritage assets to better reveal and enhance their significance." 117. Criterion 5 – All planning decision are made in accordance with the Development Plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. There is no need to repeat this requirement in the policy. 118. Paragraph 9.32 - To reiterate, the principal objective, in heritage conservation terms, is that all proposed development should be aligned to causing no harm to heritage assets and their setting. The narrative set out in paragraph 9.32, should clearly reflect this understanding. In its current format the statement would benefit from restructuring. Essentially, proposed development should aim to cause no harm to an asset. The scheme should only serve to enhance an asset in presentation. A proposed scheme must not impact on the ability to appreciate all attributes associated with an asset's significance and any identified contributions made by its setting.	Consider policy rewording to clauses 1, 2, 3, 5 in the light of comments received. Extend and re-word para. 9.32 to stress the need to cause no harm and serve only to enhance (with reference to NPPF).

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	WNP20 & paras 9.35-9.38	
20/1	Para. 9.37 - Consideration needs to be made for the fact that post pandemic a larger percentage of the working population work from home - so this should be taken into account in housing design (see p97 10.4 23% worked from home) - I imagine although this will have reduced a significant proportion of the working population remain working from home at least part of the week. Agree with the importance of open space - and private gardens should not be underestimated even for those living alone - likewise allotments and community growing spaces	Noted comment.
20/2	Pleased to read that Policy WPN20 continues to support the provision of Lifetime Homes or comparable measures to provide more easily accessible homes for residents with disabilities. Ideally provision should be increased further to recognise the number of family homes as well as individual homes that should recognise the need for easy access and use by people with mobility disability as residents or visitors though it is recognised that for wide provision to offset the paucity of accessible homes in the existing housing stock further revision of the Building Regulations is likely to be needed.	Include reference to the value of a range of lifetime homes in the supporting text.
20/3	Policies 20 to 22 should state explicitly that the priority for development of Homes is on Brownfield Sites within the DDB and that the greatest emphasis based upon need is to be support for social housing provision preferably designed built and administered through the Local Authority.	Noted comment.
20/4	WNP20 Agreed. Robust conditions and surveillance of and insistence on same.	Noted comment(s) in support
20/5 CG Fry and Son	WNP20 Major Housing Sites Sub point i) of WNP20 notes 10% of dwellings should satisfy Lifetime Homes Standards. This point would benefit from further clarification. Lifetime Homes has effectively been replaced with Building Regulations M4(2) Accessible and adaptable dwellings and M4(3) Wheelchair user dwellings. The NP should state if a specific mix of M4(2) and M4(3) is sought and how this requirement in the NP dovetails with the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan in this respect.	Include reference to the value of a range of lifetime homes in the supporting text.
20/6	WNP20 North Quay Former Council Offices Site Several years ago there was a plan that suggested recreating the old High Street (continuing on from the Boot Inn and Old Town Hall) with architecture similar to that along the north side of the harbour, the same as the buildings that replaced the old fire station with the harbourside of the High Street being expensive properties backed by affordable housing on the Chapplehay side. If this plan were to be resurrected and prompted, I would support it as would a lot of other locals I know.	Noted comment(s) in support
20/7	WNP20 Major Housing Sites – places specific requirements on new large housing developments. Support:	Support Noted
20/8	WNP20 The public transport system at present is in a dire state and would need to be substantially improved in order to accommodate the increased population generated. I do not see anything outlined to address this issue. How many more cars, electric or otherwise, will be added to an already overcrowded road system. 500 plus.	Add definition of Lifetime Homes to the Glossary.
20/9	General statement, Weymouth being I believe 3rd largest conurbation in Dorset. Should there be wider distribution of the housing, is there enough in Weymouth now. WPN20, major housing sites is there a way to ensure that developers do not cram as much building as they can into developments, increasing "garden spaces" or green space between properties and ensure adequate parking to new developments for about least 3 car park spaces for 3 beds and above.	Noted comment.
20/10	Map 19 page 66. This area should not be a major development site. It will completely ruin the vistas/views referred to earlier and the biodiversity, wildlife habitats of the bird reserves and its surrounds.	Noted objection to policy
20/11	It is suggested that a definition of Lifetime Homes as referred to in Policy WNP20 should be included in the Glossary.	Consider when drafting next version
20/12 Dorset Council	WNP20 Major Housing sites The relevant policy in the local plan is ENV13 Achieving high levels of environmental performance. The eight sub criteria under the first sentence set out in draft policy WNP20 are aimed at ensuring the development of major housing sites are of a consistent standard to provide a high-quality living environment. These criteria have been established in response to community consultation including a critique of recent housing developments. The second sentence introduces the concept of 'Walkable Neighbourhoods'. 119. Approach – We query the deliverability of all policy requirements on constrained brownfield land within the town centre. Has the Neighbourhood Plan steering group	#Consider policy rewording to clause 1 and 3 in the light of comments received. Change supporting text to define what is meant by "adequate" in ii, iii, and iv, and "satisfactory" in vii.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>investigated the deliverability of policy requirements on brownfield land taking account of practicable considerations – i.e. available space and viability.</p> <p>120. Criterion i) Following the Government's 2015 'housing standards review' Lifetime Homes standards were replaced by the optional building regulations standard M4(2) entitled 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'. The Written Ministerial Statement (25 March 2015) advises that "Neighbourhood plans should not be used to apply the new national technical standards."</p> <p>121. Criteria ii and iii) reflect Policy ENV11 Criterion i) bullet point 4. The policy or supporting text should define what is 'adequate', as this is open to interpretation and could vary dependant on the person assessing. The policy text can also remove 'where appropriate'.</p> <p>122. Criterion iv) reflects Policy ENV11 Criterion i) bullet point 4 although it would helpful if the supporting text could define what 'sufficient' open space and private garden standards may be.</p> <p>Reference to 'community orchard or allotment space' may be too onerous on an application of 10 units but could be suitable for a larger scale site.</p> <p>123. Criterion vi) reflects NPPF, paragraphs 107 e) and 112 e). The adopted Local Plan does not contain a position on 'electric vehicle charging points' however Dorset Council consulted on an 'Interim Guidance Note – Sustainability Statement and checklist' for planning application in June 2023 which notes "The inclusion of electric vehicle charging points in new development is an important issue and it should be noted that in June 2022 this requirement was incorporated into the Building Regulations1." The criteria also appear to duplicate Policy WNP55.</p> <p>124. Criterion vii) reflects Policy ENV16 Criterion iii). It is unclear if the policy is referring to external lighting? Can you define what makes it satisfactory i.e. brightness, number, positioning, etc.. It may be helpful to provide a link to national planning guidance Light pollution - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</p> <p>125. Criterion viii) Opportunities for district heating networks along with other sustainable development issues for the site should be explored through a nationally recognised assessment, such as BREEAM Communities. Agree that any firmer requirement would need to be evidenced by additional viability work.</p> <p>126. Second sentence – This criterion introduces the concept of 'Walkable Neighbourhoods' which is a similar concept to '15-minute cities' and '20-minute Neighbourhoods'. The key principle is that a neighbourhood is a place where active and sustainable ways of transportation, such as walking and cycling are increased, and motor vehicle traffic reduced.</p> <p>The objective is to design neighbourhoods where all key facilities are within a 15-20-minute walk. The concept in the UK has been drawn from international experiences in Portland, USA; Melbourne, Australia; and Paris, France. UK based organisation such as Sustrans and TCPA are seeking to widen the concept in National and Local planning policy.</p> <p>127. The NPPF does not refer to this concept however the National Model Design Code highlights that a compact and walkable neighbourhood with a mix of uses and facilities reduces demand for energy and supports health and wellbeing, with the definition of 'walkable' described as local facilities being within no more than a 10-minute walk (800 metre radius). In the wider sense, this new concept reflects the more well-known principle of sustainable development that runs throughout the NPPF as well as through national design and transport policy and can therefore be supported.</p>	<p>Add reference in the supporting text to DC advice that <i>"opportunities for district heating networks along with other sustainable development issues for the site should be explored through a nationally recognised assessment, such as BREEAM Communities."</i></p>
	<p>WNP21 & paras 9.39-9.42</p>	
21/1	WNP21 Agreed.	Support Noted
21/2	WNP21 Housing Mix supports housing size and tenure consistent with local housing needs. Support: Does this mean that when the plan is made developers should apply the Weymouth HNA tenure mix quoted in para 9.41 or can they instead use the Dorset one. It ought to be the former.	Noted comment.
21/3	We need to build more upmarket homes to attract entrepreneurs and business owners to the area.	Noted comment(s) in support
21/4 Dorset Council	WNP21 Housing mix 128. The Landscape and Urban Design team note that the policy simply repeats adopted Local Plan policies HOUS1 and HOUS3.	Noted comment.
	<p>WNP22 & paras 9.43-9.50</p>	
22/1	Agree with WNP22 #5 - should be provided in perpetuity	Noted comment(s) in support
22/2	WNP22 Affordable Housing Policy states: at least 50% Affordable on Greenfield sites. During discussions on this topic amongst the Homes Theme Group, the understanding was that areas outside of the DDB would be Exception Sites where only 100% Affordable Homes (AH) would be built. Immediately allowing only 50% is an erosion of this principle. Historically the delivery of AH has only been in the order of 13% to 19% despite higher targets being set. This is mainly due to developers being able to avoid the commitment if they can show the	Noted comment.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	development has become economically unviable. This demonstrates that the proposed approach is flawed from the start, particularly as there is a clause in the proposed policy (iv) stating 'that consideration may be given to accepting a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision where the Local Planning Authority consider that the provision of affordable housing on the proposed site is not viable, deliverable, or practical'	
22/3	WNP22 You state that 'affordable housing' plots should not be selected on the basis of desirability. But the people buying at full rate will effectively be paying more for their new homes to subsidise affordable ones. It doesn't seem fair to me that someone who is contributing to the cost of another person's home could actually end up with a worse plot than the person being subsidised.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
22/4 Wyke Regis Society	Affordable housing - we have repeatedly had developers pledging to include a number of affordable homes and then claiming they could not afford to make good their promises. Future plans should include a pledge of 10% of the cost of the development placed with the Council to ensure that if the affordable homes are not provided, there is an amount available to help house those on the waiting list for homes.	Noted comment(s) in support
22/5	Agree that developers should make available a good proportion of houses for social rent or shared ownership.	Support Noted
22/6	WNP22 Affordable housing To secure long term affordable housing requires it to be rented from a non-profit making organisation.	Noted comment(s) in support
22/7	WNP22 The split of affordable to full price housing is slanted far too far in the direction of affordable housing, with the result that it is unlikely the site will be developed at all unless policies are changed to enable the building of new council-operated housing. The very point of affordable housing is to provide a liveable home at an affordable cost. This necessarily involves building houses to a basic specification and without the additional cost of luxury finishes demanded by a full price purchaser. Should the requirement for the homes to indistinguishable from the full price homes, this will significantly reduce the number of houses built.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
22/8	Policies WNP20 to WNP22 should state explicitly that the priority for development of Homes is on Brownfield Sites within the DDB and that the greatest emphasis based upon need is to be support for social housing provision preferably designed built and administered through the Local Authority.	Noted comment(s) in support
22/9	WNP22. Agreed. There are excessive nos. of 'second' homes which need to be double council taxed. (NB: I don't regard homes owned by persons, i.e. in the armed forces, workers abroad incl. diplomatic service, tied accommodation, and the like to be 'second' homes. I have been in that position in the past). Too many unoccupied dwellings in Weymouth?	Noted comment(s) in support
22/10	More affordable homes for single people and pensioners.	Noted comment(s) in support
22/11 CG Fry and Son	WNP22: Affordable Housing Policy WNP22 notes that, in line with the adopted and emerging Local Plans, affordable housing percentage for Weymouth is set at 35%. However, the policy continues by stating that whilst this percentage will be required on sites with the Defined Development Boundary (DDB), sites outside will be required to provide 50%. This requirement could have serious implications for delivery of development sites and need to be robustly justified through detailed viability study. If a robust argument cannot be presented, the NP should mirror Local policy requirements of 35% affordable housing provision on all new developments sites of 10 or more dwellings. This point is discussed in more detail later in this consultation response.	Noted comment(s) in support
22/12	WNP22 iv: I object to developers negotiating to avoid building Affordable dwellings purely on profit grounds. This seems a constant excuse. We don't need 4/5/6-bedroom properties for more wealthy non-local residents. All development to be designed to match existing properties.	Noted comment(s) in support
22/13 Chapman Lily Planning Ltd for Bellway homes	WNP22 The 'Weymouth Local Connections Policy' is not clearly defined beyond the broad intent under para 9.48. It is evident that the details have yet to be agreed, albeit in many cases it will be important both recognise and work within the parameters for receipt of Government Grant without which affordable housing delivery might be hampered.	Include the final (agreed) Weymouth Local Connection criteria in the NP
22/14	This plan should include access to housing for local people using the Local Connection Test in conjunction with affordable housing development. This would be a necessary step in retaining local people and could have beneficial effect on the skills profile and development of the town.	Noted comment(s) in support
22/15	WNP22 Affordable Housing	Noted

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	supports homes which are price accessible to local people with priority to social rents. Support: Should emphasis Social Housing instead of Affordable Housing for rent as this is better understood by the public. 9.49 First Homes have not taken off. Can this be removed. Developers don't like it, and buyers don't like it. Where is the Weymouth Local Connection Policy published?	comment(s) in support
22/16	Support focus on affordable homes	Support Noted
22/17	I support the emphasis on affordable housing in WNP 22 but the allocation of sites in subsequent development and homes policies for residential development and affordable housing is too constrained as a result of policy WPN 38 and the lack of an up-to-date town centre strategy which reflects the realities of the shrinking high street. If the Neighbourhood Plan was predicated on a new, realistic and bold vision for the town centre, based on current trends in/foresight for retail, it could potentially release numerous residential and affordable housing sites. See comments below.	Noted comment(s) in support
22/18	WNP 22.2 70% affordable homes as intended. Any Contractor/Developer would seek to gain a maximum return on their investment. I find this proposal to be questionable.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
22/19	WPN22 Its already be recognized Weymouth needs more affordable housing per head than general housing. Further statements are required on how it will enforce the requirement for affordable housing to all developers. If the Council are going to take greenspaces from the community to develop land, they must ensure that developers cannot offer avoidance, such extra cash to avoid supplying the % given. I would prefer not to have a development if they cannot offer the community what it needs.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
22/20	'Affordable' housing should genuinely be affordable for those at the bottom of the housing chain. If they are initially sold as 'starter homes', there should be an obligation that when they are sold again, it is to people in a similar position. Similarly, more social housing should be available for people in need.	Noted comment(s) in support
22/21	WNP22 I support the strong statement on affordable housing. I hope it is carried through.	Noted comment(s) in support
22/22 Chickerell Town Council	WNP22 4.1 Difficult meeting the aim of 30% affordable homes for sale with all the homes (sale or rent) having also to be affordable in perpetuity. How does one stop the first owner making a sizeable gain when selling? Then the property no longer affordable? Preference would be 100% for rent through a HA.	Noted comment(s) in support
22/23	The policy for affordable homes should have a higher percentage of properties for rent as social housing, managed by the council (Weymouth or Dorset) or not-for-profit organisations, and not in the hands of private landlords	Noted comment(s) in support
22/24	I concur with the draft policy on affordable housing and developers must not be allowed to wriggle out of agreements due to making sites uncommercial in their opinion. Too often the social housing element is pushed to one side.	Noted comment(s) in support
22/25	Affordable housing needs to be affordable for the people actually living in the area. Two full-time working adults, on minimum wage, will only be offered a mortgage of around £130,000. Affordable housing NEEDS to be within that budget or its not affordable.	Noted comment(s) in support
22/6 CG Fry and Son	The draft NP sets a requirement of 50% affordable housing provision on sites outside the DDB. Given that both the adopted WDW&P Local Plan and the emerging Dorset Council Local plan set a requirement of 35% affordable housing, the NP must present robust evidence to exceed this figure. It should be noted that the evidence base and testing for the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan was undertaken recently and so it's questionable whether a significantly higher affordable housing provision has become justified in such a short timeframe. If anything, since the emerging LP evidence base and testing was undertaken, land values have decreased, developments costs have gone up and sales prices have stagnated, all of which further impact the viability of development and which influences realistic affordable housing provision. The NP supporting text (Para 9.86) notes viability testing was done on "similar sites demonstrating that 50% Affordable Home is viable", however, the NP viability test concludes that of the two sites considered, one is not viable at 50%. In addition, the Redlands Farm site isn't considered particularly similar to those sites tested, both of which were larger (230 and 250 units) and are located in arguably the most valuable part of Weymouth (Preston) which will have a positive impact on revenues and residual land values. In terms of the viability report itself, residual appraisals are not included and so the figures cannot be examined in detail and so lacks transparency. On page two, the benchmarks for both sites are considered. However, the assessment assumes that the non-residential elements of the sites are to be valued at agricultural value which is unrealistic in practice. Most land deals will require a minimum price per gross acre, which is well above the £20,000 per ha (£8,000 per acre). Landowners are unlikely to include additional land required to satisfy planning. For both sites assessed, the additional land (non-NDA) offered is to provide the country park extension required for planning. At £8,000 per acre, the landowners are unlikely to include this, which suggests the sites are undeliverable. Notwithstanding the above,	Consider when drafting next version

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>£8,000 per acre is an unrealistic figure for agricultural land values, especially on land close to residential areas. Values are likely to be closer to £20,000 per acre (£49,000 per ha). This point appears to be supported by Bailey Venning Associates themselves who write "I would admit candidly that these (benchmark values) are low". If a more reasonable benchmark land value is applied to both sites, they become unviable (or more unviable in the case of Budmouth Avenue). It is also difficult to work out what private sales values have been applied. This is not made clear as the actual appraisal is not included and so cannot comment other than indexation to reflect market improvements have been applied. This needs to be kept up to date as the position is worsening. Similar observations are noted for Housing Association values, in that the market for these is also worsening. The standard build costs applied are very low and, in addition, it is impossible to confirm that all these sites are likely to be delivered by PLC and/or large regional builders. No allowance or contingency costs have been applied for potential abnormalities, which would be expected on both sites assessed, given the sloped nature implies retaining features, additional cut and fill, deep drainage etc will be required. The report admits the approach to CIL/S106 is unclear and makes a broad assumption without the Local Plan/CIL review progressing. This suggests that it is premature to undertake this assessment and draw conclusions that significantly differ (in terms of HA provision) from the adopted (and emerging) Local Plan. The conclusion discusses scenarios by which Wyke Oliver Farm can be made viable, without acknowledging issues which could take the viability in a negative direction. Some of these are clearly set out earlier in the report, but not replicated in the conclusions. Overall, the benchmarks are set too low and the much of the appraisals are not disclosed, which makes it more challenging to scrutinise and comment. However, with one of the two appraisals being shown as unviable, and with major uncertainty around the rest of the report, it is not considered robust enough to demonstrate any site can deliver 50% affordable housing in the Weymouth area, which is significantly higher than the 35% provision set in the adopted and emerging Local Plans. For the reason set out above, the Redlands Farm site allocation should set the affordable housing provision at 35%, pursuant to the more robustly tested adopted and emerging Local Plans.</p>	
<p>22/27 Weymouth Civic Society (P&E Cttee)</p>	<p>WNP 22 Affordable Homes</p> <p>In these circumstances, at least there is a welcome emphasis in the draft Plan on the provision of much-needed affordable homes, especially important in the Weymouth area, which suffers from low wages and a highly seasonal economy.</p> <p>We would like to draw attention to the unreliability of provision of affordable housing in the present circumstances, where open market housing developments must provide 35% affordable housing. While the larger greenfield sites may yield the required number of homes, others may result in little or no provision. This may be due to the allowance where the site already has buildings which must be cleared, or where permission has already been granted, after which the development is claimed to be uneconomic to proceed unless the affordable housing requirement is dropped.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
<p>22/28 Dorset Council</p>	<p>WNP22 Affordable Housing</p> <p>129. Affordable Housing Threshold – Criterion 2 helpfully repeats the national threshold of ten or more units and would be a welcome addition to the Development Plan. National Policy would apply outside the Development Boundary so specifying 'within the defined development boundaries' is considered misleading. In raising the affordable housing threshold back to 10 or more units, the reference to 'other than replacement dwellings' is also no longer necessary.</p> <p>130. Designated rural areas - In Weymouth, parts of Upwey and Sutton Poyntz are located in the Dorset AONB a 'designated rural area' where a lower threshold could be supported in principle, subject to viability justification. A lower threshold is 'normally applied' in the part of the Weymouth NP area that is located in the Dorset AONB but the threshold is not currently set out within the Development Plan.</p> <p>131. Criterion 2 i) requires proposals to meet the minimum target of 35% affordable housing, and at least 50% on greenfield sites. The adopted Local Plan Policy HOUS1 however seeks 35% across all the Weymouth area with "a lower level of provision will only be permitted if there are good reasons to bring the development forward and the assessment shows it is not economically viable to the make the minimum level of provision". In this context, we would have concerns with any changes to the level of affordable housing sought. The evidence provided to date (15 December 2023) is considered insufficient to make an informed decision on the general viability of greenfield sites. In addition, the wording of the criterion could be improved by using a consistent phrase, either minimum or at least.</p> <p>132. Criterion 2 i) - The Assets Team have expressed concerns with any proposed changes to affordable housing requirements on brownfield sites in central Weymouth. The Asset Teams experience is that site viability in these locations is at best marginal and often requiring significant external funding or investment to bring forward sites. For example, the current Levelling Up Funding (LUF) is required for site clearance, remediation and flood risk works and is considered a one-off opportunity to deliver real change in</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording to clauses 1, 2 and 4 in the light of comments received.</p> <p>Include the final (agreed) Weymouth Local Connection criteria in the NP</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>Weymouth Town Centre. Any additional financial burdens could jeopardise this bid and any future projects in this area.</p> <p>133. Criterion 2 ii) This clause repeats NPPF, paragraph 63 and clause iv) and can be deleted.</p> <p>134. Criterion 2 iii) requires affordable housing to be occupied by people with a local connection and in accordance with the Weymouth Local Connections Policy. The Housing Team confirm they are working with Weymouth Town Council on an appropriate local approach. The final Weymouth Local Connection Policy should appear within the Plan document when available.</p> <p>135. Criterion 2 iv) – This clause repeats NPPF, paragraph 63 and can be deleted. It does not make sense to seek an equivalent financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision on viability grounds. Off-site provision is normally only accepted where there are exceptional planning reasons to justify not providing affordable housing on site. i.e. if they can't afford to provide it on site, they aren't going to be able to afford the same amount of money as a financial contribution. Consider whether the policy should include a requirement to deliver homes off-site before accepting an equivalent financial contribution. It may not be possible or practical to ensure all contributions are committed to schemes within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>136. Criterion 3 - This sentence should be deleted as it is unenforceable.</p> <p>137. Criterion 4 i) - Seeks 70% affordable rented homes and 30% intermediate housing for sale, including 25% First Homes. The Weymouth Housing Needs Assessment (April 2021) tested two scenarios including 70% affordable rented and 30% for sale, with the majority (25%) First Homes. The proposed policy mix therefore reflects local evidence and the greater need for affordable housing for rent. The text would benefit from clarifying that social rent forms part of the affordable rent category.</p> <p>138. Criterion 4 ii) makes reference to local evidence and is supported.</p> <p>139. Criterion 4 iii) reflects Policy HOUS1 criterion v) that schemes should be tenure blind.</p> <p>140. Criterion 5 refers to retaining schemes in perpetuity. This approach is supported.</p>	
	<p>WNP23 & paras 9.51-9.61</p>	
23/1	<p>This section (specifically WPN23) will be the core of the Neighbourhood Plan in many residents' opinion and should be at the beginning of the document. Most residents will consider this to be what a referendum vote will be about. As with the rest of the document there is extensive use of 'motherhood and apple pie' words that are not relevant (e.g., Recent studies and community consultations have helped identify the special qualities of each character area and improved our understanding of how this can be reflected in development) and much detail about needs assessment that should be in an Appendix. There is no indication of the viability of building affordable houses on the designated sites (for example, building on disused tips would need external funding to make the land viable for building works. The CEO of a local Housing Association said in an email in reaction to a question from me 'clearly some of the identified sites (reclaimed land/former tip etc) may be very challenging from a viability perspective in relation to the cost to develop etc. That type of site if ground surveys show issues may need to have big help from Homes England to make them developable.' I could not see any indication of whether the development of the proposed sites would meet the perceived shortfall.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
23/2	<p>WNP23 There seem to be a number of sites around the Lodmoor reserve area which is a flood zone. Building around these areas must surely increase flood risk to Lodmoor unless clearly defined mitigations are enforced. I don't really see these articulated in the plan.</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>
23/3	<p>Why is most of the development in the Preston area of Weymouth? It would appear that it is easier to build on farm land opposite Littlemoor rather than spread the load across the town. Why is Chickerell being excluded from the Major Housing Sites. The land on Camp Road has stood empty for decades and is ripe for development. It is land that is not farmed or used for any agricultural. Does the council have a good reason why this has been excluded?</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>
23/4	<p>WNP23 I do not support the allocation at Land off Budmouth Avenue. I support the other allocations as being necessary to meet housing needs ONLY if a policy clause is inserted that makes the site allocation subject to a legal agreement that the developer will comply with and deliver in full each of the requirements specified in the policy and that failure to do so will invalidate the site allocation and planning consent.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
23/5	<p>WNP23 Broadly agree although I don't claim location expertise.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
23/6	<p>Rather than find more land outside the DDP make the developers build the correct number of affordable homes rather than buy themselves out of their obligations.</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>
23/7	<p>I understood that no building is allowed within 500m of an SSI.</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
23/8	I understand the need for housing but what plans are being made for doctors/ dentist/ facilities. Traffic system out of town needs looking at.	Noted comment(s) in support
23/9	Green areas in the housing developments seem to be lacking	Noted comment(s) in support
23/10 CG Fry and Son	WNP23 Residential Site Allocation. The Redlands Farm site allocation noted under Policy WNP23 is strongly supported in principle. The site is also a preferred option in the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan and so support at both LP and NP level reiterates the site as being appropriate for sensitive residential development and its inclusion as an allocation is welcomed.	Noted comment(s) in support
23/11	The Plan should not use greenfield sites for housing development. More use of brownfield sites should be considered, using of existing urbanised spaces, reusing derelict land, especially land owned by the Council. Like redeveloping the land cleared by demolishing the Council buildings near the town bridge. This would make an ideal site for social housing. I object to the development above Budmouth, Brackendown and Wyke Oliver. The land is unsuitable for development. It floods and has numerous springs. The land is clay on top of a hard rock layer. With the excess water, created by a new housing, there will be more landslips like the one at 41 Enkworth Drive. The residents of 55 to 61 Budmouth Ave are constantly being flooded by the springs on the land proposed for housing. The water off cascades of the fields in heavy rain, creating a muddy river down Bodkin Lane. The local road network could not support the increased road traffic created by these developments, especially during the build phase. The previous neighbourhood plan, created before the pandemic, decided that the area of Budmouth, Brackendown and Wyke Oliver (Wey14) was unsuitable for development. Why is it now suitable, is it because a developer has purchased the land?	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
23/12	WNP23 Residential Site Allocations Why are we putting a plan together which designates an exclusive housing development area that then includes this policy which allows development beyond the area. I totally agree that there is insufficient affordable housing, and we will see the younger generations and younger talent vital to the town's economy driven out if this is not addressed. However please show me proof that every last inch of viable land and building that could be developed /repurposed (existing pockets of space and buildings within the town boundaries) has been exhausted and which places people close to the services and facilities they use on a day-to-day basis. It is unacceptable to build on anymore green belt land whilst so much development opportunity exists within the town boundary. For example why are the properties above the town shops allowed to rot and fall into disrepair?	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
23/13	WNP23: Residential Site Allocation 1. The following sites are allocation as affordable and/or mixed market housing sites, as defined on Map 20: - Land off Budmouth Avenue and Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North Only 50% affordable homes are planned which is half the original number. National Policy guidance gives great weight to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty of areas of outstanding natural beauty. The proposed loss of open space in Preston is over-development, diminishing the natural boundaries between Preston and neighbouring settlements. The natural beauty of Preston is what attracts people to live and holiday in the area. This is inappropriate development of a green belt area when there are better alternatives available. The proposal to include these sites will increase the traffic considerably. In fact, if you live up the hill, it will be difficult to get to work or go shopping easily without the use of a car. Preston is ill-served by public transport. The extra traffic will adversely affect the bird life of Lorton Meadows bird sanctuary and the enjoyment of walkers and cyclists in the area. Preston Road is a busy road and in summer the traffic is swelled by the cars from the caravan parks. The proposal is going to turn the area in to one long traffic jam adding to pollution. This is equally applicable to Littlemoor Road. Additional housing will also add to the demands on the doctors' surgery in Preston to the detriment of residents. Where are the links to the SEA reports? Historically, developers are not able to meet the quota of Affordable Housing on the grounds of financial viability, e.g. the issues with the Affordable Homes Development in Southill. Why isn't the Council developing on land it already owns or in empty buildings? Why isn't the Council thinking outside of the box?	Noted objection to policy
23/14	WNP23 Para. 9.38. will not be "walkable" as residents would have to climb the equivalent of a 13-storey building between bus stop and home. It would not be "cyclable" for the same reason	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
23/15	Para. 9.50 WNP 23 is unlikely to be "affordable" as the site will have fabulous views over the sea and prices will be elevated. The housing is likely to attract more wealthy retired people from around the country and people working all over the county who would prefer to live on such a stunning site	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
23/16	The allotments at Pinewood Road (WNP62) are likely to be negatively impacted by WNP23	Noted

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
		comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
23/17 Chapman Lily Planning Ltd for Bellway homes	WNP23 Bellway Homes support the allocation of 'Land off Budmouth Avenue'.	Support Noted
23/18	WNP 23 Wyke Oliver Farm and Land off Budmouth Avenue both unsuitable due to increased flood risk and drainage issues in lower surrounding areas as a result of complex geology which are ignored in the plan. There is simply no room or opportunity here to describe and explain this in detail.	Noted objection to policy
23/19	A development within the upstream catchment of the Lodmoor nature reserve is a callous disregard for the future viability of the area to contribute to the ever-present environmental disaster. Which is being so ably precipitated by such developments. It is impossible to control these developments once the door is opened. Existing developments in Budmouth Ave were not built as indicated on the plans and the developer has not been called to account to put thing right. Drains and road run off cause flash flooding. Total chaos on the roads while construction works are ongoing are proof of a total lack of respect for the local and planning. If 6 houses cause so much trouble in the Kingsbere / Bodkin area. Then I have no idea how bad the developments in the fields above will have. If the drainage in the area is further impaired by these developments, then who will sort it. I is nothing in the plan as to how the developers will be brought to heel. Why do I not see how these issues will be addressed up front, where they should be. Lack of ability for the planning departments to Plan, monitor and control has to be addressed before one can consider any developments in this area. If we need housing ... why are the building on Portland dockyard approach left unfinished. So there is no need??? There is a statement to the effect that there will be an affordable housing allocation. It is obviously not going to happen on the Budmouth/ Wyke Oliver proposed site. The land is too valuable. The figures will be bought out later. I challenge the system to bring those decisions to a public vote. There seems to be talk of mitigation of climate change within the plan. I do not see any requirement for zero carbon build or more importantly the absolute requirement for solar energy to be an integral part of the plan. This is reason enough to reject the plan alone. I would need to see all houses were zero overall emission rated. That includes running environmental cost. I would need to see split water recovery plans for sewage/rainwater. All drainage to be fail safe, no overflows near housing and to pass through treatment if environment would be affected. Plans for road width to accommodate standard refuse trucks. All parking to be off road and preferably integral to the buildings. I would need to see a proper road plan that did not impinge on existing roads and did not cause rush hour pollution. I would need to see what health services will be included and how that will be paid for ...a developer bond must be up front. I would need to see emergency services road plans up front. I would need to see how any disruption during development would be compensated for. Need I go on ... this plan is designed to sink a normal person in documents that can only be fully appreciated by professionals. The questions are designed to solicit one outcome. To end I am appalled to hear that previous submissions have been discounted as they did not suit the plan . I can hear the judge now ...callous disregard for the public, the environment and the future of the human race.	Noted objection to policy
23/20	I believe we should not be developing any green spaces until all brownfield spaces are filled in.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
23/21	WNP23, Para. 9.51 This states "Sites allocated for development by policy WNP23 have emerged as those most supported by the community to achieve our housing objectives". I am unsure where this community support was elicited as I have found no support from the local community for future development of the proposed site at Budmouth Avenue (WNP24). Overall, the policy of infilling to fulfil housing requirements is flawed as no new infrastructure (other than access roads from already busy streets) is required from the developers. The current sewage mains are deteriorating due to the original (pitched fibre) construction materials and remedial work reduces the current capacity before additional loading from new homes is added. There do not appear to be plans for additional Doctors surgeries or NHS dentists to support the housing developments. A number of properties adjacent to the proposed Budmouth Avenue development are already subject to issues relating from rainwater run-off, this would only be exacerbated by the removal of high ground green space and as previously stated is contrary to policy 8.11 (page 27). It is apparent (and I believe supported by a geological survey to which the council has access) that the local geology would not support any current schemes to alleviate rain/floodwater run-off.	Noted objection to policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
<p>23/22</p> <p>Chapman Lily Planning for Rapide (Beverley Road) Ltd</p>	<p>WNP23</p> <p>Support the identification of land off Beverley Road in part 1 of draft policy</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
<p>23/23</p>	<p>This is the most controversial and difficult part of the plan. Our planning system is not fit for purpose and has consistently failed to deliver on housing for all since social housing was deconstructed by 1980's government policy. Whilst understanding the arguments for allocating homes I am deeply concerned that the plan is providing a vehicle for developers whose principal concern is their profit margin. Energy efficient homes with solar and heat pumps and sufficient local infrastructure like sewerage, is not of concern to these commercial behemoths. Ref: The Great Climate Fight Stream free on Channel 4. National housing targets are also considered to be too high by many and the matter is a subject of much controversy. Ref: Dorset Deserves Better Campaign. Suggest that a "precautionary principle" approach be adopted.</p> <p>The allocation of greenfield sites in the plan seems to be at odds with the stated objective to "prioritise and facilitate brownfield site development". Not sure what the objective "create a safe and inclusive environment" refers to? Which policy / policies cover this? Same objective also appears in the Communities section. Will allocating land and sites really be better for Weymouth and provide the much-needed social housing? I fear not and like others am disinclined to support the plan because of this.</p> <p>More creativity in housing policy. There is too much reliance on allocating greenfield sites outside the DDB and too much reliance on developers to deliver "affordable" homes.</p> <p>Strengthen policy in favour of and to encourage alternative ways of delivering the housing that is needed - the current system is not working. Can we compel house builders to deliver on their social housing commitments?</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
<p>23/24</p>	<p>The principles of green space are vital to human wellbeing, mental health, physical health via exercise and wildlife conservation. What I object to is the concentration of proposed housing development between Preston and Littlemore, given the extensive developments in Littlemoor already. Why is there not more development of brown field sites elsewhere in Dorset instead of removing green space and wildlife habitat.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
<p>23/25</p>	<p>WNP23 Residential Site Allocations</p> <p>Support: Site Allocations are necessary to address the shortfall in planning provision in the current and emerging Local Plan. Should emphasise the lack of practical large options.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
<p>23/26</p>	<p>Map 20: Allocated Residential Development Sites</p> <p>The plan presents the average wage in Weymouth as £40K, surpassing the national average. According to various mortgage websites, this allows for an average mortgage on a £200K house. A brief check on Rightmove during the winter, when house advertising is typically low, reveals 82 properties available for sale. The suggestion that young people are leaving Weymouth due to house prices and job prospects is made by Weymouth Town Council staff without supporting evidence, prompting a call for more housing I know is incorrect. There are far too many assumptions in this document, and that does not make for a good plan. The ongoing developments in Littlemoor, Upway, and Chickerell appear to exceed the demand for 'Affordable Housing'. Additionally, the modest 0.2% growth over a ten-year period, equivalent to just over 1000 individuals, contrasts with the availability of over 80 properties for the average wage earner (40K) in this region, particularly during this current sluggish fourth quarter. An idea that warrants further exploration under the relevant objective is the financial incentivisation for older couples residing in larger properties to consider investing in luxury flats, such as those that could potentially be developed on the now defunct borough council block. The proposed construction plan appears unattainable given the current construction levels, which stand at 100 per year. Overbuilding is likely to attract housing associations with national footprints, which may encourage 'offloading', putting additional pressure on local resources and communities without a concurrent plan for infrastructure development. The plan's use of terms like 'chronic' and 'superior' creates undue urgency without factual support, measurable metrics, or historical context. Furthermore, suggesting a substantial build plan of 7,000 houses over 17 years, with a high percentage of damage to existing development, is certain to lead to conflicts with the current residents of Weymouth for various reasons.</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>
<p>23/27</p>	<p>Para. 9.61 be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and landscaping. I would argue that almost all estate housing built within Weymouth apart from a few small developments could be considered as unattractive (although subjective). The rate that Weymouth is building we must demand good modern architecture from all developers (possibly via a steering group) and that development is not rushed or cheap design to avoid diluting all our housing stock to 20's mass build. Rinse and repeat should not occur. Poundbury should also not be the goal. Local character of areas should be worked on and improved rather than becoming a wash of similarity. To obtain this:</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>1 - Development Architecture Steering Group could be formed.</p> <p>2 - Use of smaller building firms could be utilized.</p> <p>This could allow smaller companies to establish and stop the monopoly of those 2-3 semi local millionaires mass building everything within our town. Rather than 1 company build 150 homes. Could 6 firms build 25 each, or every 15 firms build 10 each with mix of self-build plots available. Likely hood that land owner would earn more for sale and more local people/companies get a bite at the apple. Along with providing exciting housing stock.</p>	
23/28	<p>I strongly object to building on any land outside of the development boundary and the land at Lorton Meadows should be protected for the benefit of the environment.</p> <p>I strongly object to WNP24 and WNP25, the land is unsuitable for development as defined in the 2015, 2015, 2016, 2019 and 2021 SHLAAs and the visual impact from the seafront and bay is unacceptable. I object to the decision to ignore public option on these areas during the 3rd consultation</p>	Noted objection to policy
23/29	<p>I strongly object to building outside of the development boundary defined in the 2015 Local Plan. We need to protection the open spaces</p> <p>I totally oppose the building on land defined in WNP24 and WNP25, it is wholly inappropriate with land that has regularly assessed as unsuitable for development in the 2014, 2015, 2016, 2019, 2021 SHLAA's</p>	Noted objection to policy
23/30	<p>Map 20 Allocated residential development</p> <p>I have issues with sites labelled 1 and 2 on the map</p>	Noted objection to policy
23/31	<p>WNP23 Residential Site Allocation.</p> <p>The Policy lists Land off Budmouth Avenue and Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North as 'affordable or mixed market housing sites'. Previously we had been led to believe, through the Homes Theme Group, that development outside of the Defined Development Boundary would be as Exception Sites and for 100% affordable housing. Neither of these sites is likely to meet this target since developers can avoid the commitment to affordable houses if they can demonstrate it is economically unviable to do so. As both sites, and particularly the land of Budmouth Avenue, are on sloping sites with restrictive access it is likely that the proportion of affordable home will be few in reality</p>	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
23/32	<p>Affordable houses and Affordable rents are subjective and regionally variable. Both will be out of the reach of the intended target group in this area. What people want is housing that can be rented commensurate with their income not a percentage of the mean average value of the local house price or rent in the area. This, in many cases, will be the minimal wage which will be someway off the affordable rent criteria. Local evidence shows that developers cannot, or are not prepared to, build houses with this target group in mind. The land in Map 21 and 22 is outside the DDB yet no mention is made in the text. The Steering Group appears to have assumed that approval is a 'given' thus overriding their own draft policy WNP 16/WNP34. The decision to ignore this appears to have already been taken without consulting the local community.</p>	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
23/33	<p>The map simply outlines the areas for development without detailed consideration of relief and geology, or likely drainage issues on surrounding areas. This should have been examined first before identifying areas for development. Specifically Wyke Oliver Farm and Land off Budmouth Avenue. No consideration is given to the history of flooding in Wyke Oliver Close, Preston Brook Melstock Avenue (already an Environmental Agency flood risk zone) or Southdown Avenue, all of which was considered in detail in the last proposals made in 2018, and which were then thrown out. If this and earlier representations had been consulted these areas would not have been considered in the present plan. Nor is there any opportunity to give details of all this in this survey. Two of these sites are greenfield and skyline and unnecessary keeping in mind the large greenfield development already underway in Littlemoor Road. Richard Rogers as long ago as 1999 said "building on greenfield sites waste land, and our stock of brownfield sites is constantly being replenished." Weymouth has plenty of brownfield sites without the need to destroy more green fields.</p>	Noted objection to policy
23/34	<p>It is neither good nor sensible to build further on the Green Space between Littlemoor, Preston Downs and the Land at Budmouth Avenue and Wyke Oliver Farm North. Not only will it destroy habitats for a range of wildlife along with additions to CO2 emissions, but it will further deplete the countryside around Weymouth which is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. In addition, the current infrastructure, including jobs, roads, schools, doctors' surgeries etc will not support a further 500 houses on these sites. Public services are already under extreme pressure in Weymouth, particularly in the Preston/Littlemoor area. New housing to the North of Littlemoor Road will exacerbate this pressure making. The area around the North East fringes of Weymouth has already made a significant contribution to housing targets. Enough is enough.</p>	Noted objection to policy
23/35 National Highways	<p>We have noted that the plan allocates a number of sites for development, to support the housing requirements set out within the adopted West Dorset and Weymouth Local Plan, which remains the relevant adopted local plan at this time given the current status of the emerging Local Plan for the new unitary authority of Dorset Council.</p>	Add transport impact assessment and the need for a travel plan to WNP20 and make suitable reference and

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>Proposed residential allocations are listed within policy WNP 23, with details provided in individual site policies including WNP 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29A and 34.</p> <p>Potential employment/mixed use sites are allocated within separate policies including WNP 39 and 40. It is noted that these specific policies, nor it seems the supporting text, does not clearly make reference to the requirement for development to be supported by a suitable assessment of traffic impacts and travel plan measures.</p>	<p>explanation in supporting text.</p>
<p>23/36 Dorset Council</p>	<p>WNP23: Residential Site Allocations</p> <p>141. Approach - As an overarching policy, it might be helpful for readers to list the total additional supply these allocations would contribute to housing need in Weymouth. The housing estimate for each site allocation and policy references could also appear next to each site name.</p> <p>142. Criterion 2- This criterion acts as a cross reference to other policies in the Plan and adds little value as the Plan must be read as a whole.</p> <p>143. Paragraph 9.51 – We would clarify that the council has been aware of the site selection process applied by the town council but has not formally overseen this process.</p> <p>144. Paragraph 9.57 - The SEA report “recommends that a Principal Residency policy would offer support to the local transport network to improve sustainable transport and maintaining the viability of public transport options and would avoid by not limiting non-principal residency, increases in traffic particularly in summer months.” New build housing is however a very small proportion of the total available and would be unlikely to alleviate tourist traffic. For example, the existing stock could still be converted to Air BnB’s.</p> <p>Common site allocation issues</p> <p>There are several issues that are common across many of the site allocations and these more general points are discussed first, for brevity reasons.</p> <p>146. Approximately - Many of the site allocates propose an ‘approximate’ number of residential dwellings. Dorset Council however prefers the phrase ‘around’ as this phrase has been agreed by inspectors in the past. Most recently through the Purbeck Local Plan examination.</p> <p>147. Master planning and Site Capacity – The Landscape and Urban Design team would question many of the site capacity estimates. Without a thorough understanding of the site constraints (landscape, flood risk, biodiversity, infrastructure etc..) an accurate understanding of site layout would not be possible. Although it is anticipated a comprehensive masterplan will be prepared and agreed, the Council’s experience is that this rarely occurs in practice. It is therefore recommended that these site constraints are investigated in advance of formal site allocation and co-ordinated through ‘initial’ master planning work reflecting an iterative process to site design. For further guidance on the types and levels that master-planning can detail please refer to this website. Home_England_Masterplanning_flow_illustration.pdf (publishing.service.gov.uk)</p> <p>148. Site specific requirements - The Landscape and Urban Design Team note that the policy text is very similar and often repeats National and Local Policy. Policies need to provide value and set out what each site needs to provide. At present they are just a list.</p> <p>149. Retention of hedgerows - The Landscape and Urban Design team welcome the retention of hedgerows and provision of landscaping to minimise any visual impact on the setting and local landscape character. However, without more detailed site plans and corresponding landscape and visual impact assessments they are un-able to verify the potential landscape impact of the site allocations or understand how the retention of hedgerows will impact on site design and consequently site capacity.</p> <p>150. Suitable boundary treatment - The Landscape and Urban Design team welcome suitable boundary treatment but question if this is a reference to the site boundary, plot boundaries or both?</p> <p>151. Legible street network - The Landscape and Urban Design team welcome the requirement for a legible street network.</p> <p>152. Safe footpaths and cycle routes - The Landscape and Urban Design team welcome the requirement for safe footpaths and cycle routes.</p> <p>153. Street lighting - The Landscape and Urban Design team welcome the requirement for street lighting which minimises light spillage. Where relevant lighting design should also minimise any impact on bats.</p> <p>154. Play and amenity space - The provision of play areas, public amenity space and community space is welcomed.</p> <p>155. Environmental objectives and targets - See comments on Chapter 7 and Appendix A.</p> <p>156. Highways / Site access – The Highways Development Team have advised that through the planning process the developer would be required to provide a Transport Assessment which includes detailed forecast traffic movements on the local network and a Travel Plan which would include targets to mitigate against traffic generation on the network, both of which would be fully assessed by Highways during the consultation period relating to a planning application.</p> <p>157. Cycle / scooter storage – The Council’s Transport Planning Team have made the following comments. All site allocations should consider cycle and mobility scooter parking and storage. This could fit alongside “off street resident and visitor parking</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received.</p> <p>Review and affirm the total number of dwellings set for each allocated site after further consideration of the evidence and discussion with the developer</p> <p>Include additional self-build criterion and include evidence in supporting text.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>provision with EV charging facilities that satisfy the requirements of the local planning authority”.</p> <p>158. EV Charging – This criterion is perhaps unnecessary as the requirement for EV charging infrastructure for new development is covered by Building Regs Approved Document S.</p> <p>159. Active travel network – The Transport Planning Team also encourage the Neighbourhood Plan to provide guidance on how site allocations are connected to the active travel network. It should promote improvements to ensure new developments are properly connected to the wider network. Financial contributions will be required for off-site connections.</p> <p>160. Road Standards – The Transport Planning team welcome the cross reference to Dorset Council, road design and layout standards.</p> <p>161. Heritage – The Conservation Team welcome reference to the “Conservation Area, archaeology and nearby heritage assets and their setting” and have raised no concerns with the proposed site allocations.</p> <p>162. Infrastructure - CIL/S106 Team questions if site allocation policies could be more explicit about infrastructure needs? Although a lot of residential development will be covered by CIL there will be some sites that may need site-specific mitigation alongside CIL.</p> <p>Site assessment</p> <p>Planning practice guidance explains that “plan-makers will need to assess the suitability, availability and achievability of sites, including whether the site is economically viable.” The following three test form the basis of our comments for each of the proceeding site allocations.</p> <p>163. Availability - A site can be considered available for development, when, on the best information available (confirmed by the call for sites and information from landowners and legal searches where appropriate), there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership impediments to development. For example, land controlled by a developer or landowner who has expressed an intention to develop may be considered available.</p> <p>164. Achievability - A site is considered achievable for development where there is a reasonable prospect that the particular type of development will be developed on the site at a particular point in time. This is essentially a judgement about the economic viability of a site, and the capacity of the developer to complete and let or sell the development over a certain period.</p> <p>165. Suitability - A site or broad location can be considered suitable if it would provide an appropriate location for development when considered against relevant constraints and their potential to be mitigated.</p>	
<p>23/37 Turley for Morrish Homes</p>	<p>Accordingly, my client supports the approach of identifying residential allocations on greenfield sites as set out within Policy WNP23, and specifically the allocation of the site at Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North under Policy WNP25, and the delivery of affordable housing as part of the allocations, as set out within Policy WNP22.</p> <p>It is noted that the greenfield site allocations, including Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North in Policy WNP25, were selected following a rigorous and independent assessment within a Site Options Assessment Report and Strategic Environmental Assessment prepared by consultants Aecom on behalf of the NP Steering Group, and following detailed community consultation.</p> <p>For clarity, my client would recommend that Policy WNP20 (Major Housing Sites) and WNP22 (Affordable Housing) cross refer to Policy WNP23 to make it clear that both are applicable to the proposed residential allocations within the NP.</p>	<p>Improve the synergy with WNP20 by moving criteria common to all site allocation policies to a single “major sites” policy</p>
<p>23/38 Dorset Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>It is noted that the sites Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North, Land off Budmouth Avenue and Land at Lodmoor Old Tip are proposed for residential site allocation. All these sites feature in Dorset Wildlife Trust’s comments submitted as part of the 3rd Public Engagement survey undertaken in January 2023. It is also noted that the report on the outcome of this engagement survey identified that these three sites were also the main proposed sites to receive objections by other respondents to the survey. These proposed allocations are those which are anticipated to have the potential for greatest impacts on biodiversity.</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
<p>WNP24 & paras 9.62-9.69</p>		
<p>24/1</p>	<p>My concern is the quantity of proposed housing and the high density of new housing estates. The area behind Brackendown Avenue is a wildlife corridor that links Lorton Meadows to farmland to the east. It is vital that we protect and preserve wildlife and its habitat. Surely there are more suitable brown field sites for development. Not to mention the increased traffic, road, and lack of infrastructure in this area to cope with increased population. I strongly oppose the plans shown on map 21, page76</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
<p>24/2</p>	<p>Land off Budmouth Avenue as shown on Map 21.</p> <p>All the aims are admirable, but the WNP24 (Land off Budmouth Avenue) totally conflicts with these aims! You plant to build approximately 230 homes which will not:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Protect key locations 2 Support flood resilience 	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>3 Enhance the landscape 4 Improve and extend green infrastructure 5 Facilitate responsible public access to the countryside etc etc!! This is why I strongly object to this part of the proposal. Reference in Plan - Aim: Landscape and green space</p>	
24/3	<p>Map 21 The blue line must not be developed due to the significant impact on wildlife</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
24/4	<p>Environmental Sustainability and Climate Change Management (Page 22-24) I totally agree with the aspirations of this policy, but I find the development proposal WNP24 is fundamentally at odds with it. The proposed site is deemed fit for residential development in the plan regardless of the fact these fields flood frequently and are locally known as "7 Springs Field" as they form a confluence for these underground water sources. This suggests that major drainage works would be needed in order to make the site fit for purpose and not negatively impact the existing houses or infrastructure that surround the site.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
24/5	<p>Development and Homes Aim - Provide a broad mix of homes, which align with housing need: - The aforementioned works would increase the cost and reduce the viability of erecting low-cost or affordable housing making the aim of 50% of the new builds even less likely to be met on this site than most others contained in the plan.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
24/6	<p>The proposed site behind Brackendown Avenue would be accessed by Wyke Oliver Road or possibly Budmouth Avenue. It is unrealistic to expect that each property would have less than one vehicle and probably two. Therefore at the very least several hundred extra vehicles would be using these residential streets to access the development. Preston Road is not a major road and it already congested particularly in the holiday season due to the influx of holidaymakers to the holiday parks. It is not realistic to think that this area will be adequately served by public transport, and it is at least a 40-minute walk into Weymouth Town Centre. This increase in vehicles cannot meet the objective of climate change management.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
24/7	<p>Budmouth Road Development Environmental Objectives P19 1. Your aim of Biodiversity Net Gain - All new developments are expected to include measures to conserve and enhance the biodiversity of the area - how do you intend to do this by building over a greenfield site? 2. Your aim of Climate Change Management - All new developments are expected to result in no increase in the risk of flooding and provide adequate resilience to extreme weather events - how can this be achieved if you are building on a hill which has 7 natural springs. This water will be displaced by any housing put there. The green area is needed to soak up the existing rainfall which is exacerbated due to climate change</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
24/8	<p>Budmouth Road Development 1. Landscape and green space aims and objectives page 19 Building here is contrary to all = of your objectives in particular these as illustrated below: a) identify and protect key locations and special habitats - this will not be achieved by building on such a large green area b) promote development that complements and enhances the landscape and seascape character - will not be achieved as this project will destroy the distinctive and unique landscape as the look of the ridge line will be totally changed, as stated in your own site assessment 9.63 P75 c) building over so much green belt will not conserve and enhance the biodiversity of the area or protect wildlife habitats and key landscape features and characteristics neither will it improve and extend green infrastructure d) this building project will also not protect important green gaps between settlement areas and will completely erode clear distinctions between different areas and boundaries. e) the type of housing which will go onto this estate do not appear to be affordable houses and could very well end up as second homes.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
24/9	<p>WNP24: Land off Budmouth Avenue This is my biggest worry! Please refer to Map 21 in Version 2.4. This shows a road in the new estate which runs parallel to Brackendown Avenue. At its western end the road drops to the south passing through more green land and then entering the western end of Brackendown Avenue which at present is a cul-de-sac. There is currently NO public transport into the Southdown estate and therefore cars are essential. This will mean that the residents of approx. half of the new estate will come down into Brackendown Avenue constituting a hazardous increase in traffic and all that implies. Again I am totally against this.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
24/10	<p>WNP15 maintains that vistas and views should be maintained, so why propose building where visas and views be decimated. Any development on the Brackendown/Budmouth proposed site would break the sky line changing the character of housing and would be a</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	poor planning decision and we do not want to make matters worse now. All properties on the West side of Budmouth Avenue and on the North side of Brackendown Avenue would have their views of countryside and fields (at the rear of their properties) obstructed by houses and would have no view of the countryside."	
24/11	<p>"In the last round of consultations five years ago or so I submitted details then and it was clearly identified by planning officer that the proposed area for development was not suitable on a number of grounds, the environment being a prominent one. As a result, the proposal was removed from the plan. How are we back here again?</p> <p>Copied from the policy: Draft Policy WNP 03: Wildlife Habitats and Areas</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development proposals that are likely to have a significant adverse effect on the integrity or continuity of landscape features and habitats of local and national importance and the wild flora and fauna in those areas indicated on Map 8 will not be supported unless unavoidable due to exceptional circumstances and the proposed mitigation measures are proportionate to the status of the site and satisfy the requirements of the local planning authority. 2. Compensation measures will be permissible as a last resort only. 3. Proposals to protect or restore any existing features, or to create new features of wildlife habitat – particularly where these form linkages between habitats within or beyond the site – will be supported. <p>With the development suggested at Brackendown Avenue/Budmouth Avenue, the draft policy will fail on each level.</p> <p>On page 44 of the plan, Map 12 (Green Gaps) Area 1 clearly shows the proposed development areas as two black 'blobs' which virtually obliterate this important area. I very strongly suggest that the area proposed for housing development is removed from this plan and the existing Defined Development Boundary should stay in place in perpetuity and no building should be permitted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Brackendown/Budmouth site lies within a 500m buffer zone designed to protect an SSSI (Lodmoor Nature Reserve). Any building would be in contravention of legislation. • Both Brackendown/Budmouth and Wyke Oliver Farm sites enjoy habitats for numerous flora and fauna including hedgerows where birds of prey feed, deer, bats and badgers. It also serves a feeding ground for water fowl during the autumn. • The natural green corridor (between Littlemoor and Preston) would be narrowed if the above areas were developed not to mention the huge disruption to wildlife during the construction phase which would probably last for a number of years. • The area is enjoyed by large numbers of recreational walkers, cyclists and runners and visitors who enjoy the peace and beauty of this area. Any development will significantly and detrimentally impact on this very valuable asset. 	Noted objection to policy
24/12	Development of the Land at Budmouth Avenue and Wyke Oliver Farm North is unlikely to encourage more people to walk or cycle rather than use their car. Access to the Land at Budmouth Avenue can only be made through an access road at the top of the hill in Budmouth Avenue itself or from Brackendown Avenue. In either case it is a good 10–15-minute walk from Preston Road and the nearest bus stop and located at the top of a fairly steep hill. This will discourage walking or cycling and is more likely to lead to increased use of vehicles rather than a reduction. Furthermore, an additional 500 houses on the two developments can only put pressure on the only two access roads from the main road, i.e. Melstock Avenue and Wyke Oliver Road. It is already difficult at certain times to emerge from Melstock Avenue and additional traffic can only add to safety concerns. (WPN51 Transport and Travel)	Noted objection to policy
24/13	Budmouth Avenue is not currently served by Public Transport and, due to the width of the roads leading to it, would not be suitable for buses. (WPN52 Public Transport)	Noted objection to policy
24/14	It is worth pointing out in the supporting documentation that part of the land behind Budmouth Avenue, is not privately owned (i.e. by an individual) but owned by a publicly listed company (land banking). Furthermore as the land is on a hillside, statements that 'any housing built on this land will be hidden by houses on Budmouth Avenue' is blatantly incorrect. The Steering Group's lack of knowledge of the area is evident from such statements.	Noted objection to policy
24/15	Air quality in the Preston will become an issue in that area due to increased traffic coming off the Melstock Avenue, Preston estate. This would also increase the amount of noise all through the estate At present there is a problem with flooding to houses in Budmouth Avenue due to water running off the field behind, this has been a major issue this year with the amount of rainfall.	Noted objection to policy
24/16	WNP24 Using the area behind Wyke Oliver Farm which is adjacent to Wyke Oliver Close will change the character of Wyke Oliver Road and Wyke Oliver Close from being a sedate and quiet residential area to a thoroughfare to the new development. This will not only have an adverse impact on the current residents during construction but affect the current community once the new properties are completed. The residents of these roads chose these properties based on the location and the neighbourhood because Wyke Oliver Close	Noted objection to policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>is a dead end and does not suffer from excessive traffic and noise. Adding this number of homes in this small area will result in urban sprawl which is what a lot of the residents of the area came here to avoid. Also, adding that number of homes to this small area will also have an adverse impact of services that the current population need, i.e. doctors surgeries, local shops, etc. Additionally there have been numerous studies that have indicated that the land behind Wyke Oliver Farm is not suitable for this type of development, what has changed since these studies were published? Overall this would be a negative to the area and would adversely affect the current residents and future home owners in the region considering that this area is already designated as AONB.</p>	
24/17	<p>WNP24 You state that there will be vehicular access via bracken down avenue. This is not possible due to houses bordering the entire length of the road. To access Brackendown there would be a very complicated meandering route through existing residential areas causing additional risks to pedestrians and human health. The additional traffic for 230 dwellings would be substantial. There is no mention regarding the impact on protected species that reside in this area. There are significant ecological surveys at DERC Dorset Environmental Records centre showing bats and badgers and water voles in the area and the field is used by birds at Lodmoor national nature reserve for daytime feeding and roosting.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
24/18	<p>WNP24 Land off Budmouth Avenue The clarification notes to this policy state that there was "community consultations". The most recent of these took place in August (2023). I think it fair to say that attendance was probably not a true representation of the community as a whole as there were only 61 attendees with only 34 written responses reported. Attendance at Events: The Waverley – 1, Redlands Community Sports Hub – 21, Wellworthy Sports and Social Club – 11, Preston Village Hall – 9, Weymouth Town Council - Council Chamber – 19. It would be unwise, and potentially undemocratic, to give much weight to the conclusions taken from this poor turnout and certainly does not warrant the 'robust analysis' accolade given to it! Only 50% Affordable Homes are intended which is a significant reduction to the 100% initially planned. The preceding criticism of WNP22 applies. Regrettably the weblink to the Venning and Bailey Report dated October 2023 is missing in the Pre-Submission Plan which prevents the reader seeing the analysis behind the proposal. I was only able to find it when I looked at the documents supporting the recent Town Council meeting. This is unfortunate as there is a measure of uncertainty concerning the viability of the proposed development largely due to uncertainty over the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Some assumptions have been made and there is a suggestion that the model used in the assessment had to be 'tweaked' to gain a successful result. The seemingly precarious financial balance is well illustrated by the recent announcement that the £4.5m, 31 Affordable Home development at Southill has ground to a halt because the main contractor is unable to deliver the scheme at the agreed price. It remains to be seen whether a revised plan will be offered up attempting to make it viable by delivering fewer Affordable Homes.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
24/19	<p>WNP24 - Land off Budmouth Avenue I believe the area of land proposed for this major housing development to be unsuitable for the following reasons: (1) Any increase in rainwater run-off risks adversely impacting the existing roads and housing lying downhill from the development land, with an increased risk of flooding during/following periods of heavy rain (with heavy rain events already increasing in both frequency and intensity due to climate change). (2) The inadequate road access to the development area given the large number of potential dwellings, both in terms of access points and the already constricted existing road network leading thereto (parked cars, vans and motorhomes already posing problems for the passage of any larger vehicles in Budmouth Avenue). (3) The distance from current (and likely future) public transport provision, noting the suggestion that the former bus service via Oakbury Drive could be reinstated (which I believe never ran to the "Southdown Estate" itself, as incorrectly stated in para 9.63). This service was only ever comprised of a maximum of one bus per hour, on weekdays only, and such a paltry service would hardly encourage the residents of the development area to switch to, let alone rely upon, public transport for their commuting to work and other travel needs. (4) Following on from my previous point, given that there is rightly an applaudable aim for 50% affordable housing provision, how does this square with the need for residents to largely rely on private cars to access local amenities, education, and employment? This reliance is discriminatory on both socio-economic and disability grounds, as well as being environmentally unsustainable. (5) An additional 230 households will be marooned in their homes once a year during the Iron Man event!</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
24/20	<p>Issues with this proposal were previously raised regarding serious concerns over drainage due to the geology of the location being clay based and the significant urbanisation of</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	over 200 new homes requiring sewage and storm runoff removal. These latest plans do not appear to have solved this issue. Furthermore the limited access via two ends of Brackendown Avenue stand to create significant traffic flow issues with the possibility of many new homeowners being two car households and thus potentially introducing over 400 cars into the area.	
24/1	Issues with this proposal were previously raised due to serious concerns about the drainage; the area is already prone to flooding; drainage is already an issue, and the geology of the area (clay) means additional housing will only exacerbate this issue. The proposed access for the 200 houses is woefully inadequate and will turn a quiet cul-de-sac into a busy through road for potentially up to 400 cars. The previous proposal was not approved, and this current proposal is unchanged from that which was previously submitted.	Noted objection to policy
24/22	WNP24 Land off Budmouth Avenue This size of development and the others with in excess of approx. 25 new dwellings will cumulatively contribute to unacceptable additional demand on local services, traffic congestion etc. Inappropriate development for the location	Noted objection to policy
24/23	Map 21 Potential site accesses are unsuitable for the proposed 230 dwelling development. Access to public transport, particularly from the western end of the development needs to be reconsidered. Distances will be approx. 0.75 - 1 mile, with a significant climb/descent along part of the route, even allowing for reinstatement of bus route via Oakbury Drive.	Noted objection to policy
24/24	Para. 9.64 The 'community consultation' process carried out needs to be identified. (community consultation report weblink from WNP not working). For example, the residents of Brackendown Avenue and Budmouth Avenue, as the closest to the proposed development at WNP24, have not been part of the consultation process. They were not invited, nor were they aware of the proposals until in the pre-submission draft.	Noted objection to policy
24/25	WNP 24 Land off Budmouth Avenue There are numerous problems with this location. In no particular order: 1. The existing development on the hill side down to the Lodmoor SSSI already struggles with drainage and flooding issues despite being on the hillside. Drainage is poor, there are seven water springs and run off water is a problem in many locations. Further development, even with well-designed SuDS and green spaces will only diminish the ability of the landscape at the top of the hill to absorb water. Recent infill development has demonstrated again the problems with drainage which in turn can lead to structural and subsidence risk to the existing building lower down the hill. Run-off water also, ultimately ends up in the Lodmoor SSSI. The increased impact should be modelled and assessed properly in respect of any impact on this vital local habitat. 2. Road access would presumably be via Pinemoor Close to the west or off the top of Budmouth Avenue to the east. These access routes are small, narrow access routes to what would be a significant development. Currently the estate has a lot of on street parking with constrains traffic flows. There is no reason to expect these constraints to reduce. Given that this location is not served by any public transport (noting your comment that a bus service "might" be viable but also that it would require access suitably large for buses) then it is reasonable to assume that each new dwelling would have one or more cars. This additional traffic would need to funnel down the estate to either exit at Melstock Avenue (most likely for Weymouth bound traffic) or Wyke Oliver Road. The Melstock Avenue exit is a constrained access, not compliant with current highway planning requirements and close to a blind crest. Melstock Avenue itself is not well configured for additional traffic. Whilst Wyke Oliver Road is a better junction to Preston Road, it too is hardly well configured for such a large volume of additional traffic. Traffic during construction would be highly disruptive too, unless significant parking restrictions were introduced. Whilst these might be construed to be somehow motivating for local residents to be less reliant on cars, it overlooks the basic fact that even if buses were to re-enter the estate, bus services do not run into the evenings, nor do the service adequately any worthwhile destinations. 3. The land above Budmouth Avenue and Brackendown Avenue is currently productive farm land. It is also a thriving environment for wildlife, with deer, badgers, foxes and other animals, frequent visitors to the gardens. This wildlife corridor would be significantly impacted, if not completely lost, should the Budmouth Avenue and the Wyke Oliver Farm (WNP25) developments get built. It is impossible to see how this complies with your guiding vision and objectives for the neighbourhood plan. 4. The Budmouth Avenue development proposed would break the skyline of this area of Weymouth. It places new buildings on the crest of the hill line and will reshape this area. The illustrations you use of new houses in the plan (P73) present no relevance to the existing buildings in the area. They do not seem worthy or appropriate to redefine the landscape. I am sure they represent the sort of derived, pseudo retro style that will	Noted objection to policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	prevail, as it does everywhere else but as a landmark, they would be pathetic. It is also a very hostile environment at the top of the hill with very strong winds and rain impact. Any new buildings need to be sufficiently resilient to bear up to this but the various targets for affordability and other contrivances will instead drive design to focus on cheap, low cost, low durability solutions – neither sustainable nor resilient.	
24/26	<p>WNP24</p> <p>I am opposed to allocation of this site based upon the following key considerations - The significant negative impacts (red) as stated in the Strategic Environmental report. The borderline viability for 50% Affordable Homes and the weakness of the viability test (see Venning viability assessment) More specifically I consider the site unsuitable for the following reasons - Proximity to the other sites at the Old Tip and Wyke Oliver causing excessive loss of green gaps and impact on wildlife corridors, this being contrary to policies WNP 03/04. The excessive traffic that will be generated along Southdown Avenue bringing air pollution, congestion and potential harm to the adjacent designated areas (see policy WNP02) and the 9.5ha of land to be transferred to Lorton Valley Nature Park (given the routing through this area). These impacts will be compounded by the absence of public transport facilities in this area. The proposal makes no provision for community cohesion such as play areas or a community social hub and access to shops and other services creates dependency on the private motor car contrary to other policies in the Plan.</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/27	<p>WNP24</p> <p>This land is used as a wildlife corridor between Lodmoor and Lorton SSSIs and the mitigation area (pond) down off Littlemoor Road. If you separate green areas, then wildlife can't travel between them. All current legislation prevents this. There are protected bats, badgers and all sorts of wildlife that use these fields and they both lie fully within a 500m radius of the Lodmoor SSSI. This site was previously classified as unsuitable in the SHLAA 2021. The local road network is not suitable for the development size, and the site is unsuitable for commercial purposes as pointed out in Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan Site Options and Assessment Report (Jan 2023), pg 48: "The site is outside the development boundary and the potential access roads are unsuitable for commercial traffic as they are all culs-de-sac which pass through residential areas. It is likely that employment development would have significant adverse impacts on the nearby SSSI and on local landscape character" Therefore if the plan would be to incorporate between 250-500 houses in this area, yet with no further infrastructure improvements, such as schools, doctor's surgeries, and access to main roads, then this site makes no sense, and it appears that it has only been included due to pressures of the developers. I note that Bellway Homes owns the land to the east, so no doubt apply pressure on the Council to allow building. The access points are also unworkable and if a site visit was conducted, then this would become quite obvious. I object to this development because it is the wrong place for such a large development and there are better places within Weymouth and Dorchester that could be developed cheaper, which would allow a higher percentage of affordable houses to be built. Originally this site was an 'exception site' which would provide 100% affordable housing to locals and Key Workers only. Yet between the last draft and this final copy, this figure has dropped to 50% which means that by definition 50% of the houses will be unaffordable to this demographic. This is not a good way to use 'green' land, and green land should only be built on if it provides truly affordable housing for locals.</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/28	<p>WNP 24 land at Budmouth Ave</p> <p>this is totally unsuitable for development. Access is very limited through PRESTON and would cause an eyecore on top of the hill as viewed from the beach area. Too much extra load of stretched services such as schools and doctors' surgeries. The late Councillor Tony Ferrari strongly objected to this development as many of his constituents are very much against this land being used for housing. The land is used for recreation and is in close proximity to ancient woodland Teddy Bear Wood. It's using another green space to infill and create sprawling development. Further these homes are rarely affordable and subject to market forces with a sea view will make them very expensive!</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/29	<p>WNP24</p> <p>This land fully lies within a 500m radius of the Lodmoor SSSI, and therefore development in this area may contravene sections of the Wildlife and Countryside act 1981. Lodmoor is designated a SSSI due to the birds that use it. These same birds rest and feed in the fields behind Brackendown. More importantly it is a wildlife corridor and home to protected species such as bats and badgers that are protected from disturbance and habitat destruction under the wildlife and countryside act 1981 and the Conservation of habitats and species regulations 2017. The proposed access to this site, which is via the end of Brackendown Avenue, as well as being unsuitable would also have to be built straight through a traditional orchard. Traditional orchards are priority habitat (Habitat of Principal importance) and public authorities must protect them under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities act 2000. They are also protected under the</p>	Noted objection to policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>Environmental Impact assessment Regulations (Agriculture). This development seems to contravene many of the Policy Objectives, notably Landscape and Greenspace Policies, WNP 03, WNP 04, WNP 05, WNP 10. As quoted in Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan Site Options and Assessment Report as of 13th January 2023: "Although access could be taken from Budmouth Avenue or the residential streets south of the site, these are all long and narrow culs-de-sac which are unlikely to have capacity to serve development of the whole site, and it is unlikely that the proposed capacity of 250 dwellings could be achieved without significant highways improvements. Consultation with the highways authority would be required." This land has previously been excluded from the SHLAA 2021 which concluded: "Relevant policy considerations, Outside the defined development boundary (SUS2); and is defined as having geological (ENV1 - Osmington Ridge and Vale) and local landscape interest (ENV3 - significant green space and important gap)." "Conclusion The site is located outside the development boundary and within land of local landscape importance and an important open gap. There are flooding and access concerns. An unsuitable site". Therefore I object on the grounds that this area is unsuitable and there are no reasonable grounds to why it should be included.</p>	
24/30	<p>WNP24 You state that there will be vehicular access via bracken down avenue. This is not possible due to houses bordering the entire length of the road. At Southdown farm the road cannot be extended into the field as this is traditional orchard, which is priority habitat under the Wildlife and Countryside act 1981. To access Brackendown there would be a very complicated meandering route through existing residential areas causing additional risks to pedestrians and human health. The additional traffic for 230 dwellings would be substantial. There is no mention regarding the impact on protected species that reside in this area. There are significant ecological surveys at DERC Dorset Environmental Records centre showing bats and badgers and water voles in the area there are also reptiles in the orchard and the field is used by birds at Lodmoor national nature reserve for daytime feeding and roosting.</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/31	<p>WPN24 The present access to this area is via Melbury Avenue, which is already difficult to get into, more houses can only make matters worse. To get to the proposed site entrance the traffic will have to thread their way through the already congested estate. The storm water and foul drainage systems need upgrading now throughout the estate due to flooding. The target of 50% of the planned 230 houses being affordable housing seems like a pie in the sky dream as a target like this has not been achieved. What has happened to the policy of not allowing buildings on the skyline.</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/32	<p>WNP24 Access road to the estate on Melstock Ave is already congested with vehicles trying to turn right into the estate. This can block the main Preston Road at busy times and will become more dangerous with another 230 homes, with potentially 350+ vehicles wanting to use this entrance. Already problems with water running from fields above Budmouth Ave. Properties have to cope with water running down drives, across roads and around buildings. An increase in properties will bring greater problems. The field above Budmouth Ave. is regularly used by the birds from the nature reserve, the plans will have an impact on the birds using the reserve. Other wild life, like deer, bats and owls will also be affected. The houses will have an impact on the skyline as they will be visible. Tourists using the sea front will have an additional line of properties on the skyline which is an 'eye sore'. Storm water drainage and foul water drainage, the present system struggles to cope with the present houses, increasing the number of houses, there will need to be a new drainage system for the whole of the area linked to these plans. When it rains, waters gushes down the roads and causes flooding at the bottom of the road. Houses lower down the estate have issues with water remining on their land after rain. Budmouth Ave is the main road up to the planned site, and there is already issues with the number of vehicles trying to pass each other at busy times. The tight bends on the road makes it dangerous at busy times and may limit the access for emergency vehicles.</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/33	<p>The aspirations of WNP21: Housing Mix and WNP22: Affordable Housing are to provide the right mix of housing to suit the needs of the local community with a focus on smaller 2-to-3-bedroom dwellings along with affordable housing. The proposed use of WNP24 is likely, in my opinion, to completely miss this key target due to the amount of infrastructural investment needed. This would include the complex drainage I have already outlined and the changes to local road connectivity to adequately cater to the increased traffic that would be created by the addition of 250 new dwellings, as was raised in the SHLAA review and captured in the AECOM Report.</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/34	<p>Land off Budmouth Avenue seems to imply 50% will be affordable housing. Considering the high elevation and views I think this area is far more suited to "unaffordable" housing, with very little ending up being affordable, thus not helping the housing problem. However my biggest concern is the high amount of water that runs off of this area and that's with it in agricultural use</p>	Noted objection to policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	rather than being concreted over. The whole of this hill with current housing down to Southdown avenue has underground streams that cope with the rain most of the time but clearly not all of the time, then it runs over the surface. Any current drainage is not coping, to accommodate the drainage requirements of more houses in addition to the reduction of permeable ground created by building those houses would require a mammoth drainage exercise. I see absolutely no mention of drainage in the neighbourhood plan. Where might the access to this area be? Currently Brackendown and Budmouth Avenue have continuous properties, and potential access could only be at the far ends of each of these roads, including pedestrian access. Access for the whole housing area, onto Preston road is only available at one point (2 if you count Wyke Oliver road), that's a lot of cars going to one exit, not to mention the building traffic. Being on a hill the houses would be very visible.	
24/35	WNP24 Land off Budmouth Avenue. I wish to raise concerns regarding the impact of building in this area. I have lived on Brackendown Avenue since 2003, my house has never flooded or had any issues with rain water or run off from the fields behind Brackendown Ave i.e. the area marked for housing development. In the past 20 years I have witnessed the impact of water run off as a result of the development at the western end of Brackendown Ave and I have heard from others in the area about various problems with water run of flooding through gardens etc following the house building on this estate. Is the council able to fully guarantee that if housing development takes place in the field north of Brackendown Ave that there will no issues with flooding to the existing houses. If housing is developed in this area and existing houses are impacted what is the process for managing this?	Noted objection to policy
24/36	no viable access for public transport. Vehicle access through Budmouth Avenue and Wyke Oliver road is unsatisfactory. The elevation is too much for pedestrian access or cycling (para. 11.11. Public Transport)	Noted objection to policy
24/37	is likely to encourage more retired people who are more likely to use cars than public transport etc. (para. 11.13)	Noted objection to policy
24/38	will encourage hundreds of extra car movements per day through unsuitable access roads which were never designed to be anything else but closed cul-de-sacs. (para. 11.34)	Noted objection to policy
24/39	Map 21 Development to be low rise so not to project above skyline. Land should be maintained for crops or extending allotments or solar farming. The proposed development will create severe traffic disruption to Budmouth Avenue, Bodkin lane and Kingsbere Road as road is narrower than Oakbury Drive. The junctions with Preston Road will need traffic management to avoid extensive delays and traffic disruption	Noted objection to policy
24/40	The development above Budmouth Ave- It is /should be illegal to build up catchment of a nature reserve. It is inconceivable that that the proposed social element will be built. The land is far too valuable. Should a builder request a change to plan then it should be put to a public vote by the local community. There is no fail-safe drainage plan with remedial water treatment. We get flooded from road run off!!!! Any run off that is uphill of the nature reserve must be treated and fail safe. House rain water goes to inadequate soak aways when the plan say it goes to storm drains. So building regulations and enforcement are inadequate. Road access is inadequate.... The example of the Kingsbere/Bodkin development. There should be no new through traffic from the proposed development. All traffic routes should be designed to reduce pollution, not increase it. All roads should be a minimum of two way to allow full emergency and service traffic. All houses should be built with integral parking for all local cars and visitors only within the property cartilage. There is no proposal for building of extra medical facilities and local shops. These must be built first to ensure they actually happen, and the builder does not do a runner.	Noted objection to policy
24/41	land off Budmouth Av. this is sloping ground with many winter springs which already flood several gardens, building will only make this worse. The skyline will be affected and does this encroach on the views from AOO. Access will be via estate roads which were never planned to take such traffic, this will be mainly cars as there is no public transport on this estate. Traffic will be via Melstock Av which has a sharp bend or Wyke Oliver Rd which has an Abbeyfield Care home situated close to the junction with Preston Rd, giving increased loading to Chalbury Corner roundabout which frequently grinds to a halt in the holiday season.	Noted objection to policy
24/42	WNP24: Land that could never be developed being gifted is irrelevant as it has no impact on environment/sustainability	Noted objection to policy
24/43 Chapman Lily Planning Ltd for Bellway homes	WNP24 Bellway Homes support the principle of allocating 'Land off Budmouth Avenue' subject to the following detailed comments on the criteria; 3i) Should include scope for the replacement of hedgerows, for instance where the comprehensive masterplan includes roadways or pedestrian links through existing hedgerow boundaries.	Noted comment(s) in support

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
24/44 Chapman Lily Planning Ltd for Bellway homes	Reference is made in a previous comment in relation to Policy WNP06 in the interest of consistency and practical delivery. 3iv) Should be worded to include reference to a phasing plan or s106 in the interest of clarity.	Noted comment(s) in support
24/45 Chapman Lily Planning Ltd for Bellway homes	as previously advised, the area we have offered to provide as an extension of the LVNP is 8ha (not 9.5ha). It also applies to para 9.69.	Change figure in WNP24 to read: "8.0ha"
24/46	WNP24 Land off Budmouth Avenue This size of development and others in excess of approx. 25 new dwellings will cumulatively contribute to unacceptable additional demand on local services, traffic congestion etc. Inappropriate development for the location	Noted objection to policy
24/47 Blue Waters	Paras. 10.16 and 10.17 Perhaps to whom it may concern will fully appreciate why we strongly oppose a plan to incorporate a building site access road along the back of our house and up the side, through the meadows to a building site removed from our position on the landscape. is my livelihood, for all the right reasons. The stunning views, the abundant presence of the birds from the RSPB, which we overlook. The insects and wildlife, the walking and coastal path access, the beautiful tranquil and recreational environment that is our home. My guest book and online reviews for blue waters say it all. I will not be deprived of what I have built up as a business, which goes in favour and promotes Weymouth as a tourist attraction, to such a devastating plan - geographically, bio-diversely, quality of life for existing residents as home owners and inflicting depreciation of our property value. We strongly oppose this particular proposal of the neighbourhood plan.	Noted objection to policy
24/48	WNP24 I believe the land where the proposed houses off Budmouth Avenue is being considered has already been sold to a developer so I find it impossible to believe that any comments made during the consultation process will have any effect on the outcome of the pre-submission plan. The site is not suitable for more houses, the amount of rain water that runs down the hill after downpours is incredible, more houses is just going to exacerbate the situation and I fear for the properties at the bottom of the hill. You agree that the site has 'geological and local landscape interest' yet access to this site is being considered at the end of Brackendown Avenue through the green land; stated by Weymouth CC as being an important part of the landscape to protect. Not only will it have a massive impact on the wildlife and the beauty of the area, but I also once again cannot believe that when the access road is in place, more houses won't be developed in this area as it will be an easy option; the once important beauty spot of Weymouth will be forgotten and eventually houses will join at Littlemore and Lodmoor. There has got to be a limit on when enough is enough. I also question the number of new houses proposed for Weymouth. You say that it is because young people can't afford the house prices, but I believe the real reason young people are leaving is because of the lack of job opportunity? Looking on property sites, there are affordable houses up for sale and so is there actually a need for so many more new ones? Perhaps, second home properties need to be addresses first. My husband and I moved to the area 1½ years ago, I used to live in Maidstone, Kent which used to be a lovely market town. The council developed so many new dwellings, much more than was required for the need of the community, and it resulted in lots of people from London coming to live in Maidstone. The town is now over-populated, the roads can't cope with the increased traffic, public services are strained, and serious crime has increased. As someone who used to love my home town, I couldn't bear to live there anymore; is this what you really want for the current residents of Weymouth, pushing locals out because their beloved town has been destroyed? Can Weymouth Council actually guarantee that all their commitments to the proposed planning site will be met?	Noted objection to policy
24/49	WNP24 Land at Budmouth Avenue site allocated for development subject to constraints including 50% affordable homes and gift of land to Lorton Valley Nature Park. Support: Improve Map to show access -provides necessary Affordable Homes and offsets with donation to LVNP.	Noted comment(s) in support
24/50	Map 21 Land off Budmouth Avenue I have engaged with numerous Preston residents who have voiced their apprehensions regarding the proposed construction of 230 properties in their vicinity. They have emphasised that the existing road infrastructure has not been adopted by Dorset Council due to unresolved drainage issues from the previous developer, a recurring problem in Weymouth, exemplified by similar challenges at Lodmoor Sands. For the plan to uphold the idea of 'superior' housing, it necessitates an accompanying improvement strategy	Noted objection to policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>from the current state. Residents closer to Lorton Meadows have also expressed concerns about potential air and noise pollution, anticipating negative impacts if a road or parking lot is constructed nearby. Furthermore, the plan lacks addressing essential infrastructure needs, particularly schools, in the area. Residents have highlighted congestion challenges, especially getting onto Littlemoor Road during the morning rush, with wait times exceeding 12 minutes. The forthcoming development of 500 properties at Bincombe Park, situated in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, is viewed as an undesirable outcome, placing responsibility on Dorset Council for neglecting the preservation of the area's aesthetic appeal. Concerns were also raised about the potential impact on local businesses, particularly those operating in an Airbnb-like capacity. Owners fear that the construction on roads ill-suited for heavy vehicles may compromise the serene and peaceful environment promised to their customers. Finally, there is shared concern for the wildlife in the area, especially migratory birds around RSPB Lodmoor.</p> <p>*I would like to emphasise that Bailey Venning Associates have affirmed the viability of Wyke Oliver Farm, while indicating that Budmouth Avenue is not economically feasible. Additionally, the evidence suggests that there is no substantial demand for housing in Weymouth.</p>	
24/51	<p>Policy WNP24</p> <p>It is difficult to determine from the online document what the detailed plans for this location are, as some of the maps are provided at insufficient resolution and cannot be read (e.g. Map 9 and others). However, I offer the following observations: Much of this land is waterlogged much of the year, so plays an important role in absorbing high rainfall. Urban development would increase pollution runoff into the surrounding area including RSPB Lodmoor (SSSI). The land is currently Land of Local Landscape Importance and Important Open Gap (ENV3) - There is no justification to change this. Dorset Council Local Plan Consultation 2021 proposes this land as an extension to Lorton Valley Nature Park. This is more appropriate use for this land than housing. Development on this land would further shrink the land available to local wildlife and narrow wildlife corridors between Lodmoor, Lorton Valley and areas further North and West. This land was, until recently, frequented by wildlife (including Barn Owls, Short Eared Owls, Deer). Sightings are becoming increasingly rare as development encroaches. Affordable housing built in this sought-after location is unlikely to remain 'affordable' once on the open market, so will not address the affordable housing shortage for long. I support the proposal to allocate all land in the Western side of the site to Dorset Wildlife Trust to be incorporated into the Lorton Valley Nature Park.</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/52	<p>WNP24 Land to Budmouth Avenue.</p> <p>Has poor width access to field and land. The field often unable to absorb increase in rain fall. Development will create further flooding issues. Trees, allotments should be planted to reduce run off into Lorton Valley reserve. pollution will increase to change of use by development. All development must have legal covenants for significant fines and withheld a deposit sum for retribution in likelihood of insolvency. This neighbourhood is a quiet area and be left to farming or planting of trees and increased allotments instead of increase in significant traffic. Alternative access off Louviers Rd or connect to main road via Bus Park and ride would provide significant better traffic flow. access to Preston Road would need significant improvement to avoid lengthy queues twice a day and residential complaints</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/53	<p>Developers often promise to build 'affordable' housing, but once the building works begin say they cannot viably build for that price. The area of land behind Budmouth Avenue has always been considered unsuitable for development by previous councils, but these considerations appear to be ignored by the plan.</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/54	<p>Para. 8.24 - biodiversity.</p> <p>Currently the field behind Brackendown Avenue are home to deer, badgers and many mammal and avian species. Development will see the end of this.</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/55	<p>WNP24</p> <p>Access to both Brackendown and Wyke Oliver potential developments is poor - particularly off Budmouth Avenue which is very narrow and immediately into the brow of a hill and a turn (currently a cul-de-sac). I don't know how many dwellings are currently on the estate (estimate 600-700), but this feels like a 75% increase in dwellings and therefore vehicles. Has any consideration been given to an extra access onto Littlemoor road in place of the Budmouth avenue access? I thought there was once a plan to reduce and slow traffic on the Preston Road? It is laudable to say 50% affordable homes - but there is no way any developer will actually do that - they will want to build 3 and 4 bed homes - which are far more likely to attract in extra retirees and not provide housing for local workers. The only way to get the number of affordable homes needed is for the council to build them.</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/56	<p>1. Development proposals that are likely to have a significant adverse effect on the integrity or continuity of landscape features and habitats of local and national importance and the wild flora and fauna in those areas indicated on Map 8 will not be supported</p>	Noted objection to policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>unless unavoidable due to exceptional circumstances and the proposed mitigation measures are proportionate to the status of the site and satisfy the requirements of the local planning authority.</p> <p>2. Compensation measures will be permissible as a last resort only.</p> <p>3. Proposals to protect or restore any existing features, or to create new features of wildlife habitat – particularly where these form linkages between habitats within or beyond the site – will be supported. I make no apology for copying directly from the plan as on every level a property development suggested at Brackendown Avenue/Budmouth Avenue, the draft policy will fail. It's interesting that on page 44 of the plan, Map 12 (Green Gaps) Area 1 clearly shows the proposed development areas as two black 'blobs' which virtually obliterate this important area. I very strongly suggest that the area proposed for housing development is removed from this plan and the existing Defined Development Boundary should stay in place in perpetuity and no building should be permitted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Brackendown/Budmouth site lies within a 500m buffer zone designed to protect an SSSI (Lodmoor Nature Reserve). Any building would be in contravention of legislation. • Both Brackendown/Budmouth and Wyke Oliver Farm sites enjoy habitats for numerous flora and fauna including hedgerows where birds of prey feed, deer, bats and badgers. It also serves a feeding ground for water fowl during the autumn. • The natural green corridor (between Littlemoor and Preston) would be narrowed if the above areas were developed not to mention the huge disruption to wildlife during the construction phase which would probably last for a number of years. • The area is enjoyed by large numbers of recreational walkers, cyclists and runners and visitors who enjoy the peace and beauty of this area. Any development will significantly and detrimentally impact on this very valuable asset. 	
24/57	Para 9.64. This proposal was rejected by the local community	Noted objection to policy
24/58	Due to extremely poor consultation with the local community and failing to take into account concerns raised by the planning Department of the former W&PBC this document does not include the vistas and panoramas looking inland from the Preston Beach promenade. Any building on the land behind Budmouth Avenue will break the skyline/ridge-line and fail to provide a graduated landscape leading from the current housing to the NL (former AONB). This point was raised very strongly by the old W+P planning department but ignored by in this plan. I would be happy to show this vista to the Steering Group.	Noted objection to policy
24/59	The additional housing proposed behind Budmouth Avenue will result extra traffic on roads throughout the estate causing a build-up of traffic trying to access onto Preston Road. There will be an extra strain on schools in the area, also on Doctors surgeries where it proves difficult to get an appointment without the additional number of residents should these houses be built. The Hospital already has long waiting-lists, with the additional number of people buying housing on the new Littlemoor road estate this would put a massive strain on the hospital. Removing a green lung area of which there aren't many in the area. There should also be a corridor between the existing houses on Budmouth Avenue and the proposed new develop (SSE). There is a big development of new houses along the Littlemoor Road which will consist of affordable housing. The houses built behind Budmouth Avenue would not be affordable homes therefore local families would not be able to afford to move to that area.	Noted objection to policy
24/60	Most new residents in the proposed plan will be commuting. Probably two or more vehicles per household. Increasing traffic issues in and around Preston and the relief road. Especially in the holiday season. Page76, Map21	Noted objection to policy
24/61	The vista looking inland from Preston beach road will be affected with the skyline being broken. There is no mention of this.	Noted objection to policy
24/62	Policy WNP15 maintains that vistas and views should be maintained, so why propose building where visas and views be decimated. Any development on the Brackendown/Budmouth proposed site would break the sky line changing the character of housing 'nestling on slopes and into a valley' to an urban sprawl where all the eyes can see are houses. It was argued that some houses already break the sky line, but that doesn't mean it's right and was probably a poor planning decision many years ago. But we do not want to make matters worse. All properties on the West side of Budmouth Avenue and on the North side of Brackendown Avenue would have their views of countryside and fields (at the rear of their properties) obstructed by houses and would have no view of the countryside. I was very involved in the last round of consultations five years ago or so and it was clearly identified by planning officer s that the proposed area for development was not suitable on a number of grounds, the environment being a prominent one. As a result, the proposal was removed from the plan."	Noted objection to policy
24/63	Budmouth and Brackendown Aves -the proposed development on this land would have an extremely negative visual impact on the sky-line and landscape, especially from the whole of the Preston Beach and road.	Noted objection to policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>-the proposed inclusion of 50% affordable and rental properties would destroy the character of the existing development.</p> <p>- vehicle access via Budmouth and Brackendown (and Oakbury Drive) is unacceptable, as they are already heavily congested with parked cars either side.</p> <p>-access onto the Preston Rd is already extremely difficult, and dangerous (especially from Melstock Av).</p> <p>- If you decide that this proposed development must go ahead, then access should be via Louviers Rd or Littlemoor Rd. This would have the added advantage of providing direct access to the community facilities at Littlemoor, and also provide direct access to the Weymouth Relief Rd and to Dorchester.</p>	
24/64	<p>Property development at Brackendown Avenue /Budmouth Avenue seems inevitable to fail with regards to the WNP03 Wildlife Habitats and Areas 1. The map 12 on page 44 shows the proposed development which obliterates this area particular important wildlife area. I very strongly suggest this proposed area for building is removed from the plan. My reasons are that the Brackendown and Budmouth site lies within a 500m buffer zone of an SSSI which is Lodmoor Nature Reserve. Both Brackendown and Budmouth and Wyke Oliver Farm sites have many flora and fauna of hedgerows. birds of prey feed, deer, bats and badgers and many breeds of water fowl. The green corridor between Preston and Littlemoor would significantly be narrowed which would disrupt the wildlife. The skyline would be changed behind Brackendown and Budmouth if housing were to be allowed.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
24/65	<p>Where I live, as I have said previously, there is a Traditional Orchard that is protected. Plans show a totally unnecessary road to be built, completely destroying the whole essence of the beautiful area. Brackendown Ave, has not been adopted by the council so therefor cannot see how this plan can go ahead. We have a management company overseeing. The sky at night here is amazing due to extremely little light pollution which makes for brilliant stargazing, which would be completely lost if a road was built. Not only that, noise pollution and far less clean air which goes against all clean air policies. So much wildlife is around this area, badgers, bird life will be gone for ever. How is your conscience about destroying all this beauty !!</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
24/66 Dorset Council	<p>WNP24 Land at Budmouth Avenue.</p> <p>Land at Budmouth Avenue is allocated for approximately 230 new homes. The proposal also includes the transfer of 9.5ha of land to Dorset Wildlife Trust to form an extension to the Lorton Valley Nature Park. Land in the vicinity of Southdown Allotments sufficient to double its size should be transferred to Weymouth Town Council. It should be noted that the site has previously been considered as a potential option site by both Dorset Council and Weymouth and Portland Borough Council before that but has not been taken further forward to date.</p> <p>166. Availability – A ‘call for sites’ process was carried out between September and October 2021 to identify land which would be suitable for allocation. Land at Budmouth Avenue was submitted to Weymouth Town Council through this process and is therefore considered available.</p> <p>167. Achievability – The site has been subject to ‘initial viability testing of Greenfield sites’ prepared by Bailey Venning Associates (27 September 2023) Policy criteria</p> <p>168. Criterion 2 / Site capacity – The Landscape and Urban Design team would question the estimated site capacity of approximately 230 new homes without a thorough understanding of the site constraints.</p> <p>169. Criterion 3 (ii) – The safeguarding of the Old Orchard is welcomed.</p> <p>170. Criterion 3 (v) / Site Access – The policy and landscape and urban design teams note that the provision of appropriate safe vehicular and pedestrian access points via Budmouth Avenue and Brakendown Avenue have been previously explored through the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan Review Preferred Options consultation (2018). An indicative layout of the WEY14 site appears on Page 195 and shows three potential vehicular access points from: Wyke Oliver Close; Budmouth Avenue; and Pinemoor Close, off Brackendown Avenue. A number of issues have been identified with these potential vehicular access points, which may include the need to acquire third party land. In addition to the third-party land issue, there may also be issues with land stability and residential amenity. Further technical advice and guidance should be sought from the Highways Development Team.</p> <p>171. Criterion 6 - The Council's NET note the commitment to transfer 9.5ha of land to DWT, along with a sum to cover future maintenance. If this site is to be allocated it is our view that the policy should require an additional sum to be transferred to DWT to mitigate for the inevitable increase in recreational activity which will occur (e.g. for increased presence of rangers, public engagement, signage, fencing etc.).</p> <p>172. Suitability (other constraints)</p> <p>173. Road network - Local people have expressed concern about additional traffic generation from the site and the impacts on the local road network. This issue should be explored further with the Highways Development Team.</p>	<p>Defer decision pending discussions with DWT, developer and DC.</p> <p>Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received and further discussions.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>174. Flooding – A lack of a criterion referring to flood risk is a concern. Paragraph 7.5.49 of the Local Plan Review (2018) identifies an issue with surface water from the site discharging into the Preston Brook and the associated flood alleviation scheme, which has inherent limitations. This is still considered to be a relevant issue that needs to be addressed, but discussions between the Flood Risk Management Team and local residents, have led to two further surface water discharge catchments being identified, each with reported downstream flood risk and inherent limitations.</p> <p>The further catchments discharging to: Budmouth Avenue (and Bodkin Lane); and the eastern end of Brackendown Avenue (in the vicinity of Pinemoor Close and Southdown Farm). Historic Ordnance Survey maps also indicate the presence of springs in this area and local residents have also reported spring flows from within the site. This may give rise to flooding issues, both within the site and affecting the existing development in the area.</p> <p>175. Land Instability - A lack of a criterion referring to land instability is a concern. Representations submitted to the Local Plan Review (2018) detailed several properties in the area have suffered from subsidence. The instability of the land is likely a result of the underlying geology where strata with a degree of porosity (grits and limestones) overlies impermeable strata (i.e. clays). This geology also gives rise to the springs in the area.</p> <p>176. Drainage - The underlying geology may also have implications for any drainage strategy. The impermeable clay, which may have very limited capacity for infiltration and percolation, may limit the options for sustainable urban drainage solutions.</p> <p>177. Green Infrastructure Network - Policy ENV3 applies to Important Open Gaps and land of local landscape importance and explains “Development that would cause harm to the green infrastructure network or undermine the reasons for an area’s inclusion within the network will not be permitted unless clearly outweighed by other considerations.” It is recommended that the contribution this site makes to the green infrastructure network is separately assessed.</p> <p>178. Lorton Valley Wildlife corridor - The Council’s NET note that the allocation at Budmouth Avenue is within the Lorton Valley wildlife corridor, as defined by the 'Urban Wildlife Corridors and Stepping Stones: Weymouth and Portland Borough – Addendum (September 2020)'. There is, therefore, significant conflict between this policy and policy WNP05 whose primary purpose is to protect these wildlife corridors.</p> <p>179. Landscape and visual impact - In order to support the Local Plan Review, the council commissioned a landscape and heritage study, which is online here - Landscape and Heritage Studies - Dorset Council In particular we draw your attention to the Stage 2 Assessment for Weymouth - Weymouth Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (dorsetcouncil.gov.uk) The Stage 2 report includes an assessment of the wider Wyke Oliver / Southdown Farm area (shown as Assessment Area: Weymouth 5) and concluded that this wider area is of ‘moderate-high’ landscape sensitivity. The Stage 2 assessment highlights some key characteristics, such as: the separation the landscape provides between Littlemoor and Overcombe / Preston; the locally prominent hill slopes; and views in and out of this area. Although much of the site is concealed by existing development in views across Lodmoor from Preston Road, parts of the site are visible west of Overcombe Court and from more elevated positions along Bowleaze Cove Way.</p> <p>180. Biodiversity Net Gain – The policy could refer to Biodiversity Net Gain as required by National legislation and WNP05.</p> <p>Planning Policy Advice</p> <p>181. If this site is to be taken forward it is recommended the following additional evidence is collected in support of any site allocation.</p> <p>a) Further work to investigate the issues of flood risk, downstream limitations and springs. These issues need to be assessed and a suitable drainage strategy, which takes account of the underlying geology needs to be developed.</p> <p>b) Further work to investigate the issue of land stability. It would need to be demonstrated that the site could be made stable and that development upon it would not trigger landsliding or subsidence within or beyond the site.</p> <p>c) Further work to show the likely visual impact of development and how it could be satisfactorily accommodated within this sensitive landscape.</p> <p>d) Further work to show that satisfactory access could be delivered. The council would need to be convinced that both any planning issues and any ownership / access rights issues could be overcome to enable the site to be delivered.</p> <p>e) Further work to show the impacts of additional traffic would be helpful. As part of any such work, the safety of the junction of Melstock Avenue with Preston Road should be examined, where there is a blind summit on Preston Road to the south of the junction.</p> <p>182. We understand that site promoters seek an extension to the Lorton Valley Nature Park on adjacent land. An ecological survey would be helpful to support this proposal.</p> <p>183. The Landscape and Urban Design team advise that many of these issues will have a bearing on the site layout and design. It is therefore recommended that these site constraints are investigated in advance of formal site allocation and co-ordinated through ‘initial’ master planning work reflecting an iterative process to site design.</p>	

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
<p>24/67 Dorset Council, Flood Risk Mgt Team</p>	<p>WNP24 Land off Budmouth Avenue</p> <p>Due to downstream flood risk issues rainwater harvesting and water re-use should be the first priority for inclusion within the proposed surface water management strategy. This could help to reduce the volumes of surface water making its way downstream and therefore reduce the risk of downstream flooding.</p> <p>Although British Geological Society (BGS) mapping indicates that infiltration rates may be variable across the site the applicant must demonstrate that the SuDS hierarchy has been followed and infiltration must be prioritised as the proposed means of surface water management. A developer will need to demonstrate that they have carried out site specific ground investigations in order to ascertain the viability of infiltration as means of surface water management. Mapping indicates that some infiltration may work but possibly not across the whole site. Testing will allow for SuDS features to be designed and located accordingly. Care should be taken to carry out infiltration testing to the standards set in BRE Digest 365 at the depth and location of any proposed infiltration-based SuDS. Also due to the sloping nature of the site the applicant should consider using multiple smaller suds features spread across the site rather than just one end of system attenuation feature.</p> <p>Groundwater monitoring across the course of the year will be required in order to demonstrate that groundwater will not impact the functioning and reduce the attenuation volume of any proposed soakaway features.</p> <p>Discharge to watercourse may not be feasible due to the distance to the nearest watercourse however there are a number of nearby Surface Water Sewers that may allow for a surface water connection with a restricted discharge. Any proposed connection to a Wessex Water owned asset will need to have an agreement in principle before a full or outline planning application for the site would be accepted by the LLFA. Additional restrictions on surface water discharge above and beyond greenfield rate may be necessary in order to minimise risk to downstream areas.</p> <p>Open SuDS must be prioritised with multifunctional benefits including improvements to amenity, biodiversity and water quality.</p>	<p>Refer, in the supporting text, to comments by the Flood Risk Management Team and the required evidence and supporting documents.</p>
<p>24/68</p>	<p>If the plan's aims are to minimise the risk of flooding, why are these proposals for housing developments that will only serve to increase this risk on already vulnerable areas? Map four is misleading as it does not appear to show the 500 houses that are already being built north of Littlemoor Rd building even more green space and farmland is not protecting the environment.</p> <p>The attraction of Weymouth is not only the historic town and harbour, but also the surrounding countryside and coast, and not an urban sprawl. Focus should be to develop on brownfield sites and not on green spaces and farmland as the plan states. These areas play a significant role in flood alleviation and ecological networks so should not be built on.</p> <p>I believe the selection for new development sites is flawed consultations have not been well attended because many members of the public were not aware of them, I am opposed to the development on Budmouth Ave.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
<p>24/69 Dorset Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>DWT object to the current wording which states that "An area of approx. 9.5ha of land shall be transferred to Dorset Wildlife Trust to form part of the Lorton Vally Nature Park along with a commuted sum to cover future maintenance."</p> <p>At this stage no agreement has been made with respect to Dorset Wildlife Trust taking on this land although DWT have agreed that this would be a possibility in principle and would be open to discuss the option.</p> <p>It is suggested that more appropriate wording would be: "An area of approx. 9.5ha of land shall be transferred to Dorset Wildlife Trust to form part of the Lorton Vally Nature Park to a suitable organisation, such as Dorset Wildlife Trust, which will manage the site to enhance its ecological value and for recreational access as part of the Lorton Valley Nature Park along with a commuted sum to cover future maintenance.–The transfer of land will be accompanied with a commuted sum to cover initial capital costs and long-term future maintenance."</p> <p>DWT will also reserve the right to independently respond to any development proposals that are brought forward on this site, irrespective of any separate agreement that may be reached regarding transfer of land.</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received.</p> <p>Include agreed position statement from DWT in the supporting text.</p>
<p>WNP24 and WNP25 Combined Representation</p>		
<p>24/5/1</p>	<p>Proposed developments at these sites and at the density proposed will create an 'urban outlier' (Map WNP p 28). Additionally, these sites are proposed within an area of 'wildlife corridors and stepping stones' (Map WNP p 33.)</p> <p>Draft policy WNP 04 in toto refers. these areas also fall within the existing Ecological Network (Map 8 WNP p37).</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
<p>24/5/2</p>	<p>The developments at WNP24 and WNP25 are infilling not only green belt land but areas that are rich in diversity of wildlife being so close to the SSSI that is Lodmoor and Lorton Meadows. These areas should be protected as Green Belt land and not used for housing development. The addition of something like 1000 extra cars, since there will not be an</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	adequate public transport provision at all referenced in pages 74 and 77, means that the carbon impacts in these areas will be huge. I comment on this further in section 9.	
24/5/3	<p>"I object to the proposed two planning developments outlined in the Neighbourhood Plan called WNP24 Budmouth Avenue and WNP25 Wyke Oliver Farm.</p> <p>I will address each of the objections in turn in this submission. Firstly, I would like to comment on the principle upon which many of the developments in the Weymouth area are made and why they should not go ahead. The output of businesses in West Dorset, as measured through gross value added or GVA, has risen since 2010 and is now above the South West average but remains below the national average. The GVA in Weymouth and Portland has fluctuated in recent years and remains significantly below the South West and national averages. Both West Dorset and Weymouth and Portland have experienced a decline in employment over the last five years. Sectors which have experienced high employment decline include the public sector, transport and logistics, and wholesale and retail. Weymouth and Dorchester have a significant imbalance. Weymouth has a significant amount of outward commuting to Dorchester for jobs and Dorchester relies on a much wider area for its workforce and economic success. Weymouth is by its nature a town driven by tourism; extremely busy in summer and extremely quiet in winter. It does not have any major industrial or manufacturing baseline employment and the population of Weymouth has stagnated since 2011. Therefore, there is fundamentally a question that with a stagnant population why any further housing development should take place at all. It is clear that as people come to working age or leaving education age they move out of Weymouth since there is limited employment. Nothing in this plan gives any hope for attracting any significant inward investment beyond the poorly paid retail and hospitality sectors. It would be much more appropriate to build the houses where the employment is likely to be, and recognise Weymouth for what it is, a seaside town reliant on tourism.</p> <p>Objection - The proposed development at site WNP24 and WNP25</p> <p>I strongly object to these sites for the following reasons:</p> <p>a) The general principle of whether further housing is needed in Weymouth has not been effectively made.</p> <p>b) In December 2016 the Council stated that this site was 'not potential for development'. The reasons for this site now becoming a Preferred Option have not been made transparent and the evidence is the same in 2018 and 2021 as it was in 2016.</p> <p>c) The Preston area is already densely populated, and the local roads and infrastructure would not be able to support a further 480 homes, with potentially 1000+ cars and potentially 1000 - 2000 residents, adults and children.</p> <p>d) The increase in traffic would be dangerous. All the roads in and around Wyke Oliver Rd, Budworth Avenue, Brackendown Avenue and Oakbury Drive are already extremely congested with on street parking being the norm. The roads that are quoted as access points are totally unsuited for this purpose. Your policy states two access points but the map also states Wyke Oliver Road/Close as an access point. Adding circa 1000 vehicles to these roads would be dangerous. The existing Preston Road/Wyke Oliver Road junction is already a problem due to permanent car parking at that junction.</p> <p>e) With significant levels of on street parking on these roads the increase in traffic would be dangerous and run very high risks of accidents and personal injury. These roads are certainly not suitable for the very heavy plant machinery that will be needed for construction.</p> <p>f) The Preston area already suffers from a lack of doctors, dentists and schooling. So, the existing infrastructure does not support the existing homes and population, yet alone a further 480 homes. In addition, the current development opposite the Littlemoor Shopping Centre will pressurise local health services beyond their existing levels. Our health services are at breaking point now. The current GP waiting times are in excess of 6 weeks, adding a further 2000 residents and children will exacerbate an already very poor provision.</p> <p>g) The public transport system only operates via the Preston Road which is too far from the Wyke Oliver Farm and Budmouth Avenue sites, the roads are far too narrow for public transport to navigate, so this would be a development without a viable public transport solution. The roads are 6 metres in width and with the on-street parking buses would not be able to navigate through the area and that is why there isn't any public transport now.</p> <p>h) These houses will be on the top of a significant hills making walking to Preston Road for these potential residents a very difficult option particularly the elderly. Therefore, there is no viable transport option other than use of cars. This would be in contravention to one of your Strategic Priorities, I quote'Provide greater opportunities to reduce car use; improve safety; ensure convenient and appropriate public transport services; and seek greater network efficiency for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians...." This site will rely entirely on car access.</p> <p>i) The sites are home to a rich diverse wildlife and the site should become part of the Lorton Meadows and Lodmoor wildlife areas and not developed for housing. The biodiversity is truly impressive with deer, foxes, badgers, owls, birds of prey and this summer the Lorton Meadows area was proudly featured on BBC's Countryfile. We should</p>	Noted objection to policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>protect and preserve these areas, the Wyke Oliver Farm site belongs in this wider conservation area. Again, your Strategic Priorities states; 'Protect and enhance the outstanding natural and built environment, including its landscape, biodiversity and geodiversity, and the local distinctiveness of places within the area – this will be the over-riding objective in those parts of the plan review area which are particularly sensitive to change' ...</p> <p>j) The area and the hills all around Preston are clay based and are prone to flooding and water saturation. A further development of 480 or so homes would just increase the danger of flooding not just for the new homes but all the residents in the streets below these hilltop developments. Again your Strategic Priorities state; 'Reduce vulnerability to the impacts of climate change, both by minimising the potential impacts and by adapting to those that are inevitable– this will be the over-riding objective in those parts of the plan review area which are at highest risk' providing ponds will also just increase danger to animals and children, it has to be questioned who will maintain and monitor these ponds.</p> <p>k) Finally, there is no employment locally, all the existing employment is on the west side of Weymouth and increasingly outside of Weymouth. There is significant driving out of Weymouth for work. The sites on the western side of Weymouth make more sense from a transport, employment and, as far as I understand, a lack of objection by local residents.</p> <p>l) Your plan states that effective community consultations have taken place in Preston. This is simply not true, we live directly opposite the land proposed for development at Wyke Oliver Farm, we have not been contacted or engaged in any consultation. It would be very unwise to base any policy on such poor attempts at community consultations. I also understand that earlier this year the Council rejected concerns of residents, this is improper behaviour by the Council.</p> <p>m) These developments are deliberately infilling green space between Preston and Littlemoor when we all realise there are more Brownfield sites that could be developed if needed. The change of use from Greenfield sites is not justified in your plan and will change the landscape significantly and detrimentally.</p> <p>n) The aim of 50% affordable housing is unlikely to be met, historically 13-19% has been achieved and developers will avoid this if they can prove it is not economically viable and offset their commitments to elsewhere in their portfolios or via a financial contribution.</p> <p>o) Whilst the land at WNP25 Wyke Oliver Farm may be available, it has been available through many Neighbourhood Plan developments and rightly refused planning every time. In 2021 the Dorset Council Local Plan did not include allocations for both sites, this was the right decision then and the rational for changing that 2021 decision has not been effectively made in this Neighbourhood Plan Development."</p>	
24/5/4	<p>WNP24 and WNP25 both fall within the AONB and beyond the development boundary and are currently used to grow corn in the last few seasons, apparently with great success. Wild birds from the nearby RSPB Lodmoor reserve and wild deer graze on the stalks and cob residue post-harvest, making it an important food resource for wildlife prior to the onset of winter. Converting these fields into housing would remove this resource and would negatively impact the wildlife in the area.</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/5/5	<p>WNP24 and WNP25</p> <p>Access out of the existing Overcombe residential area is currently provided by two roads - Wyke Oliver Road and Melstock Avenue. Adding almost 500 new homes as detailed in the policies referenced above will cause greater congestion with the additional traffic that will result, and the plan does not address this issue as there appears to be no additional new access roads serving the Overcombe residential area. In addition, during construction there will be a significant increase in vehicle movements due to construction traffic (material and equipment deliveries. plus cars and vans used by the workforce to get to/from work) and this can only result in serious traffic congestion and subsequent disruption to the local community.</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/5/6	<p>WNP24 and WNP25</p> <p>Allocation of Development in the Greenspace between Littlemoor, Preston, Overcombe is not appropriate and will be very damaging."</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/5/7	<p>WNP24 and WNP 25</p> <p>Use of the word 'should' needs to be reconsidered. it carries little weight in a legal argument.</p>	Noted comment.
24/5/8	<p>While overall, the plan seems to be considerate for conservation, I have objections, specifically to WNP24 for the land behind Budmouth Avenue, and for WNP25 for the land at Wyke Oliver Farm. As a resident lower down the hill in Highdown, I am concerned at the destruction of the land at the top of the slope. With increasing concrete with the proposed development, the land at the top will be less able to soak up water. With the climate changing to more severe rains, we are already seeing water cascading down the hill, flooding garages and the land further down. Underground streams add to this flow of water. The area has seen landslip nearer the coast and there is no consideration of the stability of the land where houses may suffer from slippage. Will the developers consider</p>	Noted objection to policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>some means of prevention of this possibility? As important for the residents is the increase in traffic accessing the main Preston Road. Only two access roads are available, namely Wyke Oliver Road and Melstock Avenue. This can only cause congestion all around the surrounding roads at peak times and during the holiday period. The local facilities - schools, doctor's surgeries, hospitals, etc. are already overstretched. The extra population will increase to overload these facilities even further. It already takes 2 weeks to see a doctor - how much longer will we have to wait? I do not believe any of my concerns are covered by the plans.</p>	
24/5/9	<p>I strongly object to WNP24 and WNP25</p> <p>Both of these sites are outside of the development boundary and therefore cannot recommended in the NP as they are unachievable. The adopted 2015 local plan defines this space as an important local gap subject to policy ENV3 SHLAA 2014&2015 updated in 2016 defined the unallocated land as unsuitable for development SHLAA 2019 defined the land as unsuitable for development and stated, "The site is located outside the development boundary and within land of local landscape importance and an important open gap. There are flooding and access concerns." SHLAA 2021 concludes the site is located outside the development boundary and within land of local landscape importance and an important open gap. There are flooding and access concerns. An unsuitable site. The unallocated land is within an existing Ecological network (https://dorsetlnp.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Eco-Net-Weymouth-Portland-2020.pdf) The unallocated land is part of the Lorton Valley corridor (https://dorsetlnp.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Weymouth-Portland-Corridors-and-Stepping-Stones-Report-2010.pdf) From the referenced document "The Lodmoor – Lorton Valley provide a complex mosaic of habitats that together form a significant high quality north – south wildlife corridor through the borough. The corridor is significantly constrained to the east of Littlemoor, with the Wyke Oliver Farm gap forming a vital connection to the wider countryside. The majority of the surviving semi-natural habitat in the corridor is in conservation management. Proposals for the establishment of a Lorton Valley Country Park have the potential to significantly improve the quality, connectivity and management of habitats in the northern section of the valley. Conversely further infill development within the valley is likely to have a detrimental impact to the wildlife corridor." The land covered by these policies was presented in the previous consultation as an "exception site" with 100% affordable housing. The use of this land in any manner was strongly rejected by the community but the NP team have ignored the public option in favour of their own agenda and now recommend the sites as a full site with significantly more building! Reference "Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan Homes Focus Group Workshop Discussion Questions and Prompts Tue 28th Feb 13.30 to 15.00" states of page 3 "The January 2023 Consultation shows substantial disagreement by respondents with one or more of the sites on Map E being considered as an exception site, for a major affordable housing development. 19% of respondents agree, 64% disagree and 17% don't know. The relative strength of community opposition is shown by the written response to the January 2023 Consultation: Land end of Southdown Ave 3 disagreed; 6 Land off Budmouth Ave (site 6) 76 disagreed; 7 Wyke Oliver Farm north (site 7) 45 disagreed; 8 Land south of Wessex Roundabout (site 8) 3 disagreed; 9 Redlands Farm (site 9) 4 disagreed; 10 Lodmoor Old tip – mid (site 10) 25 disagreed; 11 Lodmoor Old tip – south (site 11) 22 disagreed" The blatant disregard of the democratic process by the NP team in favour of their own agendas is clearly demonstrated in the minutes of the "Meeting: Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group Meeting Date and Time: Monday 13th February at 7.00pm Place: Council Chamber, The New Town Hall, Commercial Road" where on page 3 Item 5 it states "David advised the group that he was going to write to the Planning department about how the impact that the false communication has had on the results, as he was concerned that the number of negative comments would be taken into account. Phil did make a point that although we cannot demonstrate that there was an impact on the false communication, we can allude to it having potentially influenced results." It needs to be recognised that this so called "false" information is now what has been included in the NP. These areas are protected area under the 2021 amendments to The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 The houses off the site are subject to regular flooding during even moderate rain fall and any building will increase the flooding that already occurs in Budmouth and Bodkin. The supporting document provided for this land on page 75 clearly shows that the only way this land can be justified is to fudge the figures to make it look viable, Statements include "For the benefit of clarity, we make the (unrealistic) assumption that the entire development, including land acquisition, is financed at a (rolled up) rate of 8%. In reality, of course, no bank would fund a project where the developer had no stake. In this sense, the allowance is generous. The assumption is also unrealistic in as much as the debt would almost certainly be structured in tranches – each subject to their own interest rate, arrangement and exit fees. Such arrangements are too diverse to capture, and the convention is that we make this simplified (but slightly generous allowance)." "The imposition of a 50% affordable housing requirement is, of course, the single most significant aspect of planning gain." "This is a matter which I</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>believe that Dorset Council is working hard to solve but at the lower tier of Neighbourhood Plan making, it may not be possible to achieve complete accuracy here. If Dorset significantly increases their ambition in respect of planning obligations (either through CIL or S106) our conclusions in respect of affordable housing may need to be revised." "Our initial finding then is that Wyke Oliver Farm is viable, but Budmouth Avenue is not. One peculiarity of this outcome is that, because of its lower density, the Budmouth Avenue site, has fewer homes but a higher Benchmark Land Value." "With that in mind and in view of the fact that the four-bedroom homes we identified in our search of comparables were smaller than we had expected to find, we re-ran our model with the size of the average four-bedroom house increased to 150m2. We also turned down the value allowance slightly, to £3,700/m2 for a spot value of £555,000. That is consistent with prices currently sought by CG Fry on their current development at Chesil Reach. Even on that basis, coverage rises only to 10,400sqft/acre – this would still be quite a lightly developed development – but land value rises to £4.13m. Enough to render the site viable without any diminution of the affordable housing requirement of 50%." The pictures on pages 73, 76, 78, 79, 82 and 84 bear no relation to the content and have obviously been included to distract the reader.</p>	
24/5/10	<p>WPN24, WPN25, WP26 The inclusion in the WNP of large-scale new developments (WPN24, WPN25, WP26) of on greenfield sites (e.g. farmland) outside the current Local Plan defined development boundary should not be considered until an up-to-date housing need number for Weymouth is supplied Dorset Council Local Plan or generated by Weymouth Town Council. This is because the 3,225 homes from the Draft Local Plan issued in 2021 is likely to change as a result of significant changes such as recent policy drivers at the national level regarding housing numbers and delivery, e.g.:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> with respect to changes in the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) expected to be published the week of 19th December 2023 the Levelling-up and Regeneration Bill These changes may reduce the number of homes required in Weymouth from the Local Plan below the 3,225 in 2021. When the revised number of homes for Weymouth is known, and if required, the large greenfield sites with a high allocation of affordable homes can be fully considered and allocated or be identified as exceptions sites. 	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>
24/5/11	<p>In addition to the proposed development being outside the development area, set out below, my additional reasons for objecting to this proposal are that it is out of character with the surrounding Preston area, the land is subject to flooding, and the road infrastructure is totally unsuitable for use by both construction traffic and the subsequent use by approximately 750 vehicles, assuming an average of 1.5 cars per household.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
24/5/12	<p>I support the development of housing, especially low-cost housing, but not in areas outside the existing development boundaries, especially at the expense of green space. My objections to the proposed developments within the Preston and Lodmoor sites are that they are completely out of character with the area. Also the area is frequently subject to flooding and the infrastructure is totally unsuitable. The proposed access roads, i.e. Wyke Oliver Road and the roads leading to Melstock Avenue are totally unsuitable, too narrow and would be unable to cope with the increased volume of traffic. The two junctions with Preston Road are dangerous enough already. Surely it would make more sense to extend the developments to the north of Littlemoor Road, joining force with infrastructure under construction.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
24/5/13	<p>Land off Budmouth Avenue and Wyke Oliver Farm. The impact on additional housing with a minimum of 2 car per household, on Budmouth this could mean 400 cars moving through many junctions and narrow road ways to get out of the wider estate, compacting problems already known (congestion and multiple accidents) with the roads connecting to Preston main road. How is this beneficial to the community. I Believe the community needs the 50% avoidable housing on the greenfield sites, but the area is not suitable for bus routes required for those households without cars. These developments are right next to areas of SSSI and registered nature reserves, is there not a policy in these plans for protect the ecology of the area. How is this area suitable for housing</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
24/5/14	<p>Extensive building is already underway on the north side of Littlemoor road and more land seems to be available to the west of the current development site which appears still to be for sale. Why are we looking for more housing in Weymouth? Brackendown, Budmouth and Wyke Oliver are outside the Defined Development Boundary, and this was also rejected in the previous local plan. It appears that the Town Council or Dorset Council are in communication with the land owners (Bellway Homes) a large and influential development company who I understand have a reputation of 'getting their own way'. The development should not be allowed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would have a negative impact on the local ecology and biodiversity (see above) •It would be in contravention of legislation designed to protect a nearby SSSI (see above) 	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A development of this size (nearly 500 dwellings including Wyke Oliver) would presumably increase the population by in the region of 1500 people including children with the associated demands for schools, healthcare and road infrastructure to cope with extra traffic (possibly an extra 500 cars leaving the estate every morning?). I see nothing in the plan to deal with this. • Extra drainage and sewage systems which when put to a previous developer as to how this would be dealt with was unable to provide a solution. There is a very significant issue particular to the Budmouth site is water. When the land in the proposed development area is sodden the run off from the agricultural land is tremendous and causes a lot of issues. • It would spoil the character of the area which is contrary to the policy and directly against you own aim (page 21) 'Celebrate the unique character and culture of each local neighbourhood' • The associated long term construction work disrupting the lives of an older population causing unhappiness, anxiety and worry. • This would cause a likely decline in house prices for properties adjoining the proposed sites. • Why not use brown field sites and the old council buildings on North Quay. The old gasometer site (if still available) and disused industrial units could also be considered. Also use sites such as the old brewery building and the old council office sites as flats. Please remove the sites at Brackendown, Budmouth and Wyke Oliver from the plan." 	
24/5/15	<p>Whilst I agree that there is no doubt that we need affordable starter housing and social and rented accommodation to be built. There is not a demand for more housing at the higher price to be built. The sensible proposal would be to build new towns where the much needed infra structure of schools and doctors and dental practices could be built at the same time and also be built where the road network could cope. The sites of Budmouth and Wyke Oliver are outside the defined development boundary and for this reason that is why it was rejected in the previous local plan.</p> <p>IA development of nearly 500 houses including Wyke Oliver would increase the population to about 1500 people. this would increase pressure on local schools, doctors, dentists, hospitals and the local roads. There is no mention on how the extra traffic of perhaps 500 cars would be dealt with. The strain on drainage and sewage systems seems not to have been addressed. A very important and significant issue is the water at Budmouth. the run off from the land when sodden is a huge problem and has been very bad this year. This can only be made worse by proposing to build on the land behind. I ask for the sites at Budmouth, Brackendown and Wyke Oliver to be removed from the plan.</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/5/16	Green Gaps, which I fully support, yet the proposals to develop the Budmouth Avenue and Wyke Oliver Farm sites are inconsistent with this policy.	Noted objection to policy
24/5/17	Countryside which I fully support, yet the proposals to develop the Budmouth Avenue and Wyke Oliver Farm sites are inconsistent with this policy.	Noted objection to policy
24/5/18	<p>Land off Budmouth Avenue and Land off Wyke Oliver Farm.</p> <p>These developments of approx. 480 homes will almost double the existing number of homes on the whole estate. There are currently only 2 access road to the estate (Melstock and Wyke Oliver). The estate will become much busier, more cars on narrow road (particularly on Budmouth Avenue). Why does the plan not discuss the need for better road access to the Littlemoor road? It is not uncommon for one of the existing access points to be unavailable due to ongoing work by Wessex Water and other utility companies. The plan suggests a desire for more cycling and use of public transport - there are no current bus routes on the estate and the narrowness of the roads, and the number of parked cars will not facilitate such aspirations.</p> <p>Repeat of previous comments - There is already excessive run off of ground water from the fields above Brackendown and Budmouth Avenues. In the winter months the fields are sodden and muddy water spills onto Budmouth and floods back gardens on both roads. Will developers provide sufficient large bore drains to take away this rain water once 500+ house are built and the land paved over? Will we end up with the same issue that Preston Downs suffered from, insufficient drainage, requiring remedial work. Where will this water be release? Lodmoor marshes? Repeat of previous comments - Developers WILL NOT commit to building 50% social housing on the land above Brackendown/Budmouth, this is a pipe dream as the land is too desirable for the developers. The land has been offered up by land owners who want to sell to the highest bidders, not for social housing.</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/5/19	The area covered by the Budmouth and Wyke Oliver Road developments are also covered by DERC ecological networks and wildlife corridors (Maps 8 and 9 and 12). I'm not sure how that is not compromised by the possible developments. It is also a green gap area.	Noted objection to policy
24/5/20	Page 19 says 'Development will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that the development is for measures (sic) to prevent flooding' - water runoff into Brackendown and Budmouth Avenues is considerable and getting worse. This commitment needs to be more than lip service if these areas are developed. Flooding is hardly mentioned in ref to	Noted objection to policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>the Budmouth development and not mentioned at all for Wyke Oliver - the water flows off the hill and floods garden in Brackendown and Budmouth each winter/spring (photos available). I think this needs greater acknowledgement in the plan and to be addressed in greater detail in any planning application by a developer.</p>	
24/5/21	<p>"I again refer to the land adjacent to Brackendown/Budmouth Avenues and the area near Wyke Oliver Farm. But to address the issue of housing requirements in Weymouth, I would suggest that although there is a clear need for social/rented accommodation (9.5) together with affordable starter homes, there is no huge demand for higher grade housing. I would suggest that the Town Council concentrate on social and affordable rented accommodation and inform the Dorset Council that Weymouth is 'full'. Extensive building is already underway on the north side of Littlemoor Road, and more land seems to be available to the west of the current development site which appears still to be for sale. Why are we looking for more housing in Weymouth. Other towns in Dorset must be in a similar position so why not be bold and go ahead with the late Cllr Tony Ferrari's (RIP) proposal and build new towns. This will alleviate the anxiety caused by spoiling Weymouth by cramming in houses where they are not needed, and the community infrastructure can't support. That said I turn to the areas mentioned above which I will refer to as Budmouth and Wyke Oliver. These sites are outside the Defined Development Boundary, and this was also rejected in the previous local plan. It appears that the Town Council or Dorset Council are in communication with the land owners (Bellway Homes) a large and influential development company who I understand have a reputation of 'getting their own way'. This may or may not be true but large companies have resources and abilities to 'push' things through. I would hate to see Weymouth Town Council, or the Dorset Council being put in a position where they and the residents are 'bullied' (probably too strong a word) into submission and where local residents' quality life was adversely affected. I would hope that our local councillors will support the people of Preston. I can speak specifically for Budmouth Avenue as I live in the road and would be directly affected by any development. I site the following issues as to why the development should not be allowed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is out the Defined Development Boundary • It would have a negative impact on the local ecology and biodiversity (see above) • It would be in contravention of legislation designed to protect a nearby SSSI (see above) • A development of this size (nearly 500 dwellings including Wyke Oliver) would presumably increase the population by in the region of 1500 people including children with the associated demands for schools, healthcare and road infrastructure to cope with extra traffic (possibly an extra 500 cars leaving the estate every morning?). I see nothing in the plan to deal with this. • Extra drainage and sewage systems (see below) which when put to a previous developer as to how this would be dealt with was unable to provide a solution. • It would spoil the character of the area which is contrary to the policy and directly against you own aim (page 21) 'Celebrate the unique character and culture of each local neighbourhood' • The associated long term construction work disrupting the lives of an older population causing unhappiness, anxiety and worry. • This would cause a likely decline in house prices for properties adjoining the proposed sites. <p>A very significant issue particular to the Budmouth site is water. When the land in the proposed development area is sodden the run off from the agricultural land is tremendous, particularly this year. The situation is managed by individual local residents, and we cope. This year however matters took a turn for the worse and the run off was immense. I mention this because any development will only exacerbate matters. Water will flow down tarmac and concrete much more quickly than over agricultural or grass land. The water will inevitably run into a drainage system, but then where? Nobody can explain to me how this will be overcome unless at vast expense which may make the development economically unviable. Either that or very expensive houses would be built thus not achieving the affordable housing quota expected. In any event I'm sure every effort will be made by the developer to maximise their profits which would not be difficult as houses with what would potentially have some of the best sea views in Weymouth would attract a premium price tag, way out of the range of people who desperately need housing. When this was discussed with Chair of the Steering Group recently at Preston village hall, he asked where else could we build houses? My answer (as above) is to admit Weymouth is 'full' and support a new town initiative. I also see no mention of brown field sites and the old council buildings on North Quay. The old gasometer site (if still available) and disused industrial units could also be considered. In addition, there are a number of caravan parks which would be happy to surrender some of their land together with the area around Hope Square. We tend to build one or two storey houses in Weymouth but why not encourage the building of flats, that is build up and not out. The old brewery building, and the old council office sites would be ideal for this. These are just my thoughts. Please remove the sites at Budmouth and Wyke Oliver from the plan.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
24/5/22	Not supported. These areas have already been shown - by the Council's own 'experts' to be unsuitable for development.	Noted objection to policy
24/5/23	<p>Para. 11.4</p> <p>The focus is on promoting clean, safe, sustainable, and affordable travel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reducing the impact of the motor vehicle • safeguarding community facilities • supporting community initiatives • encouraging sports and recreation • safeguarding our heritage and enhancing public spaces. <p>The two biggest developments - Budmouth and Wyke Oliver are in a location where there is little existing infrastructure - in particular public transport, shops and supermarkets and sports. In these areas 50% affordable has been proposed but these are the people who most need the infrastructure - yet this is an area where car use is more prevalent and public transport poor and local facilities, particularly supermarkets and sporting facilities are few and far between. Increasing the estate size by 480 houses will result in increased road use - especially up the Preston and Littlemoor Roads and beyond to go to supermarkets, petrol stations and out of town developments. A piecemeal approach to development when so many houses are needed, results in no commitment to infrastructure and developers getting away without making proper provision to roads and access - let alone shops, meeting places, healthcare, schools etc. Constant reliance on developing where landowners want to sell land (rather than where it's needed) hampers any strategic vision which could result in happier, healthier places to live.</p>	Noted objection to policy
24/5/24	<p>The area's green spaces play a significant role in flood alleviation so why are there proposals to develop on them there is no mention of flooding from rainwater runoff which will only get worse if these developments are approved. Para. 8.11</p> <p>Farmland in the neighbourhood is important for character setting and connectivity so why is it OK to develop houses on it. Para. 8.10</p> <p>Where is the protection for Preston and Littlemoor. The proposed development in Preston will adversely impact the ecological networks.</p> <p>The NPPF requires plans to avoid inappropriate development in vulnerable areas. the land behind Budmouth should be considered vulnerable.</p> <p>I do not support the proposed development off Budmouth Avenue and Wyke Oliver Farm. I do not believe any meaningful conclusions can be gained from the consultations held in August as they were badly publicised. I would not call it a robust analysis. There is no mention of brownfield sites.</p> <p>Why is the neighbourhood plan considering sites for development behind Budmouth when it has already been refused twice for proper and legitimate reasons</p> <p>the traffic levels on the Littlemoor and Preston Rd are too high now especially in holiday season the housing developments in these areas will make this worse. There is not enough infrastructure and facilities to support these extra houses or to make cycling walking a viable option.</p>	Noted objection to policy
	WNP25 & paras 9.70-9.78	
25/1	Our objection is purely about the use of Wyke Oliver Road as access from/to the proposed development. We are not against development per se. Wyke Oliver Road already experiences a significant amount of traffic and on-street parking and, we believe, it is close to (or at) it's maximum capacity. It is not sufficient to say that there are other access routes to/from the proposed development as, in practice, other routes are more circuitous and people will, by default, choose Wyke Oliver Road. Access to the proposed development at Wyke Farm should use other routes including Littlemoor Road - the latter being much more suited to a higher volume of traffic.	Refer to the need for a transport impact assessment in the supporting text.
25/2	<p>WNP25 Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North</p> <p>Wyke Oliver Farm has tenant farmers who through age and poor health are anxious to retire. Also, the owners of the farm have consistently failed to maintain the premises and it is now rundown. However recent world events have highlighted the need for UK self-sufficiency in food production. Given investment in the farm it has the capability to resume growing crops for UK use. This would be entirely in accordance with its status as "Green Land" and is entirely in accordance with the Government's Policy of maximising UK food production.</p>	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
25/3	<p>Para. 6.4</p> <p>With reference to the proposed building of new houses on Wyke Oliver Farm the unique character of the existing area would be totally destroyed by the building of such a scheme. Old existing and possibly listed buildings would have to be destroyed. The volume of traffic generated would seriously downgrade the character of the existing area. Any Green Credentials proposed would therefore be negated / off set by the amount of resulting traffic generated.</p>	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
25/4	<p>WNP25</p> <p>The impact of build on Wyke Oliver farm will increase the flooding in the surrounding area, it is already an issue with numerous springs and inadequate drainage.</p>	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
25/5	<p>WNP25 Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North</p> <p>Again the engagement with residents is misleading as the numbers are so low. Moreover, I am led to believe that many of the first-round consultation reports were discounted due to suggestions of impropriety or bias due to alleged distortions of the facts following the circulation of some flyers. I for one did not see the flyer so my input was not tainted, but I suspect it may have been filtered out as I delayed submission until the last minute. Again there are no weblinks to the SEA reports and the community consultation report, so readers are required to research these if they wish to gain a full insight to the background quoted. There is evidence that information from some of the supporting documents has been selectively chosen. For example one of the conclusions from the SEA report states: 'Nevertheless, development still has the potential to lead to increased recreational pressure on designated sites, and the disturbance of habitats and species. Due to this, minor significant negative effects are concluded.' Yet the mention in the plan is 'more positive'. Moreover I cannot find an endorsement of the statement: "... to achieve the NP objectives, sites should be taken forward and the policies should address the concerns and constraints". This is more a conclusion that appears to have been made by the Steering Group.</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>
25/6	<p>Land at Wyke Oliver Farm.</p> <p>Such a development would require traffic to use either Wyke Oliver Road or Melstock Drive in order to reach Preston Road. Both these roads are already congested with residents' vehicles parked often on both sides of the road - this has been a longstanding problem which forced the local bus company to cease using Oakbury Drive as part of its route between the town and Sutton Poyntz.</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>
25/7	<p>WNP25 Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North</p> <p>This size of development and others with in excess of approx. 25 new dwellings will cumulatively contribute to unacceptable additional demand on local services, traffic congestion etc. Inappropriate development for the location. If it reaches the crest of the E/W ridge it will also detract from visual amenity of the area.</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>
25/8	<p>Proposed developments at these sites and at the density proposed will create an 'urban outlier' (Map WNP p 28). Additionally, these sites are proposed within an area of 'wildlife corridors and stepping stones' (Map WNP p 33.)</p> <p>Draft policy WNP 04 in toto refers. these areas also fall within the existing Ecological Network (Map 8 WNP p37).</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
25/9	<p>WNP25</p> <p>Access again is via a single estate road. Again the day dream of getting 50% of proposed dwellings to be affordable not likely to happen.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
25/10	<p>WNP25</p> <p>The proposal to make the land at Wyke Oliver Farm available for housing is wrong on many counts.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Once farmland is built on it can never be recovered. Can we feed ourselves in the future? 2 Wyke Oliver Farmyard has a history of flooding. Nearby development will exacerbate the problem, particularly for the houses in Wyke Oliver Close. 3 The Farm buildings are used by bats plus migratory birds build their nests there. 4 Given the steeply sloping site it is inevitable that obtrusive skyline development would be necessary. Overcombe Drive in Preston illustrates how undesirable this can be. 5 The proposal is for 250 houses on the land. Where is the provision for school places, access to doctors or employment? Where are the buyers for these properties to come from (second homes)? Is there sewage/drainage capacity for a large development? 6 Wyke Oliver Road is already a feeder road for a large number of properties on the Budmouth/Brackendown estate. How will the road cope with the extra traffic generated by a major construction project? 	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
25/11	<p>WNP 25</p> <p>This would seem to be nestled in an already developed area. With some land being transferred to Dorset Wildlife Trust I feel that this may be a good site for housing</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
25/12	<p>Para. 9.70</p> <p>Access to Louviers road or Park and ride site would be more direct and better for pedestrians, cyclists, vehicles and bus route thus avoiding congestion on restricted roads as most must travel outside Weymouth area for work.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
25/13	<p>WNP25 Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North</p> <p>I understand that this site has been proposed for development on a number of occasions and in 2019 it was rejected by an Inspector. I am unclear how this site is now fit for purpose and viable for development. Any future work would have a devastating impact on the surrounding areas. Amenities already stretched such as Schools, Doctor's Surgeries, Dentists would be overwhelmed and must be a priority consideration. In addition, the volume of traffic in and out of the area with only one proposed route. With 250 homes and many more vehicles, Wyke Oliver Road and Preston Road and the road infrastructure would be catastrophic for this section of Weymouth. Close to the farm are many wildlife</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>such as deer, badgers, bats and owls to name a few. It is important these animals and birds are preserved and protected. Also, I am unclear about the divisions of Weymouth. Currently there is extensive Housing Development in and around the town including Littlemoor Road. This, I am told, is not part of the Preston area yet its location is only a stone throw away from Wyke Oliver Farm. I question the boundaries of Weymouth and to consider Weymouth Housing Developments as a whole and not as sub-areas. I cannot comprehend how the amenities in Weymouth will cope with these future proposed plans. Finally, Natural England states that where there is a Site of Special Scientific Interest, of which Lodmoor Nature Reserve is nearby, there should not be any development within 500 metres of such a site. Lodmoor Nature Reserve is within this area and further development will negatively impact the surrounding environment.</p>	
25/14	<p>Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North again access will be via Wyke Oliver Rd which has an Abbeyfield Care home situated close to the junction with Preston Rd, giving increased loading to Chalbury Corner roundabout which frequently grinds to a halt in the holiday season. Additionally this land is subject to winter springs which do not appear to have been considered. This land will be visible from the AONB, conclusion why build on green space in Preston without any thought being given to additional services i.e. Health Surgery, social open spaces, play areas, local shops - I suspect because they do not make the developer money.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
25/15	<p>WNP25 Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North It is my understanding that previous attempts have been made to develop this site and that they were dismissed by an Inspector (2019). I cannot see how the grounds for that dismissal have changed so dramatically that the new proposal is viable. I note that the only road access to the proposed development of 250 homes is along Wyke Oliver Road. This residential, dead-end road narrows considerably as it comes toward the Farm and the proposed entrance. The volume of traffic generated by 250 houses, (approaching 400 cars), will simply overwhelm Wyke Oliver Road and cannot be considered safe. At peak flow times the junction with Preston Road will never cope with this amount of traffic and will generate hold ups. This will blight existing properties and residents. What consideration will be given to construction traffic? I'm pretty sure that I have read that advice from Natural England is that there should not be development within 500m of a site of SSSI, which Lodmoor Nature Reserve is. This site is well within 500m of that. I am aware that the owners of the Farm wish to sell but what consideration is given to the fact that it is still a working farm with the Tenant Farmer living there. It is within my knowledge, (my garden backs onto the farm), that there are resident badgers and bats within the farm. As far as I am aware these creatures are afforded some protection.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
25/16	<p>WNP25 I disagree with the proposal to make the land at Wyke Oliver Farm available for housing. Once farmland is covered in houses it can never be recovered. What about future food needs. Wyke Oliver Farmyard has been flooded in the past. The proposed development will worsen the problem, particularly for the houses in Wyke Oliver Close. The Farm buildings are used by bats plus migratory birds build their nests there. This very hilly area will be prone to skyline developments as in Overcombe Drive in Preston. With 250 houses built where is the provision for school places, access to doctors or employment? Where are the buyers for these properties. Will they be second homes or AirBnBs? Is there sewage/drainage capacity for a large development? How will Wyke Oliver Road cope with the extra traffic generated by a major construction project? It is already a feeder road for a large number of properties on the Budmouth/Brackendown road network. Planned changes by the Government means Councils will be able to create plans for fewer homes if they can show that meeting the target would damage the area's character or require building on green belt land. Please take note when considering the possibility of housing at Wyke Oliver Farm.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
25/17	<p>WNP25 Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North Support: Improve Map to show access -provides necessary Affordable Homes and offsets with donation to LVNP.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
25/18	<p>Building additional homes on Wyke Oliver farm would result in an increase in flooding for the existing residents in the surrounding area and there is not suitable access to the proposed new homes with only two minor roads in and out, what would happen in an emergency?</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
25/19	<p>Para. 9.68 500 homes are at present being built at Littlemoor and if more are built at Brackendown / Budmouth how is the infrastructure going to survive? Schools, doctors insufficient bus services already, poor road systems, poor public transport ...all over subscribed where applicable. It already takes 12 mins at work times to get on to the Preston Road from Melstock Ave. I thought we were meant to have a clean air policy; it won't be with all the cars queuing with exhaust fumes entering the atmosphere !!</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
25/20	<p>WNP25.3</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	The building of an access road through Wyke Oliver Close. The road is totally unsuitable for the volume of traffic that would be generated. My property is adjacent to the proposed route. Any development below the 40-metre contour line, which is the height of the hill adjacent to our property, would totally ruin the character of the area. Even with screening, as proposed, the area would be ruined totally not to mention the depreciation in value of the existing properties. The farm buildings would have to be demolished thus contradicting the intention of maintaining the unique character of the area. Judging by their age I would think that the farm buildings may be listed. This was not mentioned. As previously stated, the road as it stands is subject to flooding which combined with the local geology / geography would be potentially increased. The inclusion of attenuation ponds on the side of a hill would not be sufficient to alleviate this problem. Any building work, i.e. cutting a road through, would result in severe disruption to the local community.	
25/21	The White Poplar trees adjacent to Wyke Oliver farm have tree preservation orders in place. Would these TPOs be upheld? The destruction of these together with the removal of the existing dry-stone walls would lead to a serious detrimental environmental impact on the local area. Paras. 8.42, 8.43, 8.44 Tree replacement.	Noted objection to policy
25/22	WNP25 Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North. Both developments if implemented will increase the risk of flooding at the bottom of Kingsbere Road where the current drainage system is frequently overloaded. Furthermore, the natural drainage currently employed to soak away rainwater on many parts of the Budmouth Avenue estate will not cope with more water from any new development at the top of the hill.	Noted objection to policy
25/23	(Environmental Sustainability Para. 7.9 "Any plan that does not considerand help build our resilience to things like flooding will simply be not fit for purpose" Objective 4 26 SUDS "incorporate sustainability drainage into all new development sites.) Clearly the detailed relief and geology of the Wyke Oliver Farm and land off Budmouth - Avenue both of which are included in the plan - have not been considered particularly its impact on Wyke Oliver Close, Wyke Oliver stream and Preston Brook - already an Environmental Agency flood zone. Suds and attenuation ponds on high relief and complex geology such as this simply cause drainage issues in surrounding lower areas.	Noted objection to policy
25/24 Symonds and Sampson for tenant farmers	WNP25: Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North The Barnes and Legg family have been tenant farmers at Wyke Oliver Farm since 1936, and the current generations continue to hold a secure tenancy for their lifetimes. Clearly if this proposed development were permitted to proceed, they would most likely be out of their homes and would lose their livelihood. In the absence of any suitable arrangements to deal with this loss they would have significant concerns about the proposal going ahead and would resist it.	Noted objection to policy
25/25	Para. 9.72 - no mention is made to the extensive set of questions raised by the former W+P BC to the owner and developer of this area (land banked in some cases) and these raising these questions during the Local Plan era have not been consulted despite these people being known to the Council. The owner/developer undertake work on the land breaching EA regulations and were formally reprimanded. This paragraph hints that the Steering group is being influenced by the Developer and NOT the local community.	Noted objection to policy
25/26	The priority must be affordable housing. This appears to be an ongoing issue where developers appear to favour unaffordable housing. Councils must challenge this, otherwise the problem will always exist both locally and nationally.	Noted comment(s) in support
25/27	Affordable housing. These must be built. Developers somehow get out of achieving this in almost all cases. Suddenly the affordable housing isn't viable and the Council rolls over. This happens EVERY time and no one is ever held to account, thus making a mockery of the Government driven house building Plan forced down our throats.	Noted comment(s) in support
25/28 Dorset Council	WNP25 Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North is allocated for approximately 250 new homes. The proposal also includes the transfer of 23ha of land to Dorset Wildlife Trust to form an extension to the Lorton Valley Nature Park. 184. Availability – A 'call for sites' process was carried out between September and October 2021 to identify land which would be suitable for allocation. Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North was submitted to Weymouth Town Council through this process and is therefore considered available. 185. Achievability – The site has been subject to 'initial viability testing of Greenfield sites' prepared by Bailey Venning Associates (27 September 2023) 186. Policy Criteria 187. Criterion 2 / Site Capacity – The Landscape and Urban Design team would question the estimated site capacity of approximately 250 new homes without a thorough understanding of the site constraints. 188. Criterion 3 (iv) – Unclear what a community focus is?	Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received. Discuss proposed changes with DWT and DC (Planning and Highways) Refer to self-build housing opportunity in supporting text.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>189. Criterion 3 (v) / Site Access – The provision of appropriate safe vehicular and pedestrian access via Wyke Oliver Road should be confirmed with the Highways Development Team.</p> <p>190. Criterion 3 (viii) – Improved access to Lorton Valley Nature Park is welcomed.</p> <p>191. Criterion 6 - The Council's NET note the commitment to transfer a total of 23ha of land to DWT, along with a sum to cover future maintenance. If this site is to be 27 allocated it is our view that the policy should require an additional sum to be transferred to DWT to mitigate for the inevitable increase in recreational activity which will occur (e.g. for increased presence of rangers, public engagement, signage, fencing etc.).</p> <p>192. Paragraph 9.75 - Definitive Map Team request "network of cycleways and footpaths" is replaced with "network of cycleways and public rights of way" or ""network of cycleways and public footpaths and bridleways"</p> <p>193. Suitability (Other constraints)</p> <p>194. Flooding – A lack of a criterion referring to flood risk is a concern.</p> <p>195. Green Infrastructure Network - Policy ENV3 applies to Important Open Gaps and land of local landscape importance and explains "Development that would cause harm to the green infrastructure network or undermine the reasons for an area's inclusion within the network will not be permitted unless clearly outweighed by other considerations." It is recommended that the contribution this site makes to the green infrastructure network is separately assessed.</p> <p>196. Landscape and Visual Impact – In order to support the Local Plan Review, the council commissioned a landscape and heritage study, which is online here - Landscape and Heritage Studies - Dorset Council In particular we draw your attention to the Stage 2 Assessment for Weymouth - Weymouth Landscape Sensitivity Assessment (dorsetcouncil.gov.uk) The Stage 2 report includes an assessment of the wider Wyke Oliver / Southdown Farm area (shown as Assessment Area: Weymouth 5) and concluded that this wider area is of 'moderate-high' landscape sensitivity. The Stage 2 assessment highlights some key characteristics, such as: the separation the landscape provides between Littlemoor and Overcombe / Preston; the locally prominent hill slopes; and views in and out of this area. Although much of the site is concealed by existing development in views across Lodmoor from Preston Road, parts of the site are visible west of Overcombe Court and from more elevated positions along Bowleaze Cove Way. The Landscape and Urban Design also note that there is a high point to the north of the site,</p> <p>197. Lorton Valley Wildlife corridor - The Council's NET note the allocations at Wyke Oliver Farm North is within the Lorton Valley wildlife corridor, as defined by the 'Urban Wildlife Corridors and Stepping Stones: Weymouth and Portland Borough – Addendum (September 2020)'. There is, therefore, significant conflict between this policy and policy WNP05 whose primary purpose is to protect these wildlife corridors.</p> <p>198. Design - The Landscape and Urban Design team note that the build element of the scheme is divided into two parcels separated by a dry valley. Is the intention to link the sites through this dip or for the two communities to be physically separated?</p> <p>199. Planning Policy Advice</p> <p>200. If this site is to be taken forward it is recommended the following additional evidence is collected in support of any site allocation.</p> <p>a) Further work to show the likely visual impact of development and how it could be satisfactorily accommodated within this sensitive landscape.</p> <p>b) Further work to show that satisfactory access could be delivered.</p> <p>201. We understand that site promoters seek an extension to the Lorton Valley Nature Park on adjacent land. An ecological survey would be helpful to support this proposal.</p> <p>202. The Landscape and Urban Design team advise that many of these issues will have a bearing on the site layout and design. It is therefore recommended that these site constraints are investigated in advance of formal site allocation and co-ordinated through 'initial' master planning work reflecting an iterative process to site design.</p>	
<p>25/29 Dorset Council, Flood Risk Mgt Team</p>	<p>Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North</p> <p>Due to existing downstream flooding issues and constraints in the form of a long stretch of culvert, rainwater harvesting, and water re-use should be the first priority for inclusion within the proposed surface water management strategy. This could help to reduce the volumes of surface water making its way downstream and therefore reduce the risk of flooding.</p> <p>Applicant must demonstrate that the SuDS hierarchy has been followed and infiltration must be prioritised as the proposed means of surface water management. A developer will need to demonstrate that they have carried out site specific ground investigations. Infiltration rates are likely to vary across the site due to the varying geology and careful consideration will be required in order to locate SuDS features appropriately. Care should be taken to carry out infiltration testing to the standards set in BRE Digest 365 at the depth and location of any proposed infiltration-based SuDS.</p> <p>Groundwater monitoring across the course of the year will be required in order to demonstrate that groundwater will not impact the functioning and reduce the attenuation volume of any proposed soakaway features.</p>	<p>Refer, in the supporting text, to comments by the Flood Risk Management Team and the required evidence and supporting documents.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>Attenuation of surface water and a restricted discharge to the adjacent watercourse may be considered in the event that infiltration is proven not to be viable but as there is a significant constraint in the form of a long stretch of downstream culvert the LLFA may require additional restrictions on surface water discharge above and beyond greenfield rate in order to minimise risk to downstream areas.</p> <p>Open SuDS must be prioritised with multifunctional benefits including improvements to amenity, biodiversity and water quality.</p>	
<p>25/30 Turley for Morrish Homes</p>	<p>My client broadly supports the criteria of Policy WNP25 that seek any future development proposals to accord with.</p> <p>My client is committed to providing a high quality, sustainable development that safeguards existing important trees and hedgerows, integrates successfully with the existing landscape and built-up areas, and provides a significant extension to the Lorton Valley Country Park. This will include properties designed to meet Future Homes Standard, including ECO-efficient passive style houses that go beyond the current building regulation standards, that could be set within the more elevated parts of the development area, utilising the levels sensitively.</p> <p>More specifically, my client would highlight that the site is located within a reasonable walking distance of a number of key services and facilities, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preston Road Surgery • Rowlands Pharmacy • SPAR providing a Post Office and convenience store • St Andrew's Primary School • Westfield Arts College <p>Access to these services is facilitated by a network of footways within the vicinity of the site, including those along both sides of Wyke Oliver Road and the shared footway/cycleways along the B3155 Preston Road and A353 Littlemoor Road respectively as well as walking/cycling routes using the public right of way network through the Country Park to the west.</p> <p>Any future development proposals will take up the opportunity to connect to this existing pedestrian/cycle infrastructure and will also deliver a network of permeable routes within the site to encourage travel by active modes and where possible provide shorter routes for local journeys through the site, including any opportunities to deliver improvements to routes identified.</p> <p>The nearest bus stops are located on Preston Road, approximately a 600m walk from the site. These bus stops are served by the 4, 5, 10A, X12 and X54 bus routes, which provide useful connections to the nearby destinations of Weymouth and Dorchester, with the no. 4 bus route operating at 30-minute frequencies throughout a typical weekday. The nearest railway station is Upwey, which is accessible via the no 10A bus service, and provides frequent services to destinations including Weymouth, Southampton Central, Dorchester and London Waterloo.</p> <p>There are therefore good opportunities for residents to access wider facilities and services, including employment opportunities by public transport., as well as the proposed to be extended Country Park.</p> <p>Specific comments are made below in relation to the Policy, specific criteria and the related Map 22 where it is considered they may benefit from further reassurance and/or clarity.</p> <p>Highway Access</p> <p>My client appointed highway consultants, i-Transport, to undertake an assessment of the opportunities to access the site from Wyke Oliver Road. Access is proposed from Wyke Oliver Road in line with the draft allocation and initial design work has been undertaken on the proposed arrangement which would extend Wyke Oliver Road into the site. Further survey work is planned, and an access design will be refined in due course in consultation with DC Highways.</p> <p>The access design will ensure that safe and suitable access can be provided to the site for all users, in line with national and local transport policy, and will comply with relevant guidance in Manual for Streets (MfS), e.g. appropriate visibility will be achieved, and the junction will be designed to comfortably accommodate the movements of cars, emergency vehicles and refuse vehicles.</p> <p>Highway Capacity</p> <p>Given the sustainable location of the site and the opportunities to access sustainable transport modes, the transport strategy for the site will seek to prioritise walking, cycling and public transport modes for local journeys.</p> <p>Based on an initial assessment the highway consultant estimates that a development in line with the proposed allocation would be expected to generate approximately 120-130 two-way vehicle movements in the peak periods, which broadly equates to around two additional vehicle movements during the busiest periods of the day. Based on their on-site observations, the highway consultant is also comfortable that there is capacity on the existing network in the vicinity of the site to accommodate this level of increase in</p>	<p>Review and affirm the total number of dwellings</p> <p>Consider and explain in the supporting text what kind of 'community focus' may be appropriate and how consultation with the local community and TC might help.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>vehicular movements (i.e. at the Wyke Oliver Road/Preston Road junction, the Preston Road/Littlemoor Road roundabout and the Preston Beach Roundabout).</p> <p>A comprehensive series of traffic surveys is planned for 2024 and will be undertaken during a neutral time period to ascertain the existing traffic flows on the network and enable junction modelling to be undertaken. This will inform further assessment of the impact on the highway network and other modes of transport and assist in shaping future detailed proposals.</p> <p>Site Capacity</p> <p>My client has appointed landscape consultants to undertake an initial assessment to assess the impact of the development of the allocation on the wider landscape. This has identified that the extent of development area identified on Map 22 will not have a significant adverse impact on the setting of the Dorset National Landscape designation (former AONB), the separation of Littlemoor and Overcombe/Preston or the immediate landscape setting.</p> <p>My client supports the related criteria (i – iii) and the opportunity this provides to include suitable boundary treatments and new planting to further mitigate any impact.</p> <p>It is noted that the capacity of the site is referred to as ‘approximately 250 dwellings’. The net developable area identified on the accompanying plan equates to 9 hectares.</p> <p>Assuming a density of 30 dwellings per hectare (a reasonable density to use on the basis it is regarded as a suitable balance between making efficient use of land but responding to the site context), this would equate to approximately 270 dwellings. My client would request this marginally enhanced capacity is given further consideration as an update to the Policy.</p> <p>This would be consistent with increasing the opportunity for providing market but particularly affordable housing, a key objective of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Community Provision</p> <p>Criteria iv. of the allocation confirms that any future proposal should make ‘provision of a community focus agreed with the Local Planning Authority’. My client agrees that it is important to provide a development with a community focus that will benefit the existing and wider community, proportionate to the scale of the proposed allocation.</p> <p>However, my client would welcome further clarification of what form this ‘community focus’ might take, so that this might be refined to become more related to specific needs.</p>	
<p>25/31 Dorset Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>DWT object to the current wording which states that “The remaining area of land shown on Map 22 is allocated as land for nature conservation. An area of 23ha of land shall be transferred to Dorset Wildlife Trust to form part of the Lorton Vally Nature Park along with a commuted sum to cover future maintenance.”</p> <p>No agreement has been made with respect to Dorset Wildlife Trust taking on this land although DWT have agreed that this would be a possibility in principle.</p> <p>It is suggested that more appropriate wording would be:</p> <p>“The remaining area of land shown on Map 22 is allocated as land for nature conservation. An area of 23ha of land shall be transferred to Dorset Wildlife Trust to form part of the Lorton Vally Nature Park to a suitable organisation, such as Dorset Wildlife Trust, which will manage the site to enhance its ecological value and for recreational access as part of the Lorton Valley Nature Park along with a commuted sum to cover future maintenance. The transfer of land will be accompanied with a commuted sum to cover initial capital costs and long-term future maintenance.”</p> <p>DWT will also reserve the right to independently respond to any development proposals that are brought forward on this site, irrespective of any separate agreement that may be reached regarding transfer of land.</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received.</p> <p>Include agreed position statement from DWT in the supporting text.</p>
	<p>WNP26 & paras 9.79-9.87</p>	
<p>26/1</p>	<p>Further development of 150 houses at Redlands Farm. The Plan states that new developments should be in walking distance of shopping and local amenities. This site is not close to any amenities and will place further pressure on already limited education, doctor, dentist, and transport facilities in this area particularly with the major development in progress on the adjacent site of Nottingham Lane and at Littlemoor Road.</p> <p>There are no indications that any of these facilities will be upgraded or expanded. There is only one dentist at Littlemoor and none in the area are taking on NHS patients. Traffic problems are getting worse at Radipole Junior School during drop off and collection times causing difficulties and potential traffic hazard for local residents with nothing being done to sort it out now and this will only get worse with more families moving into the area.</p> <p>Development of agricultural land beyond the current development boundaries is crazy when we have large, empty sites such as Brewers Quay, Westwey House, Marchesi House in Radipole Lane, Jubilee Sidings car park, St Nicholas Street bowling centre standing unused. Why are these not being pushed hard for development?</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
<p>26/2</p>	<p>WNP26</p> <p>Development of existing brownfield sites and those already consented should be prioritised rather than agricultural land outside the development boundaries.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
26/3 RSPB	<p>Comment on WNP26 Land at Redlands Farm.</p> <p>To note that this proposed development area is within the River Wey catchment. Current land use within this catchment contributes to the transport of sediments and associated nutrients into Radipole Lake SSSI, leading to parts of the site being in unfavourable condition. Any development should seek to mitigate this detriment, e.g. through the location of SUDs within the development and re-naturalising sections of the River Wey to reduce sediment and nutrient transport within the catchment.</p>	<p>Include policy criterion referring to potential issues with drainage</p>
26/4	<p>WNP26 Land at Redlands Farm</p> <p>Again misleading 4th stage consultation figures are referred to and the link to the viability report is missing. The significant point concerning this proposed development is that it goes all the way down to the banks of the River Wey. Not only will this attract a significant risk of flooding, but it will severely encroach on the character of the Wey Valley. However most worrying is the statement 'The required proportion of affordable dwellings and the mix of tenures is based on a viability assessment that has been conducted on similar sites demonstrating that 50% Affordable Home is viable'. Steering Group Minutes of 29 Sep 2023 record that currently only 35% Affordable Housing could be built. This is well down on the 100% aspiration originally envisaged. Moreover, if it is 35% and yet the Plan states 50% this appears to be deliberately misleading the public!</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
26/5	<p>I do not support housing on Redlands Farm, especially to the large extent shown on the plan. This area has already had a large amount of new housing at Nottingham and other smaller developments. The new river Wey water meadows should be larger to reach up towards the former farm shop site. This would protect the slope towards the river valley area with its peaceful rural setting and abundance of wildlife. The part of the site furthest from the river between Dorchester Road and the former farm shop site could be developed if necessary. I support the draft policy 35 relating to new housing to be for principal residential use.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
26/6	<p>WNP26 Land at Redlands Farm</p> <p>This size of development and others with in excess of approx. 25 new dwellings will cumulatively contribute to unacceptable additional demand on local services, traffic congestion etc. Inappropriate development for the location</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
26/7 CG Fry and Son	<p>WNP26 Land at Redlands Farm</p> <p>Policy is strongly supported in principle, albeit several requirements of the policy should be altered.</p> <p>Sub points 1 and 2 are agreeable.</p> <p>Sub point 3i is broadly agreeable. The majority of existing trees and hedges will be retained and reinforced. In localised areas, very small sections may be proposed for removal where essential infrastructure i.e. roads and footways through existing hedges are necessary to access different parcels of the development. However, substantial new soft landscaping across the development will vastly increase quantities of trees and hedges on the site. Tree lined streets are referred to in the policy and where these are feasible, these will be considered. However, tree lined streets are often not practical from a technical perspective. The policy should be altered to note tree lined streets are welcomed but not essential. Sub point 3ii is agreeable.</p> <p>Sub point 3iii notes that development should be sufficiently lower than the western ridge line so as not to be visible from the Wey Valley. It is suggested this text is reworded to the following "built form to be positioned appropriately on site to ensure it is well screened from the Wey Valley"</p> <p>Sub point iv is not agreeable. The requirement for the site to deliver 50% affordable housing does not appear to be justified by robust evidence. An assessment by Bailey Venning Associates was commissioned by the NP Group to look at the viability of the certain site allocations, however, this appears to have only considered the Budmouth Avenue and Land at Wyke Oliver Farm sites. Of these two sites, the assessment concluded that the Budmouth Avenue site was not viable at 50%. The Assessment did not consider the Redlands Farm site. On the basis that the viability assessment did not robustly consider the Redlands Farm site and concluded that 50% of sites it did assess were not viable to deliver 50% affordable housing, there is no robust evidence to require the Redlands Farm site to deliver 50% affordable housing. In addition, the Redlands Farm allocation in the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan requires the site to deliver 35% affordable housing. The NP should be altered to reflect the requirements of the emerging Local Plan in terms of affordable housing provision at Redlands Farm. This point is discussed in more detail later in this consultation response.</p> <p>Sub points v to vii are agreeable.</p> <p>Sub point viii refers to retention of PROWs across the site. As noted above, where PROWs and proposed built form are at odds, the process of slightly altering the route of a footpath should be permitted by way of the accepted process of formal application. Given the extensive public open space proposed on this site, new walking routes will be proposed and will link into existing public footpaths to offer improved connectivity into the countryside.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>Sub points ix to xiii are agreeable.</p> <p>The wording of sub point xiv is overly restrictive. Whilst the principle of the surface water attenuation strategy is known to be achievable, the exact details, location, sizes and nature of surface water attenuation ponds will be developed with the technical consultant team at a later stage. Whilst these ponds will feed into the wider open space strategy and have ecological benefits, sub point xiv is too specific.</p> <p>Sub point xv is agreeable in principle albeit points made above which challenge some of the environmental objectives should be taken into account.</p> <p>Sub points 4, 5 and 6 are agreeable.</p>	
26/8	<p>WNP26</p> <p>As mentioned above this area is home to a great deal of wildlife and beautiful scenery very popular with walkers. The large adjoining housing development is already taking away habitat for a great many animals.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
26/9	<p>WNP26 Land at Redlands Farm</p> <p>this development should not be included in the plan.</p> <p>Para.8.21 Wey Valley Watermeadows recommends 2 fields near the river way to be environmentally protected. This should be extended to adjacent fields that, while not on the river floodplain, they have very identical characteristics as those defined in para. 8.21.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
26/10	<p>WNP26</p> <p>I do not support the allocation of the Redlands Farm site (WPN26) Policy until the Weymouth housing need is updated. I would support the allocation of this site later (or as an exception site), but only if ALL of the following are met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the results of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) are reviewed in detail and considered satisfactory, there are many factors to be considered and the views of the local Redlands community should be taken into account. it is required to meet the updated number of homes for Weymouth based on the emerging Local Plan and the imminent changes to the NPPF. it includes as a minimum 50% affordable homes for local people. Also an independent viability assessment specific for the Redland Farm site must be done before the next stage, as well as discussions with the landowner and developer to get confirmation they are in principle happy with at least 50%. We do not want the situation where the landowner, developer later succeeds in reducing the number of affordable homes because of viability. The allocation of the 9.1ha public open space must be a condition of any housing development on the other land. have some community infrastructure for the benefit of the local community as identified by local residents. <p>Redlands Farm development will have local area visual impact (particularly the skyline) and is next to 320 homes to be built at the adjoining WEY 12 Land at Wey Valley site. There is also uncertainty about suitable road access via WEY12. The nearby access via Dorchester road is limited by its width and Dorset Council/Weymouth Town Council analysis of the effect of the Redlands Farm additional homes on transport access is required and be made public. If the Redlands Farm site is developed it should be required to be scaled down in area and number of homes, being limited to the eastern most field area next to the Dorchester Road houses.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
26/11	<p>Draft Policy WNP26: Land at Redlands Farm</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Land at Redlands Farm as defined on Map 23 is allocated for residential development of approximately 150 dwellings: Change approximately to up to 150 dwellings. Development should be in accordance with a comprehensive masterplan, agreed with the local planning authority, which demonstrates a fully integrated and co-ordinated development of approximately 150 dwellings during the plan period that accords with the policies in the development plan.: change to up to 150 dwellings.: There should be proactive engagement with local residents when developing the masterplan. Development proposals will be supported where the development conforms with other relevant policies in the Neighbourhood Plan and a comprehensive proposal addressing all the following criteria; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the retention of hedgerows and provision of landscaping including, tree-lined roads and pathways, to minimise any visual impact on the setting and local landscape character; : Agree suitable boundary treatment, consistent with the character of the area, to adequately screen the new dwellings from existing neighbouring residential properties; Agree the height of the development is sufficiently lower than the western ridge line, so as not to be visible from the Wey Valley; This needs to be much more specific as the Wey Valley is a large area and complex landscape. A survey of the area should be conducted to identify from where the development should not be visible from and the policy words strengthened. 	<p>Emphasise and describe the values of the setting in the supporting text.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>iv. affordable housing provision should form 50% of every completed stage of the development and comprise a mix of sizes, types and tenures as agreed with Dorset Council; Change to at least 50%</p> <p>v. provision of appropriate safe vehicular and pedestrian access to the satisfaction of the local highway authority; Agree</p> <p>vi. provision of positive frontages onto the adjoining road network; Agree</p> <p>vii. a legible street network, which links the residential properties with services and facilities such as community buildings, play spaces and allotments; The local community should be consulted on what community facilities they want. An initial list from the Residents Committee has been already sent to the developer and can be supplied by email.</p> <p>viii. the retention of public rights of way across the site; and any new public rights of way (there is currently an application for a new right of way) over this site.</p> <p>ix. safe footpaths and cycle routes throughout the development, with relevant links to the wider network and community facilities; Agree</p> <p>x. a street lighting scheme designed with pedestrian safety and minimum light spillage and pollution in mind; Agree</p> <p>xi. off-street resident and visitor vehicle parking provision with EV charging facilities that satisfy the requirements of the local planning authority; Agree</p> <p>xii. provision of play areas, public amenity space and community horticultural space as required to satisfy the LPA's standards of provision and integrated into the development to maximise passive surveillance; Agree</p> <p>xiii. a new major public open space linked to the development to the west of the site, Agree</p> <p>xiv. any necessary attenuation ponds should form part of the habitat enrichment alongside broad leaf woodland comparable with the nearby coppices, and: Agree</p> <p>xv. alignment with the environmental objectives and targets of the Neighbourhood Plan: Agree</p> <p>4. The design and layout of roads should comply with the standards of Dorset Council and provide adequately for the safety of all road users as well as the amenity of residents: Agree, this is an area of concern to local residents and needs to be clarified based on the feedback from this regulation 14 consultation.</p> <p>5. Proposals and layout of roads should comply with the standards of Dorset Council and provide adequately for the safety of all road users as well as the amenity of residents.: Agree</p> <p>6. The remaining area of land shown on Map 23 is allocated as open space. An area of 9.1 ha of land shall be transferred to an appropriate body to provide for public use and nature conservation, along with a commuted sum to cover future maintenance.: Agree</p> <p>Additional Policies Proposed: Development of the Redlands Farm should not start until after the substantial completion of all 3 phases of WEY 12 Land at Wey Valley and not until the WEY12 real world impact (including flooding) is fully understood. Housing development should meet strict design codes, be at the most two story high and not blocks of flats."</p>	
26/12	<p>WNP26 Land at Redlands Farm</p> <p>Support: Improve Map to show access -provides necessary Affordable Homes and offsets with donation to Public Open Space.</p>	Support Noted
26/13	<p>WNP26 Land at Redlands Farm</p> <p>I believe this site is unsuitable for all the reasons notated within the SHLAA site assessment. The site also acts as the last divide between Radipole and Broadway and also Radipole to Nottingham (with the new development) and wonderful stop gap upon the now rather imposing and relentless thickening of housing on Dorchester Road. The Plan states it wants to avoid urban sprawl. The villages are Weymouth are sadly losing their identity and just becoming part of Weymouth. It is absolutely perfectly positioned close to and easy walk from the preschool, junior and secondary. Having such a wonderful part of the River Wey and meadows attached to it to the west it has the potential to have a fully functioning eco systems within its boundary if managed correctly. Allowing small woodland pockets, scrub grassland, meadow, floodplain and potential for ponds. If managed regeneratively and in a wilder way would become a beacon for Weymouth and Dorset nature-based solution improvements. This linked to areas like Tumbledown (similar but still different) and RSBP to the south along with Lorton and Lodmoor to the east really starts to create significant habitat size and surrounds the people of Weymouth and villages in nature. As stated in the book "Rebirthing" cutting a Persian carpet into pieces you end up with scraps not a carpet. Habitat on scale and within towns will help educate and inspire people towards change and engage with nature. I am however in agreement with if this site must actually be developed the mitigation measures of the western half of the land however believe that a strong contract in favour of nature should be written and that the right group or person is found to manage the site. Missing an opportunity to improve this area significantly and long term is an absolute must.</p>	Noted objection to policy
26/14	<p>WNP26 Land at Redlands Farm</p>	Noted

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>The network of cycleways and footpaths should be planned to encourage non-motorised travel within the site, provide access to the countryside to the west and link to community facilities and amenities beyond the site. Although I am in complete agreement for a network of footpaths and cycles ways to be created and people to better connect with nature. I believe better wording could also note the want to ensure and encourage nature recovery in the area. Although access is needed, required and wanted it must be suitable access. If the focus on space for the public to use as field or nature recovery. Particularly with flood plain and water meadows heavy foot fall across its entirety would be counter protective and damage the area. The statement could read like the following: "A suitable network of cycleways and footpaths should be planned with consultation to wildlife experts and groups, to both encourage non-motorised travel and nature recovery within the site. This will provide suitable access to the countryside to the west and link to community facilities and amenities beyond the site, along with giving nature the space to recover and allow biodiversity back to the fields, meadow and river creating a bio diverse riparian habitat."</p>	<p>comment(s) in support</p>
<p>26/15</p>	<p>WPN26 at Redlands Farm is proposed to build around 150 homes. This is next to 320 homes to be built at the adjoining WEY 12 Land at Wey Valley site. This in total is too many homes for the area. In addition WPN26 is an important open gap and landscape of local interest. It should remain farmland and I object to this site being in the neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
<p>26/16 Dorset Council</p>	<p>WNP26 Land at Redlands Farm Land at Redlands Farm is allocated for residential development of approximately 150 dwellings. The proposal also includes the transfer of 9.1ha of land to an appropriate body for public open space.</p> <p>203. Availability – A ‘call for sites’ process was carried out between September and October 2021 to identify land which would be suitable for allocation. Land at Redlands Farm was submitted to Weymouth Town Council through this process and is therefore considered available.</p> <p>204. Achievability – The site has not been subject to specific viability testing.</p> <p>205. Policy criteria</p> <p>206. Criterion 2 / Site Capacity – The Landscape and Urban Design team would question the estimated site capacity of approximately 150 new homes without a thorough understanding of the site constraints.</p> <p>207. Site Access / Criterion 3 (v) – The provision of appropriate safe vehicular and pedestrian access via Wyke Oliver Road should be confirmed with the Highways Development Team. The planning policy and landscape and urban design teams note that there is potential to access the site from Dorchester Road as well as from the Wey Valley development site to the north including through the provision of safe and convenient cycle and footpath routes.</p> <p>208. Criterion 4 and 5 – The text for both criteria are the same.</p> <p>209. Criterion 6 – This criterion proposes to allocate the remaining land not identified for housing as open space (9.1 ha) and for this land to be transferred to an appropriate body for the purpose of public use and nature conservation along with a commuted sum to cover future maintenance. It is noted that Policy WNPO2 criterion 2 proposes to support this land as a nature conservation area, referred to as Wey Valley Meadows.</p> <p>210. To avoid any contradictions between the two policies our advice at WNPO2 was to delete criterion 2 and instead discuss this matter at WNP26, Criterion 6. The phrase ‘wildlife site’ was also preferred over area of nature conservation which sounds like existing designations. In this context, it is suggested the allocation should make reference to both open space and / or wildlife area in the first sentence. We also queried the extent of the proposed wildlife area which does not align with the land proposed for transfer?</p> <p>211. The second and third sentence of the of criterion 6 refer to actions that would be better located in the supporting text. Further details regarding the future land transfer would be helpful, for example is the land to be managed by the Town Council or a community group? Paragraph 9.87 refers to agreement with the Local Planning Authority however we are not aware of any such discussions having taken place. Details of these discussion should be tabled, or the reference deleted.</p> <p>212. Paragraph 9.84 - Definitive Map Team request “network of cycleways and footpaths” is replaced with “network of cycleways and public rights of way” or “network of cycleways and public footpaths and bridleways”</p> <p>213. Suitability (other site constraints)</p> <p>214. Green Infrastructure Network - Policy ENV3 applies to Important Open Gaps and land of local landscape importance and explains “Development that would cause harm to the green infrastructure network or undermine the reasons for an area’s inclusion within the network will not be permitted unless clearly outweighed by other considerations.” It is recommended that the contribution this site makes to the green infrastructure network is separately assessed.</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received.</p> <p>Hold further discussion with DC (Planning and Highways) regarding policy criteria.</p> <p>Ensure supporting evidence is adequate and refer to the required technical and context documents in the supporting text.</p> <p>Change reference in para. 9.84 to read: “network of cycleways and public rights of way”</p> <p>Include guidance on community facilities need in supporting text after discussion with DC</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>215. Flooding - A small part of the site is susceptible to surface water flooding. A drainage strategy will be required to manage flooding in this area and ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.</p> <p>216. Heritage - To the north of the site is the Nottingham Conservation Area and to the south, the Radipole Conservation Area. The planning policy team note development will need to consider the setting of the conservation areas and ensure that the layout, design and landscaping responds accordingly.</p> <p>217. Planning Policy Advice</p> <p>218. If this site is to be taken forward it is recommended the following additional evidence is collected in support of any site allocation.</p> <p>a) Further work to show the likely visual impact of development and how it could be satisfactorily accommodated within this sensitive landscape. Development will also need to consider the setting of the conservation areas.</p> <p>b) Further work to show that satisfactory access could be delivered.</p> <p>c) A drainage strategy will be required to manage flooding in this area and ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.</p> <p>219. The Landscape and Urban Design team advise that many of these issues will have a bearing on the site layout and design. It is therefore recommended that these site constraints are investigated in advance of formal site allocation and co-ordinated through 'initial' master planning work reflecting an iterative process to site design.</p>	
<p>26/17 Dorset Council, Flood Risk Mgt Team</p>	<p>Land at Redlands Farm</p> <p>Applicant is to demonstrate that the SuDS hierarchy has been followed and infiltration must be prioritised as the proposed means of surface water management. A developer will need to demonstrate that they have carried out site specific ground investigations. Infiltration rates are likely to vary across the site, due to varying Geology, and careful consideration will be required in order to locate SuDS features appropriately. Care should be taken to carry out infiltration testing to the standards set in BRE Digest 365 at the depth and location of any proposed infiltration-based SuDS.</p> <p>Groundwater monitoring across the course of the year will also be required in order to demonstrate that groundwater will not impact the functioning and reduce the attenuation volume of any proposed soakaway features.</p> <p>The site is approximately 150m from a river but discharge to watercourse should be considered in the event that infiltration to ground is dismissed partially or fully. Applicant would need to demonstrate how they would access a watercourse through third party land. Additional restrictions on surface water discharge above and beyond greenfield rate may be necessary in order to minimise risk to downstream areas.</p> <p>Wessex Water mapping shows nearby surface water sewers, but a suitable connection point would need to be agreed with Wessex Water. This would likely be based on the size and available capacity within the nearby surface water sewers. Once again additional restrictions on surface water discharge above and beyond greenfield rate may be necessary in order to minimise risk to downstream areas. Wessex Water will only agree a connection to their system once an applicant has shown that they have exhausted all options higher up the SuDS hierarchy.</p> <p>Open SuDS must be prioritised with multifunctional benefits including improvements to amenity, biodiversity and water quality.</p> <p>The proposed development should be set back from the modelled areas of surface water flood risk.</p>	<p>Include criterion referring to potential issues with drainage</p> <p>Refer to, in the supporting text, comments by the Flood Risk Management Team and the required evidence and supporting documents</p>
<p>26/18 Dorset Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>The area mapped as part of this policy includes within the area proposed for public use and nature conservation the area already identified under Policy WNPO2: Wey Valley Watermeadows. This is not recognised anywhere within draft policy WNP26 or the accompanying text. It is not clear how this policy relates to the proposed WNPO2 and this omission appears to overstate the area of land allocated as open space and for nature conservation in association with this allocation significantly, given that approximately 5ha is stated to already be secured under policy WNPO2.</p> <p>The wording of and text accompanying WNP26 should make this relationship clear.</p>	<p>Ensure that policies WNP26 and WNPO2 are aligned in area and proposal, and this is made clear in the supporting text of both policies.</p>
	<p>WNP27 & paras 9.88-9.92</p>	
<p>27/1</p>	<p>WNP27 Land off Beverley Road, Littlemoor</p> <p>Even though this area is within the DDB, It appears from AECOM's comments, that the area enjoys a number of open space features e.g. green space, mature trees, local walkers and close proximity to Public Rights of Way. These will be seriously affected if the site is earmarked for development. The proposed plan acknowledges that currently "there is no existing access to the site; it is steeply rising land that may require earthworks and there is the potential loss of ecologically valuable green space and mature trees".</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
<p>27/2</p>	<p>WNP27</p> <p>I think you have done enough damage to Littlemoor already, so give it a rest, and use the land off Beverly Road as allotments, which are in short supply in the area. Especially has the new housing being built across the road have very small gardens and therefore allotments would make more sense.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
27/3	WNP27 Land off Beverley Road Littlemoor This size of development and others with in excess of approx. 25 new dwellings will cumulatively contribute to unacceptable additional demand on local services, traffic congestion etc. Marginally inappropriate development for the location	Noted objection to policy
27/4	WNP27 vii should explicitly state the level of Affordable Homes based upon need i.e. a minimum of 35% with an expectation of 50%.	Noted comment(s) in support
27/5	WNP27 I strongly oppose the development of land off Beverley Road. The land here is a flood plain for the stream which passes through it. It frequently floods, and this issue cannot be remediated. Additionally access will be problematic for residents and vehicles. The area must remain a Green lung and allowed to be designated a "green space". Planning must be refused.	Noted objection to policy
27/6 Chapman Lily Planning for Rapide (Beverley Road) Ltd	WNP27 Support the nominal capacity and detailed criteria set out in draft	Support Noted
27/7	WNP27 Land at Beverley Road, Littlemoor Support only if the proportion of AH is tied down is this a greenfield site i.e. 50%.	Noted comment(s) in support
27/8 Dorset Council	WNP27 Land at Beverley Road, Littlemoor Land at Beverley Road is allocated for residential development of approximately 25 dwellings. 220. Availability – A 'call for sites' process was carried out between September and October 2021 to identify land which would be suitable for allocation. Land at Beverley Road was submitted to Weymouth Town Council through this process and is therefore considered available. 221. Achievability – The site has not been subject to specific viability testing. 222. Policy criteria 223. Criterion 2 (ii) - The Landscape and Urban Design team note that this is a steeply sloping site, and the design of any scheme will need to reflect this constraint. The AECOM report also noted that "The ground rises quite steeply to the south of the site, and residential development may require earthworks, potentially increasing the costs of development." 224. Criterion 2 (viii) – Does the town council have confidence that a suitable access can be formed into the site from the car parking serving homes on Beverley Road? Paragraph 9.89 states that 'it is likely' that an access could be achieved. Further advice and guidance should be sought from the Highways Development Team. 225. Suitability (Other constraints) 226. Flooding – The land to the north of the site is susceptible to surface water flooding. A drainage strategy will be required to manage flooding in this area and ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. 227. Loss of incidental open space – The AECOM site assessment noted "Development of the site would lead to the loss of undesignated green space, the majority of which falls within an area identified as a Higher Potential Ecological --Network in the Local Plan. It may also result in the loss of mature trees within this green space. On the site visit it was observed that the green space is well-used by local residents and dog walkers to access the PRoW network to the south." 228. Planning Policy Advice 229. The site is located within the defined development boundary where the principle of development has been established. A potentially suitable site subject to establishing site access and overcoming design constraints.	Consider policy rewording to clause 2 in the light of comments received. Change spelling of "Medieval" in para. 9.96.
27/9 Dorset Council, Flood Risk Mgt Team	Land off Beverley Road, Littlemoor Due to the existing flood mitigation attenuation area at the lowest part of the site any proposed development must be located well away from the modelled areas of flood risk. Developers of this site must not fill in, interfere with or build within the existing attenuation feature. Any development must not encroach on the attenuation area and adequate space must be left around it for maintenance purposes. Due to downstream flooding issues rainwater harvesting and water re-use should be the first priority for inclusion within the proposed surface water management strategy. This could help to reduce the volumes of surface water making its way downstream and therefore reduce the risk of downstream flooding. Applicant must demonstrate that the SuDS hierarchy has been followed and infiltration must be prioritised as the proposed means of surface water management. A developer will need to demonstrate that they have carried out site specific ground investigations. Infiltration rates are likely to vary across the site and careful consideration will be required	Noted comment.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>in order to locate SuDS features appropriately. Care should be taken to carry out infiltration testing to the standards set in BRE Digest 365 at the depth and location of any proposed infiltration-based SuDS.</p> <p>Groundwater monitoring across the course of the year will be required in order to demonstrate that groundwater will not impact the functioning and reduce the attenuation volume of any proposed soakaway features.</p> <p>Discharge to watercourse may be considered in the event that infiltration is proven not to be viable. A minimum of greenfield discharge rates and volumes will be expected in order not to increase downstream flood risk.</p> <p>Wessex Water mapping shows a surface water sewer on Kestrel Way so this could also be considered as means of connection but agreement with Wessex Water will be required. Open SuDS must be prioritised with multifunctional benefits including improvements to amenity, biodiversity and water quality.</p>	
	WNP28 & paras 9.93-9.97	
28/1	<p>WNP28</p> <p>Approval to convert the bowling alley to residential seems to be at odds with later policies for the town centre. Superbowl was a major family all-weather/all-year attraction; its loss without replacement is detrimental to vibrancy of the town centre.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
28/2	<p>WNP28</p> <p>This directly conflicts with WNP 38, which requires the maintenance of employment, and the WNP 47, which requires the development of sustainable tourism, where amenities / attractions are within walking distance of the tourist accommodation. This site should be much better used for tourist purposes, potentially along with the overly large postal sorting office adjacent, to attract additional visitors to the very centre of the town.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
28/3	<p>WNP28</p> <p>Reuse of existing land with plenty of amenities close by</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
28/4	<p>WNP28</p> <p>The latest DC proposal for the St Nicholas Street site include "four non-residential ground floor units which could be used for commercial, community or leisure purposes." Their proposals are for a maximum of 4 storeys stepped back to give the appearance of 3. It is therefore unbelievable that the plan is proposing high density residential of 6 storeys and no replacement of the lost parking or wet-weather attraction space.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
28/5	<p>WNP28 Land at St Nicholas Street</p> <p>Support: if clarify a minimum level of AH.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
28/6	<p>Map 25: Land at St Nicholas Street Draft Policy</p> <p>WNP28: Land at St Nicholas Street (formerly Lakeside Superbowl)</p> <p>Disappointed that more Prime Town centre land is ear-marked for residential development, rather than the promotion of and regeneration of the Town Centre, Tourism and Retail protection, wet weather leisure spaces and prime car parking.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
28/7 Dorset Council	<p>WNP28 Land at St Nicholas Street</p> <p>Land at St Nichols Street is allocated for high density residential development. The site is owned by Dorset Council.</p> <p>230. Availability – The Assets Team have confirmed that "Dorset Council supports this site being put forward for residential led mixed use development, provided that this is not limited to solely affordable housing."</p> <p>231. Achievability – The site has not been subject to specific viability testing.</p> <p>232. Policy Criteria</p> <p>233. Criterion 2 (i) – The Landscape and Urban Design team note the plan refers to development "not exceeding 6 storeys" but would question this analysis given the immediate context. Paragraph 9.95 also refers to "development over, up to, 5 storeys", however it is unclear what this means in practice?</p> <p>234. Criterion 2 (ii) – This statement will be subject to the findings of the Level 2 SFRA and further work.</p> <p>235. Criterion 2 (iii) – This criterion is a cross refence and can be deleted or the % requirement specified.</p> <p>236. Criteria 2 (iv-v) – These criteria may not be practical.</p> <p>237. Criterion 5 – "Any application shall be accompanied by a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment to demonstrate that the development is acceptable and to provide appropriate mitigation measures". Paragraph 9.97 continues "Approximately half of the site is in Flood Zone 3, and therefore the sequential test and a site-level exception test would need to be applied before this part of the site can be developed." A Level 2 SFRA has been commissioned for Weymouth and is ongoing. Once this report is complete a sequential test and exceptions test assessment should usually be undertaken before site allocation, taking this new work into account.</p> <p>238. The Neighbourhood Plan group would also benefit from direct engagement with the Environment Agency to better understand their requirements for any site allocations in areas at risk of flooding.</p> <p>239. Paragraph 9.96 – Spelling of Medieval</p>	<p>Consider when drafting next version</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>240. Planning Policy Advice</p> <p>241. The site is located within the defined development boundary where the principle of development has been established. A potentially suitable site subject to overcoming flood risk and design constraints.</p>	
<p>28/8 Dorset Council, Flood Risk Mgt Team</p>	<p>Land at St Nicholas Street (formerly Lakeside Superbowl)</p> <p>Applicant must demonstrate that the SuDS hierarchy has been followed so although infiltration may not be viable at this location a developer will need to demonstrate that they have carried out suitable site-specific ground investigations in order to evidence viability.</p> <p>In the event that infiltration is proposed groundwater monitoring will be required across the course of the year in order to demonstrate that groundwater will not impact the functioning and reduce the attenuation volume of any proposed soakaway features. Discharge to watercourse may be considered in the event that infiltration is proven not to be viable, but applicant would need to demonstrate how they would access the nearby River Wey through third party land.</p> <p>It is likely that the developer of this site will need to investigate the existing surface water drainage system and look to see if the point of connection can be re-used. If surface water is to be directed to a combined surface water sewer, then agreement with Wessex Water will be required. A reduction in runoff rates and volumes may also be required by the LLFA and Wessex Water depending on the existing capacity of the system.</p> <p>Although some underground attenuation is probably inevitable on a site such as this, where high density housing is proposed, the applicant should look to find ways of introducing greening to the site. Rainwater harvesting is also to be encouraged.</p> <p>Although the site is allocated to be a high-density development, above ground SuDS features should be included in the proposals with multifunctional benefits including improvements to amenity, biodiversity and water quality.</p> <p>Due to the site being in Flood Zones 2 and 3 the Environment Agency should be consulted as they have an in-principal objection to ground floor dwellings in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Also their standing advice for Weymouth Town Centre also states that the following should be demonstrated in the FRA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground floor finished floor levels shall be set no lower than 3.0mAOD (600mm above the 2035 still water tidal flood level of 2.4mAOD) and • Flood Resiliency up to 3.3mAOD <p>The EA standing advice also states that the LPA should ensure that the applicant has covered the following matters within any FRA to ensure a safe development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood resilience and resistance (in consultation with building regulations) • Emergency Planning (in consultation with LPA Emergency Planners) 	<p>Consider policy rewording to clause 2 in the light of comments received.</p>
<p>28/9 Historic England</p>	<p>WNP28 (St Nicholas Street) advocates a height limit, the former of 6 storeys and the latter of 5. It will be important to the realisation of these development aspirations for the evidence base in each case to demonstrate that such height thresholds can be delivered without causing harm to heritage assets.</p> <p>WNP28 in particular is identified as lying within the Conservation Area and in proximity to Grade II Listed Buildings We would therefore encourage specific liaison with the Dorset Council heritage team on these (and the other) site allocation policies if this has not already taken place.</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording to clause 4 in the light of comments received.</p>
<p>28/10 Weymouth BID</p>	<p>Replacement of the St Nicholas Street car park and bowling alley by high density housing is detrimental to business in the town. We are against any reduction in car parking capacity and believe that the town needs more, not less, space allocated to parking as well as wet-weather attractions.</p> <p>67% of businesses believe this is not a good idea.</p> <p>The DC plans which went out for consultation were for mixed use including "retail, commercial, workshops/studios offices on the ground floor" but even that has been lost here. The town desperately needs more leisure facilities and town centre locations are prime for this type of development.</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>
	<p>WNP29A & paras 9.98-9.105</p>	
<p>29A/1</p>	<p>WNP29A Land at Lodmoor old tip mid-section - 90 homes</p> <p>This area is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. a former landfill with contamination and toxicity issues once disturbed b. close to current flooding risk areas c. a key area for wildlife. It is inhabited by large number of vermin who will flood into nearby residential areas once disturbed creating a potential public health risk d. close to the RSPB Lodmoor reserve 	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
<p>29A/2</p>	<p>WNP29A - housing</p> <p>The facilities listed as available for residents of this large new development include the doctors' surgery on Dorchester Road. Surgeries in the whole of Weymouth are already desperately over-subscribed since one closed a couple of years ago. There is no remaining capacity. A whole new surgery would be needed, but doctors are not queueing up to come.</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
29A/3	WNP29A Lodmoor old tip. This seems a poor choice for residential development due to the previously mentioned flood risk and below ground waste issues from the landfill. However there is a throwaway comment about relocation of the Recycling centre. This ought to be addressed in the plan as it is not clear where it would be relocated. It is an important town amenity.	Noted objection to policy
29A/4	WNP29A This would seem to be an ideal place for new housing with easy access to local amenities - reusing land.	Support Noted
29A/5	WNP29A Lodmoor Old Tip – Mid Section . Support: Could this show an indicative development area on the map and not just the site boundary. Note this area falls within WEY9 which doesn't mention Housing.	Support Noted
29A/6	Land at "Lodmoor Old Tip" seems an unsuitable place to build new homes.	Noted objection to policy
29A/7	WNP29A The plan states this site is suitable for residential development and the current household recycling facility should be relocated. I strongly object to any proposal to relocate this facility. This facility is ideally located and is very popular with the residents of Weymouth. It is conveniently located and should be retained in its current position.	Noted objection to policy
29A/8	should have a max number of homes not a minimum. It is open to abuse if there is no cap. Height should be limited to a single storey	Noted comment(s) in support
29A/9	not supported. To develop this site will have an adverse effect on the local green spaces, SSSI and the local biodiversity and wildlife habitats.	Noted objection to policy
29A/10 Dorset Council, Flood Risk Mgt Team	Land at Lodmoor Old Tip – Mid section Applicant must demonstrate that the SuDS hierarchy has been followed. It is likely that due to the fact that this site was once landfill, infiltration may not be an appropriate means of surface water management at this location. Infiltration through the made ground may pose a pollution risk. Therefore an applicant will need to consult with the Environment Agency to discuss the viability of infiltration-based SuDS on this site. If their advice is not to use infiltration, then the applicant will need to move down the SuDS hierarchy to restricted discharge to watercourse. Groundwater monitoring across the course of the year may be required in order to demonstrate that groundwater will not impact the functioning and reduce the attenuation volume of any proposed underground SuDS assets. Attenuation of surface water with a restricted discharge to an adjacent watercourse may be the most likely means of surface water management for any development of this site. Open SuDS must be prioritised with multifunctional benefits including improvements to amenity, biodiversity and water quality. Due to the fact that the site is surrounded by Flood Zones 2/3 the Environment Agency should be consulted on any applications to develop this site. The applicant would need to demonstrate that access to the site would be flood free (or at least trafficable) during the 1 in 100 years plus climate change fluvial flooding event and the 1-in-200-year tidal flooding event. A flood emergency plan would need to be submitted alongside any planning application.	Noted flood management issue. Incorporate advice into any policy for the site.
	WNP29B & paras 9.106-9.112	
29B/1	The proposed development at the bottom of Weymouth bay avenue is located in a flood risk area according to several agencies, EA, Mapflow, for example. Has recent experience of developments in areas of high flood risk, flood plains and wetlands not shown us this is a mistake? Furthermore, traffic directed down Weymouth bay avenue is going to cause havoc. It is already difficult to get out of Weymouth Bay Ave onto the main road. There are other areas with better access onto the new road.	Noted objection to policy
29B/2	No small commercial units at the end of Weymouth Bay Avenue this will increase traffic, speeding vans within a quiet and young family neighbourhood. This is a high risk to road safety	Noted objection to policy
29B/3	WNP29B Land at Lodmoor old tip north section - industrial development This area is: a. a former landfill area with contamination and toxicity issues once disturbed b. in or very near to a flood risk area c. inhabited by a large number of vermin and other wildlife d. unsuitable due to inadequate commercial access and traffic impact on local residents. It will create a large amount of heavy non domestic goods and works vehicle traffic up and down an established single lane residential access road (Weymouth Bay Avenue) from around 7.30am to 6pm weekdays and Saturdays. This road is difficult to navigate safely due to residents' and visitors' cars being parked near homes. There are large numbers of families with young children and family pets living in this road and the works traffic would be a risk to their safety. Heavy traffic will disturb dust and particles that will cause air contamination and fuel fumes (diesel particularly) impacting on the health of local residents, especially those with asthma or allergic conditions. The traffic will cause noise	Noted objection to policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>pollution in a domestic area. Many years ago there was a green tip in this area. I can say from experience in 1999 that the air in Weymouth Bay Avenue was contaminated with dust and particles from the infrequent works vehicles using this residential road. The heavier vehicles could be felt passing inside my home (the house would rumble/shake). These vehicles were also a danger to local residents using the road.</p>	
29B/4	<p>WNP29B - employment Is there a real market for these "small scale industrial units or workshops"? If it is simply a box-ticking exercise to "provide more employment, empty units would soon create a run-down area. Access to the site is proposed as via Weymouth Bay Ave. Commercial vehicles running up and down the length of this residential road would be both a pollutant and a noise nuisance. Residents would be justifiably unhappy. Any such development would need significant (and free) parking to ensure that commercial vehicles did not park at the bottom of Weymouth Bay Avenue, already a favourite parking spot for dog-walkers.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
29B/5	<p>WNP 29B Lodmoor 'Old' Tip North Section This site is more liable to flooding but less deeply tipped than sites WNP29A and WNP29C but otherwise the reasons to remove the site from the draft WNP are the same. In addition Weymouth Bay Avenue's junction with Dorchester Road is of poor design for modern vehicles, particularly goods traffic. This proposal will worsen the problem and contribute to the dangers to residents from speeding traffic.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
29B/6	<p>WNP29B Lodmoor Old Tip – North Section Support: Ok if light industrial and small workshops.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
29B/7	<p>Ref WNP29b support so long as small-scale industry such as workshops or small units.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
29B/8 Dorset Council, Flood Risk Mgt Team	<p>Land at Lodmoor Old Tip – North section Applicant must demonstrate that the SuDS hierarchy has been followed. It is likely that due to parts of this site once being landfill, infiltration may not be an appropriate means of surface water management at this location. Infiltration through made ground could pose a pollution risk. Therefore an applicant will need to consult with the Environment Agency to discuss the viability of infiltration-based SuDS on this site. If their advice is not to use infiltration, then the applicant will need to move down the SuDS hierarchy. Also groundwater at this location may be too high so groundwater monitoring across the course of the year could be required in order to demonstrate that groundwater will not impact the functioning and reduce the attenuation volume of any proposed underground SuDS assets. Attenuation of surface water with a restricted discharge to an adjacent watercourse may be the most likely means of surface water management for any development of this site. Open SuDS should be prioritised with multifunctional benefits including improvements to amenity, biodiversity and water quality. Due to the fact that significant parts of the site are at Fluvial / Tidal flood risk as indicated by Flood Zones 2/3 the Environment Agency should be consulted on any applications to develop this site. The applicant would likely need to demonstrate that access to the site would be flood free (or at least trafficable) during the 1-in-100 year plus climate change fluvial flooding event and the 1-in-200-year tidal flooding event. A flood emergency plan would need to be submitted alongside any planning application. A this site is at significant surface water, fluvial and tidal flood risk any development would need to be shown to be compatible with the existing flood risk and flood resilient construction would need to be demonstrated with any planning application proposals.</p>	<p>Noted flood management issue. Incorporate advice into any policy for the site.</p>
WNP29C & paras 9.113-9.120		
29C/1	<p>WNP29C: Lodmoor Old Tip – South Section – site allocated for mixed use development subject to conditions</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
29C/2	<p>not supported. To develop this site will have an adverse effect on the local green spaces, SSSI and the local biodiversity and wildlife habitats.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
29C/3 Dorset Council, Flood Risk Mgt Team	<p>Land at Lodmoor Old Tip – South section Applicant must demonstrate that the SuDS hierarchy has been followed. It is likely that due to the fact that this site was once landfill, infiltration may not be an appropriate means of surface water management at this location. Infiltration through the made ground may post a pollution risk. Therefore an applicant will need to consult with the Environment Agency to discuss the viability of infiltration-based SuDS on this site. If their advice is not to use infiltration, then the applicant will need to move down the SuDS hierarchy. Groundwater monitoring across the course of the year may be required in order to demonstrate that groundwater will not impact the functioning and reduce the attenuation volume of any proposed underground SuDS assets. Attenuation of surface water with a restricted discharge to an adjacent watercourse may be the most likely means of surface water management for any development of this site. Open SuDS must be prioritised with multifunctional benefits including improvements to amenity, biodiversity and water quality.</p>	<p>Noted flood management issue. Incorporate advice into any policy for the site.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>Due to the fact that the site is surrounded by Flood Zones 2/3 the Environment Agency should be consulted on any applications to develop this site. The applicant would need to demonstrate that access to the site would be flood free or at least trafficable during the 1 in 100 years plus climate change fluvial flooding event and the 1-in-200 year tidal flooding event.</p> <p>A flood emergency plan would need to be submitted alongside any planning application.</p>	
	<p>WNP29A, WNP29B, WNP29C Combined Representation</p>	
29/1	<p>Development on Lodmoor Old Tip and land adjacent to the SSSI.</p> <p>Development on these sites may cause additional pressure on the SSSI and in particular the RSPB reserve. I'd like to see buffer zones and provision made for recreational use away from the reserve. The southern section (the overflow car park) is used by dog walkers to exercise their dogs, so it's important that an alternative site is found for them. The middle section a mix of rough grassland and scrub while not part of the bird reserve is an important extension to it and provides habitat and food especially for migrating birds from redwings to warblers and finches who use the hedges and scrub for shelter and for food. Again I'd like to see a large block of this habitat left intact. The northern section would have the least impact on the reserve, with all the usual provisos about drainage and the statutory requirements to protect the SSSI.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
29/4	<p>WP29A/B/C. I broadly agree but am concerned about site access and at this stage notional but potential traffic issues.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
29/3	<p>Draft Policy WNP29A/B/C: Lodmoor Old Tip – this is a good opportunity to improve the whole area around the old tip. I think the development approach for Weymouth should prioritize the re-development of brown field spaces and the creation of new, larger communities. A good example of this is expanding development at Littlemoor where relatively large communities can be developed with the appropriate infrastructure support.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
29/4	<p>Developments on site of old tip at Lodmoor would be too close to this site of SSI and would harm the habitat and biodiversity.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
29/5	<p>WNP29A, B and C</p> <p>The old tip would be a bad place to try and build. Methane emissions for one thing. Buildings would be very intrusive on this now high ground. You have been beaten to it in finding a use for this ground. It is already a public open space with footpaths. It is currently in use for: a) Recreational walking b) exercising dogs c) birdwatching. Building on this open space would not be welcomed. This area is already an important wildlife area. Grasshopper Warblers are often present in the spring. Dartford Warblers regularly use the area. Short-eared Owls use the area.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
29/6	<p>Lodmoor tip sites should be defined as green spaces.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
29/7	<p>I think the area of the old Lodmoor tip between the country park and Lodmoor reserve should have the same protection as the reserve itself. It is contiguous with the reserve, has a high value for wildlife (e.g. many warbler species such as Lesser Whitethroat and Cettis Warblers) and is part of the green corridor involving the whole Lorton Vale and the country park. Rather than it being seen as a possible suburban development area (in other words "concreting" it somehow) I would suggest it is developed as part of what is a unique suburban nature reserve. Perhaps a visitor centre and viewing area from the tip looking over the reserve.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
29/8	<p>Comment on WNP29A, 29B, 29C.</p> <p>To note that this proposed development area is immediately adjacent to Lodmoor SSSI. Current land use both provides informal public access and extends and buffers the habitats of the SSSI. Any development has the potential to displace recreational use onto Lodmoor SSSI and measures should be taken to mitigate this impact within the development site by maintaining areas of green space and recreational access.</p>	<p>Address the proximity of, and likely impact of development on, Lodmoor SSSI and incorporate advice into any policy for the site.</p>
29/9	<p>Draft Policy WNP29A: Land at Lodmoor Old Tip – Mid-Section Draft Policy WNP29B: Lodmoor Old Tip – North Section Draft Policy WNP29C: Lodmoor Old Tip South Section</p> <p>I do not believe that this land is suitable to build homes or industrial units or workshops on due to flood risk and contamination of the ground due to it previously being used as a tip. Studies were undertaken a few years ago when Weymouth Football Club wanted to relocate to this area and studies showed contamination. Also this is adjacent to an SSSI, RSPB Lodmoor Bird Reserve. NOTHING should be built in this area EVER!!!!</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
29/10	<p>Para. 10:47 The site proposed on north/south old tip is not wise. This is toxic landfill. There is a strong suspicion that heavy metal wastes were dumped here. This land is low lying and has become integrated with the wetlands nature reserve. The poisons in the soil mean any householders growing vegetables or fruit would be seriously harmed. A very poor site. Ideally, we need any building land to be reallocated to industrial or employment land. There is a massive daily tide of about 4000 people that leave Weymouth via the A354 every morning and returning over the ridgeway at tea time. There are not enough</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	jobs in the town. So, rather than more housing, which locals cannot hope to afford, we need jobs	
29/11	WNP29A WNP29B and WNP29C All Lodmoor tip sites should be excluded from development. Any development would destroy both the country park and nature reserve, severely impacting the environment destroying the panoramic vista of Weymouth and creating severe other issues. If this area has been selected to meet a numbers game (knowing that it is practically extremely difficult to build here) is an exceeding poor and dangerous strategy.	Noted objection to policy
29/12	WNP 29A Lodmoor 'Old' Tip Mid-Section. WNPC Lodmoor 'Old' Tip South Section. A housing objective of the WNP states that it will ensure housing is suitable for its locality and another objective is to protect special habitats such as the Lodmoor RSPB reserve. These sites do not meet these objectives. Foundations, water connections, and sewage disposal all threatened by building here. The NPPF makes reference to ground conditions and pollution both of which are extensive for these sites. The proposed development is likely to be on land identified as being contaminated under the Environmental Protection Act 1990, therefore unacceptable. The sites are above flood levels, but the Preston Beach Road is not, as identified by the Environment Agency; it has been closed because of surface water failing to drain away and the threat of over-topping by the sea. The NPPF refers to identifying sites at the lowest risk of flooding and to taking into account the lifetime risk to the development. This will increase as Global Heating increases. Consequently both these sites should be removed from the draft WNP.	Noted objection to policy
29/13	WNP 29a,29b,29c Flooding concern. Should anyone be building homes on these sites at all? Regardless of what the SFRA might say when it finally arrives. Flood mitigation measures are needed for Weymouth and this area is vulnerable and should be considered for whatever might be possible to manage excess water.	Noted objection to policy
29/14	WNP29A, WNP29B and WNP29C. The Lodmoor old tip is unsuitable for building on due to the risk of subsidence and methane gas, in addition this is a valuable public open space.	Noted objection to policy
29/15	I oppose any development, housing or industrial, at Lodmoor. The risk of pollution is extremely high next to an inspiring nature reserve. The area routinely floods, taking ground contaminates into the nature reserve and subsequently out to sea.	Noted objection to policy
29/16	I object to any housing development WNP29A, B and C Old Tip	Noted objection to policy
29/17	I would like these comments to be taken into account as part of the pre-submission consultation on the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan. My interest lies in draft allocations WNP29A (Land at Lodmoor Old Tip – Mid Section) and WNP29B (Land at Lodmoor Old Tip – North Section). You will see from this representation that I believe both prospective allocations should be removed from the plan on the grounds that they fail several of the 'basic conditions' set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and ref. ID: 41-065-20140306 of the Planning Practice Guidance. Both sites lie immediately adjacent to the SSSI and perform extremely important roles as part of a linked green infrastructure network that provides supporting habitat for numerous flora and fauna. I am a keen environmentalist and bird enthusiast, and I have witnessed firsthand a wide range of bird species within both sites, including breeding greenfinches and feeding red-backed shrike, which are now both on the Red List of UK Birds of Conservation Concern. The sites also support breeding bullfinches, overwintering thrush species such as the redwing, and feeding kestrels. Each of these bird species is now on the Amber List of UK Birds of Conservation Concern. My primary concern is that this supporting habitat would be permanently lost. The test the neighbourhood plan examiner will have to satisfy themselves with when considering the allocations is whether there is a reasonable likelihood the loss of this habitat can be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for at the planning application stage. Given the existing value of this habitat, there is no evidence to suggest any of these could be achieved. Rather, the result would be a catastrophic loss of irreplaceable habitat and species. My second concern is that the sites are both constrained by land at risk of flooding and a high-water table. This means that a drainage solution to manage run-off (and the serious risk of eutrophication into the SSSI) would be extremely difficult and costly to deliver. Lodmoor SSSI supports throughout the year many further bird species with declining populations (and therefore also members of the Red List), such as the black-tailed godwit, curlew, dunlin, herring gull, lapwing, ruff, starling (with a murmuration occurring here each autumn and winter), whimbrel and yellow wagtail. A further constraint is the potential presence of archaeology, which would be an additional cost to investigate and mitigate. Indeed, depending on the findings of any future study, areas of both sites could well be sterilised for development because of below-ground heritage.	Noted objection to policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>On the subject of below ground, I have an additional concern over land contamination from the former landfill activities that took place at both sites. This would again be extremely costly to mitigate if it is indeed possible to mitigate against the gases likely to be present. The release of these gases would not only be a major concern for the health of future occupants of the development, but also neighbouring occupiers, recreational users of the nature reserve/country park and the welfare of flora and fauna.</p> <p>Paragraph 16 of the NPPF makes clear that all plans have to be aspirational but deliverable. I would suggest that the constraints covering both sites and the costs to investigate and mitigate them (if even possible) would render any development unviable and therefore not deliverable. This would be particularly apparent for site WNP29B (Land at Lodmoor Old Tip – North Section), which is proposed for industrial units. It is well known that land values for employment developments are low, and I have substantial doubts that the site would be even remotely attractive to any developer because of the build costs and ongoing maintenance costs of any mitigation. Indeed, only earlier this year, the public was consulted on a retail development round the corner at Weymouth Gateway for a new M&S store on land originally allocated for employment purposes. The narrative from the developers was that it is not viable to develop the employment land, such that retail is the only option. That site is comparatively much less constrained in planning terms, so that is a strong indicator that industrial units at site WNP29B would be equally unviable.</p> <p>For this reason, I find that the two allocations – and therefore the neighbourhood plan itself – fail basic condition A because of conflict with the NPPF by virtue of being undeliverable.</p> <p>The lack of clarity on archaeology places the allocations at risk of not complying with basic condition B, which aims to protect features of historic interest.</p> <p>The loss of habitat would lead to substantial environmental losses, which would not be outweighed by the social or economic benefits on offer, especially when there are available alternative sites in the town. The allocations would therefore fall foul of basic condition D, which requires the neighbourhood plan to contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development. The ecological impacts would also conflict with basic condition F, which requires the neighbourhood plan to be compatible with EU obligations, in this case the protection of habitats and species under the Habitats and Wild Birds Directives.</p> <p>Similarly, the ecological impacts mean the allocations would also conflict with the ‘other basic conditions’ set out in the legislation and ref. ID: 41-079-20190509 of the Planning Practice Guidance, namely the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.</p> <p>To summarise, the draft allocations fail the basic conditions in several respects because of ecological, flood risk, archaeological and contamination constraints, which would also render development unviable to deliver. Therefore, both allocations should be removed from the neighbourhood plan.</p>	
<p>29/18 Dorset Council</p>	<p>WNP29A, B and C Lodmoor Old Tip</p> <p>Land at Lodmoor Old Tip has been divided into three parcels of land. The middle section 29A is allocated for residential development suitable for 90 homes. The northern parcel 29B is proposed for an employment use comprising small industrial units or workshops. The southern section 29C is allocated for leisure use with some residential use. The site is owned by Dorset Council.</p> <p>242. Availability - The Assets Team have confirmed that Dorset Council objects to sites 29A and 29C being put forward for housing and 29B for employment. They could be considered for leisure or recreational, but the household / waste recycling centre would need to be retained. The site is therefore not available for the proposed use. The Assets Team have however confirmed that Dorset Council could support site 29C coming forward for leisure, recreation, or transport use.</p> <p>243. Achievability - Initial Viability Testing does not review the site specifically.</p> <p>244. Basic Conditions - The supporting text for each of these policies refers to this site being part of WEY8 Lodmoor Gateway within the WDW&P Local Plan. However, it is important to recognise that this policy permits tourism, low key recreation and ancillary uses, due in part to the proximity to sensitive wildlife sites, rather than residential development or employment use. 245.</p> <p>NPPG Neighbourhood Planning Basic Condition Criterion e. requires that “the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).” 246.</p> <p>Relevant policy in the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan is WEY8 - Lodmoor Gateway and Country Park Area. This policy states that “Land at Lodmoor will be permitted for tourism, low key recreation and ancillary uses, appropriate to its gateway location and its proximity to sensitive sites. Any development will be expected to be of a high-quality design and relate positively to the adjoining public areas. A comprehensive approach may be required to ensure that development complies with the aims of the Weymouth Town Centre Strategy.” Policies 29A, B and C are considered to conflict with</p>	<p>Review allocation policy following further discussions with site owner.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>WEY8 as the implementation of housing or industrial units on this site would prevent the tourism, low key recreation and ancillary uses from coming forward on this land.</p> <p>247. Household Recycling centre - Weymouth Household Recycling Centre and Lodmoor Composting are both identified as 'Safeguarded Waste Sites' within the Waste Plan (2019).</p> <p>248. Policy 24 of the Waste Plan states "The loss of or impact on Safeguarded Waste Facilities, through redevelopment or change of use, either on the site or within the Waste Consultation Area, for any purposes other than waste management will generally be considered unacceptable and will be resisted by the Waste Planning Authority, unless there would be no adverse impact on the current or future operation of the safeguarded waste facility or one of the circumstances set out in criteria (b) to (d) are met.</p> <p>a. The proposal incorporates careful design, layout, and mitigation to ensure that there are no unacceptable impacts from the waste site on the non-waste development; or</p> <p>b. redevelopment of the site or loss of the infrastructure would form part of a strategy or scheme that has wider social and/or economic benefits that outweigh the retention of the site or the infrastructure for waste use;</p> <p>or the Waste Planning Authority should be satisfied that:</p> <p>c. a suitable replacement waste management site or infrastructure has been identified and permitted; or</p> <p>d. there is no longer an identified need for the facility or site across any form of waste arising in the Plan area".</p> <p>249. As Neighbourhood Plan policies cannot include 'excluded development' (Localism Act 2011, Sections 61J and 61K) such as county matters (mineral extraction and waste development), nationally significant infrastructure or any other matters set out in Section 61K of the Town and County Planning Act 1990. The Neighbourhood Plan is severely limited on what can be changed in this location even if one of the circumstances (b) to (d) could be met.</p> <p>250. The Commercial Waste and Strategy team explain the site is located on the closed former Lodmoor Landfill Site and closely related to the existing Household Recycling Centre (HRC) and the waste transfer station (leased to Eco Sustainable Solutions). The HRC is popular and well used by residents, and Dorset Reclaim making drop offs from the Bulky Item collection service they operate on behalf of Dorset Council. There are no plans to relocate the HRC and no alternative site has been identified as part of the policy or plan. The waste transfer station is an essential piece of infrastructure that allows Dorset Council to direct deliver green waste from the kerbside collections and street sweepings. Any proposals must exclude the two existing waste facilities that are safeguarded in the Waste Plan (2019) and any nearby proposal must ensure no adverse impact on their current or future operations.</p> <p>251. Continued vehicular access to these sites (for residents, contractors and Dorset Council Operations vehicles) would be required to these sites in perpetuity. Legislation on the disposal of waste is continually changing, resulting in local authorities being required to accept and separate differing waste streams, or collection in differing ways to manage wastes. Therefore, the way in which the sites operate will likely alter over time and should be accounted for in any changes to surrounding infrastructure and uses.</p> <p>252. Whilst Dorset Council will endeavour not to cause annoyance to nearby noise / odour and dust sensitive locations, the operations of these site may intensify, potentially causing further future conflicts. Consequently, we would raise concerns with locating residential uses near to a waste use. Criteria should be included to ensure that there is no conflict in uses. Smell/noise from the household recycling centre, and the impact on the amenity of new homes, would need to be considered. Providing housing in this location could cause ongoing future conflict.</p> <p>253. SSSI impact - The NET does not consider the Lodmoor Old Tip site to be a suitable location for residential development or employment use. This area of land provides supporting habitat for the Lodmoor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), provides an important buffer between Radipole SSSI and has intrinsic value for the habitats and species it supports. It is our view that these policies should not be extended to allow for uses other than those already permitted by the WDW&P Local Plan, due to the potential for significant impacts on a nationally designated wildlife site.</p> <p>254. Lodmoor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is located to the northern and eastern sides of the site. Natural England have suggested that homes positioned directly adjacent to the SSSI are likely to give rise to adverse impacts. It may be difficult to mitigate or avoid these adverse effects. Policy ENV2 iii) advises "Development that is likely to have an adverse effect upon nationally designated wildlife sites will not be permitted unless the benefits, in terms of other objectives, clearly outweigh the impacts on the special features of the site and broader nature conservation interests and there is no alternative acceptable solution." Any proposal would potentially and unavoidably, be contrary to this policy.</p> <p>255. It should also be noted that development of the Mid and North sections of the Lodmoor Old Tip site is likely to result in the loss of much of the mosaic semi-natural</p>	

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>habitats present which will require compensation, and a minimum 10% net gain under the Environment Act. It is unlikely that any development would be able to achieve this on-site and therefore off-site compensation would need to be found. Given the nature of that habitats present, and the fact that the site lies within an existing Ecological Network, this is likely to incur a significant cost which should be considered when choosing whether to allocate the site for development. The South Section, that primarily covers a permanent and temporary car park, does not support the same mosaic of habitats as the Mid and North sections and could be considered.</p> <p>256. Climate change / coastal change - The site is not subject to flood risk, but the land around the site is affected by surface water and river flooding. The council's drainage engineer (Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)) has also explained that there is a complex interaction between the freshwater drainage catchment and the coastline. They have suggested that high tides (which are in part regulated by valves under Preston Beach Road) can 'lock' flood water arising from rivers/surface water in this area behind Preston Beach Road. They have also advised that there are surface water flooding issues in proximity to a number of drainage channels which run around the site and in neighbouring streets to the west.</p> <p>257. The Shoreline Management Plan (Durlston Head to Rame Head: Shoreline management plans - Dorset Council) indicates that the long-term management objective for this section of coastline (referred to as 'Policy Unit 5g15') is for 'managed re-alignment'. This means that the site's defences will allow the shoreline position to move backwards (or forwards) with management to control or limit movement.</p> <p>258. While not directly subject to flood risk, we have reservations that it may be very difficult to manage surface water run-off from the site without increasing flood risk elsewhere and that in the future the site itself may be subject to flooding (taking account of climate change) or be affected by coastal change through managed re-alignment of the coastline.</p> <p>259. Once published, the town council should consider the findings from the Level 2 SFRA which will include assessments of forecast future flood extents that make allowances for climate change. As the existing modelling already suggests that surface water and river flooding extents surround the site it may be difficult to demonstrate that safe access into and from the site can be achieved in the event of a flood (particularly when climate change allowances are applied to current assessments of risk).</p> <p>260. Contamination – The Commercial Waste and Strategy team state that this proposed area is located on the closed former Lodmoor Landfill Site. There are also site-specific drainage channels and associated monitoring points (from the HRC, and Eco sites also), these would have been originally engineered using the closed landfill site's proposed end use, that of an open space. Any development, including the introduction of areas of hard standing, may cause the water and leachate from the filled area to act in a differing way. Consequently, a full study of the existing system and proposed improvements would be required to be identified within the Draft Policy.</p> <p>261. Investigations would be required to determine whether the land is contaminated. If contamination is revealed, remediation would be needed to address this issue. Remediation measures can be costly and often effect development viability.</p>	
29/19	<p>I believe developing the former tip at Lodmoor would have a detrimental impact on the Lodmoor Nature reserve. Weymouth is fortunate to have two rare but important reedbed sites in the town centre that would be negatively affected with any further development. Whilst there is a great need for more housing, we should fiercely protect the diminishing wildlife areas we already have as they would be irreplaceable once lost and we already have many brownfield sites that could easily be developed before we start destroying the edges of nature reserves. It is indeed a very fine balance we tread and as a country with one of the worst records for Bio Diversity in Europe and the worst rivers in Europe we really need to be much better. Developers like greenfield sites as it reduces their costs and therefore increases their profits, but this is simply not an acceptable reason to lose valuable wildlife areas.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
29/20	<p>WNP 29A, B and C.</p> <p>I am very much against moving the tip to Chickerell as they have access to the tip on Portland already, so this would mean two tips to the West of the town and none to the East. Yet most of your new housing is to the East of the town WNP24, WNP25, and WNP26, will give us 630 new dwellings all within a mile of the tip. When you move the tip seven miles to the East, if each makes one trip a year to the tip it will result in a carbon footprint of 8,820 miles for the round trip. This is not good planning. All area 6, if and when it becomes available should be used for allotments, which are in short supply to the East of the town, and this is the area (to the East of the town) where you are concentrating your new housing.</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>
29/1	<p>WPN28/WPN29a/b/c</p> <p>I believe that failing business areas should be re-purposed to housing, where the viability of creating greenspace is non-existent. These areas should be developed before the greenfield sites across the town are considered for development, just because these are</p>	<p>Noted objection to policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	easier for developers. Cities don't have these issues in developers building on brownfield sites	
29/22	<p>WNP29 a-c</p> <p>- we shouldn't build on the old tip land, as it is within 500metres of an SSI</p> <p>- why build on the site of the existing tip, as it would necessitate the provision of another tip, probably further away, so less convenient, which would necessitate longer journeys (with the resultant impact on the environment).</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>objection to policy</p>
29/23 Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>This site was newly promoted in response to the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan call for sites and some of our comments made in response to the public engagement undertaken in January 2023 are repeated here. The site assessment published then failed to recognise that the northern part of the site is mapped as part of the Lorton Valley Nature Park and the current draft also fails to recognise this. It is not clear whether the boundaries of the LVNP have changed or the reason for this omission. As per the map in the draft Dorset Council Local Plan (p205 in the Options Consultation document dated January 2021) this area does appear to still be included.</p> <p>It is also mapped as part of Dorset's Existing Ecological Network and lies adjacent to Lodmoor SSSI and RSPB reserve and Lodmoor Country Park. The northern part of the site also includes Reedbed and Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh priority habitats. The northern and central parts of the site in particular provide valuable habitats adjacent to the SSSI and form a buffer between the designated sites and the existing developed areas to the west. DWT consider that the loss of habitats immediately adjacent to the SSSI and likely to be contributing materially to the integrity of the designated site is unacceptable.</p> <p>The site is also well used as informal recreational space by local people for dog walking and other activities.</p> <p>A quantum of at least 90 dwellings for the central part and 30-40 dwellings for the southern part are proposed which would represent a huge impact on adjacent sites and the wider Lorton Valley. Development of the site would both result in the loss or erosion of a habitat buffer and increased pressures on the designated sites.</p> <p>Any proposal for low density development on the site must seek to minimise areas of existing habitats impacted and avoid loss or erosion of the buffer area adjacent to the protected sites.</p> <p>Consideration of impacts on the adjacent RSPB reserve, Lodmoor SSSI and the wider Lorton Valley Nature Park must include the impact and need to mitigate and compensate for additional recreational pressure. In addition, development in this area may also have the potential to affect water management in the adjacent wetland reserve, a strategy to ensure nitrate and phosphate neutrality may be necessary to ensure that the condition and value of the habitats and the species they support can be maintained.</p>	<p>Ensure site boundary shown on map is correct and relates accurately to any policy regarding this area.</p> <p>Address other concerns expressed by DWT regarding impact on wildlife if an allocation policy remains in the NP.</p>
	<p>WNP30 & paras 9.121-9.124</p>	
30/1	WNP30 Self-Build and Custom-Build Housing Support	<p>Support Noted</p>
30/2	<p>WNP30: Self-Build and Custom-Build-Housing</p> <p>I full support the direction of self-build and community housing groups. This can and should be used on larger scale development sites (for example Redland's) but allow for a number of plots to be allocated for Self-Build. Roman Road (where I live) was previously council owned site that was given to self-building in the 50's, with the rule that no 2 properties can be the same. It is a shame that this has been lost. The last remaining site at Roman Road has just been completed. This was sold by the council in 2018/2019 and a lost opportunity for the council to earn more money (by selling plots) and creating a more diverse housing stock. These houses have been up for 450,000+ not providing any affordable homes at all. I have builder friends that cannot afford to buy a house, however, could build one but sadly are priced out by developers.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>comment(s) in support</p>
30/3 Dorset Council	<p>WNP30 Self-Build and Custom-Build-Housing</p> <p>This policy builds on policy HOU56 Self-build and custom-build housing in the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan (January 2021). This policy seeks to encourage self-build and custom build housing in Weymouth.</p> <p>262. Criterion 2 – We suggest that it might be helpful to add some clarification to criterion 2 of the policy to ensure that it is clear when self / custom build development might be supported outside defined development boundaries (DDBs). Are the references to the 'development plan' relating to the local or neighbourhood plan once made? We assume Criterion 2 i) refers to Policy WNP34: Exception Site Development and Criteria 2 ii-v) refer to Policy WNP13 Countryside which in turn refers to Local Plan Policy SUS2 iii) which is a summary of Local Plan policies HOU56 Other residential development outside DDBs (replacement, subdivision or for rural workers) and SUS3 adaption and re-use of buildings outside the DDB (reuse). We recommend avoiding multiple cross references between plans and polices.</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording to clause 2 in the light of comments received.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>263. Criterion 3 - We suggest that it would be helpful to receive clarification around the requirement for a design brief. What should the brief include and what is its role in decision-taking and delivery?</p> <p>264. Criterion 4 – The new reference to ‘innovative design and sustainability approaches’ is noted and welcomed.</p>	
	<p>WNP31 & paras 9.125-9.131</p>	
31/1	<p>The importance of community land trusts (9.129) (WNP31) needs amplifying further especially to support the younger generation.</p>	Noted comment.
31/2	<p>Community Housing Schemes WNP31 With the known limitations of achieving Affordable Housing targets documented in the Proposed Plan and elsewhere, I would like to see a more initiative and positive approach to Community Housing Schemes e.g. An active policy of Community Housing Schemes will be pursued.</p>	Noted comment.
31/3	<p>The solution is not to squeeze small boxes and call them homes, into tight spaces in the town centre.</p>	Noted comment(s) in support
31/4	<p>WNP31 What ‘brownfield’ sites are intended to be used for Community Housing? Surely not the town centre car parks which would be most unsuitable for families or retired people? Reference is made to the admirable Hazelmead development in Bridport which is a spacious greenfield development in an AONB. Is it really being proposed that the town centre is suitable for young families?</p>	Noted comment(s) in support
31/5	<p>WNP31 Greater emphasis on intentional communities, co-housing, and Low Impact Development (LIDs) Community living provides economies of scale on several levels that is demonstrably beneficial and has particular relevance in times of economic hardship, which look set to continue indefinitely. How can we influence conditions for land to be made available to enable alternative ways of delivering homes for economically disadvantaged people in particular.</p>	Noted comment.
31/6	<p>WNP31: Community Housing Schemes Support</p>	Support Noted
31/7 Dorset Council	<p>WNP31 Community Housing Schemes 265. There is no statutory definition of Community Led Housing (CLH) and neither does it have a single form. However, the three eligibility criteria for the Government’s Community Housing Fund (note: the guidance was withdrawn on 20 April 2022 but remains relevant) can and have been used to define CLH for planning purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is meaningful community engagement and consent occurs throughout the development process. The community does not necessarily have to initiate and manage the process, or build the homes themselves, though some may do; • The local community group or organisation owns, manages or stewards the homes in a manner of their choosing. This may be done through a mutually supported arrangement with a Registered Provider (RP) that owns the freehold or leasehold for the property; and • The benefits to the local area and/or specified community must be clearly defined and legally protected in perpetuity. <p>266. Further detailed guidance and examples of CLH are helpfully provided by ‘Community First Yorkshire’. 90709-planners-guide-clh-final.pdf (communityledhomes.org.uk)</p> <p>267. It is recommended that an additional criterion is added to highlight the importance of community engagement. Suggested text “it is demonstrated that the community has been involved in the preparation of the proposal and is supportive”.</p> <p>268. Criterion 1 - This is a long sentence and would benefit from being broken up. For example, the demonstration of local housing needs could form a new criterion.</p> </p>	Consider policy rewording to clauses 1 and 3 in the light of comments received.
	<p>WNP32 & paras 9.132-9.136</p>	
32/1	<p>WNP32: Specialist Housing Provision – Support supports such provision based upon need and covering a range of tenures.</p>	Support Noted
32/2	<p>specialist housing for elderly - please do not support the high-end, high-maintenance-charge retirement village model, which I feel is another national scandal in the making. There are not-for-profit organisations offering better solutions that we should be building on as a nation.</p>	Noted comment(s) in support
32/3 Dorset Council	<p>WNP32 Specialist Housing Provision 269. Approach - Planning practice guidance (PPG) Housing for older and disabled people - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk), Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 63-006-20190626 suggests Plans could “provide indicative figures or a range for the number of units of specialist housing for older people needed across the plan area throughout the plan period.” 270. The Weymouth Housing Needs Assessment (2021) estimates “the additional need for specialist dwellings for older people is likely to fall between 1,029 and 1,374 dwellings by the end of the plan period.” 271. PPG, paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 63-010-20190626 explains that there are different types of specialist housing designed to meet the diverse needs of older people, which can</p>	Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>include: age-restricted general market housing, retirement living or sheltered housing, extra care housing or housing-with-care and residential care homes and nursing homes, however this list is not definitive.</p> <p>272. The Weymouth Housing Needs Assessment (2021) uses two models to determine future need for specialist housing. Section 6.3.2 outlines a tenure-led projection and section 6.3.3 uses the Housing Learning and Improvement Network (HLIN) toolkit. The conclusions of both approaches can be used to translate the forecast need by form of provision.</p> <p>273. PPG, paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 63-012-20190626 discusses if Plans should make specific provision for specialist housing for older people. "Plans need to provide for specialist housing for older people where a need exists. Innovative and diverse housing models will need to be considered where appropriate." Planning practice guidance continues "Plan-makers will need to consider the size, location and quality of dwellings needed in the future for older people in order to allow them to live independently and safely in their own home for as long as possible, or to move to more suitable accommodation if they so wish."</p> <p>274. Paragraph 9.133 - The Weymouth HNA, paragraph 243 stresses that "While it is important to maximise the accessibility of all new housing, it is particularly important for specialist housing for older people to be provided in sustainable, accessible locations, for a number of reasons". Given the importance of accessible locations, it is suggested this requirement could form an additional criterion to the policy.</p>	
	<p>WNP33 & paras 9.137-9.141</p>	
<p>33/1</p>	<p>WNP33 Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) - Support places conditions on conversion of residences to an HMO.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
<p>33/2 Dorset Council</p>	<p>WNP33 Houses in Multiple Occupation</p> <p>275. Definition - Consideration should be given to the full legal definition of an HMO. Under the Housing Act 2004, a building, or part of a building, is considered to be an HMO if it meets one of the three tests (the standard build test, the self-contained flat test and the converted building test). Housing Act 2004 (legislation.gov.uk) Shelter Legal England - House in multiple occupation (HMO) definition - Shelter England</p> <p>276. Evidence - No evidence of harm has been presented to justify restricting the number of HMOs in this way. The supporting text notes that there is a higher concentration in parts of Weymouth however not that this concentration is harmful. Further evidence should be gathered to justify the policy.</p> <p>277. Criterion 1 (i) Consider defining over concentration. E.g. a maximum percentage of HMOs within a given area as a percentage. For example, South Gloucestershire suggest no more than 10% of households in each locality. 'Locality' is defined as 'Census Output Area'. Clarification should be provided as supporting text. Microsoft Word - HMO SPD Final Version for website.docx (southglos.gov.uk)</p> <p>278. Criterion 1 (iii) This policy criterion is worded in the double negative and should be considered for rewording.</p> <p>279. Criterion 1 (iv) Recommend adding a requirement to have appropriate landscaping as part of the frontage and parking, etc in part iv).</p> <p>280. Criterion 2 – Refers to use class 4, this should be C4. In 2010, a new planning Use Class C4 was created for dwellings occupied as HMOs by up to six residents. The planning meaning of the new Use Class was aligned with the definition of an HMO in the Housing Act 2004. HMOs with over 6 occupants (large HMO) do not fall within any specific Use Class, known as Sui Generis uses.</p> <p>281. Criterion 2 – Permitted development rights allow a dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to change to a small HMO C4 (3-6 residents) without the need for planning permission. Planning permission is however needed for large HMO units over 6 occupants. Class C4 HMOs would not be required to comply with this policy without an article 4 in place. The article 4 direction should ideally be in place prior to the making of the Neighbourhood Plan if this was to be included in the policy. This is because one of the basic conditions tests that the plan will be examined against is 'having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State'.</p> <p>Alternatively, the policy could set criteria for large HMO's that fall within sui generis uses.</p> <p>285. Criterion 2. duplication of text 'to a'.</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording to clauses 1 and 2 in the light of comments received. Include definition in para. 9.141 of "over-concentration" in a Weymouth context.</p>
	<p>WNP34 & paras 9.142-9.145</p>	
<p>34/1</p>	<p>WNP34 Exception Site Development</p> <p>Sadly I do not think the proposed strategy will work! Allowing development in sensitive areas outside of the Defined Development Boundary with the knowledge that developers have commercial viability concerns, on the surface appears ill conceived. It is known that historically AH has only been delivered at the rate of 13-19%. What confidence is there that it will be any different in the future if the target is set at 35% or higher? What is needed is a robust, assertive plan for something like Land Trusts: Council ownership of rentable accommodation etc. I appreciate that it would require massive infrastructure changes and obviously funding, but it is the only way to crack the problem. Otherwise</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	there is the danger of just doing the same old thing so to speak. The statement that it would potentially take the construction of 7,000 or more dwellings to achieve the currently defined targets says it all. Surely the focus should be on the identified needs such as the current housing waiting list. One only has to see the current rash of 4/5 bedroom properties being built to see that we are addressing the wrong end of the market. It may well be the right market for developers, but it is not necessarily the right end for the community!	
34/2	WNP34: Exception Site Development WNP24 seems to fit the criteria that would make it an exception site, but it is contained within the Dorset AONB and cannot be described as being 'small in nature'. WNP24 appears to be at odds with this policy as well as the others already mentioned.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
34/3	WNP34 Exception Site Development sets conditions for sites that are outside the development boundary. Support: But needs revision. First Homes have not taken off. Can this be removed. Developers don't like it, and buyers don't like it. It implies this is only for 1st Homes – these needs explaining especially as the greatest need is for Social Housing and First Homes is focussed on Discounted Sale.	Noted comment(s) in support
34/4	WNP34 Exception Site Developments The tests set out for such sites are tightly drawn as para 9.134 makes clear. Would it be possible to look at each area of land that might possibly comply in what is a fairly small NP area, and specifically name any that could be brought forward?	Noted comment(s) in support
34/5	Building on open green space should be exclusively reserved to provide 100% affordable housing with covenants to ensure that they go only to local workers or key workers from outside the area. Otherwise	Noted comment(s) in support
34/6	If building outside the development boundary, housing should be 100% affordable with covenants ensuring that only local people or key workers can live there.	Noted comment(s) in support
34/7 Dorset Council	WNP34 Exception Site Development 283. Approach - The Ministerial Statement is clear that rural exception sites apply both 'within' and 'outside' designated rural areas (such as AONBs) however policy WNP34 implies rural exception sites are only supported 'within' AONBs. This difference can be resolved by deleting "Within the Dorset AONB area" at the beginning of Criterion 2. We agree that First Home Exception sites are only suitable outside of AONBs. 284. It is not clear which parts of the Policy apply solely to First Home Exception sites and which parts only apply to Rural Exception sites? Criterion 1 applies to First Home Exception sites and Criterion 2 to Rural Exception sites. Criterion 3-5 appear to apply to both types of exception site however criterion 3 refers to First Home schemes only and may be better added to the list in Criterion 1. It may be clearer to simply split the policy into two, with each policy dealing with the specific policy requirements. 285. Criterion 2 cross-references to Policy HOU52 of the adopted Local Plan however this can be avoided by simply listing the additional criterion in the policy. Policy HOU52 requires proposals to meet 'identified need' and that the 'scheme is of a character, scale and design appropriate to the location'. The third criterion which seeks secure arrangements for subsequent occupiers appears as Criterion 4 in Policy WNP34. 286. Criteria 3 and 4 both refer to homes for 'local people' and 'local occupancy' which are references to the 'Weymouth Local Connection Policy' introduced in WNP22, Criterion 2 (iii). The Council's comments to that policy would also apply to these references.	Consider policy rewording to clause 2 in the light of comments received. Include definitions in supporting text, refer to NPPF para. 73 and its emphasis on community-led developments.
	WNP35 & paras 9.146-9.149	
35/1	WNP35 Para. 9.146 An increase in building will only force down the price of housing - this is basic economics. Only a change to the overall economics of second home ownership will make more or less houses available for local people. This policy is more likely to reduce, not increase, the number of homes built. There is an implication that second homes are a negative effect on the town, when they actually accommodate either the wealthiest visitors to the town (and often have strong connections to it) or, where let, accommodate the highest spending visitors to the town. Holiday lets in Weymouth are bringing, even on the minimum use basis (70 let nights per year), based on 2.5 bedroom per unit, 70,000 room nights of capacity to the town, which, on the basis of a relatively modest £100/room/night, suggests a local economic benefit of at least £7m per year, which would otherwise be lost to the local economy. This benefit does need to be acknowledged and, should the proposals go ahead to restrict such second homes / holiday lets, explanation given of how the lost spending in the local economy be replaced.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
35/2	I strongly support WNP35 as a means of preventing the loss of local housing stock.	Support Noted
35/3	WNP35 Agreed. I would suspect this issue is more cogent in the Purbeck area but that's relative and would need to be addressed in Weymouth.	Noted comment(s) in support
35/4	Cut the amount of second homes in Weymouth, especially around the town centre. The council would not have to allow one more home to be built, if they could turn every second home back into a lived-in home. It destroys communities and increases rent and	Noted comment(s) in support

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	lowers housing availability. I have lived on Weymouth harbourside, and my family still do. Years ago, people such as lifeboat men lived locally. Now none of them do, as they cannot afford to live on the harbourside. Small coastal communities are struggling to get retained firefighters who live close enough to the stations. This will affect day to day life. The harbourside is dead in winter. Rows of homes, with no lights on. It's sad.	
35/5 CG Fry and Son	WNP35 Principal Residence Requirement As noted above it, is questionable whether this requirement is justified and whether second homes or holiday homes are legitimately causing such an issue that they must be prevented. If robust evidence cannot be presented to confirm this, then Policy WNP35 should be removed from the NP.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
35/6	WNP35 Principal Residence Requirement seeks to address threat to housing stock of second homes and holiday letting rather than long-term letting. Support:	Support Noted
35/7	Not sure which policy my comments fall within. 1) totally support restriction of holiday house ownership (I resist the term 'second home', we have one home. Any additional properties have another purpose). It destroys communities and distorts the housing market as the gap between rich and poor widens in this country.	Noted comment(s) in support
35/8	I agree we need to do something to reduce the amount of second homes and especially holiday lets.	Noted comment(s) in support
35/9	WNP35 Weymouth needs to retain its unique character and not be overwhelmed by "executive" second homes which drive up local property prices and make housing further out of reach for local people.	Noted comment(s) in support
35/10	WNP35 The proposal to impose a primary occupancy restriction on all new houses seems unrealistic and will not be acceptable to developers. The policy is explicitly designed to drive down new house prices which will not encourage supply. To control occupancy the LA needs to own the property, as above.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
35/11	Fully support WNP35 in its proposal to restrict all new housing to principal residences. I value our green space and the community, and passionately object to building on open spaces when there are dozens of properties that stand empty for much of the year	Noted comment(s) in support
35/12	I strongly support WNP35, the second home habit must not be allowed to develop locally. I also think the whole Plan is a valuable initiative. Bravo	Support Noted
35/13 Weymouth Civic Society (P&E Cttee)	WNP 35 Principal Residence Requirement We commend the Council in its wish to ensure that new housing will not be for second homes.	Support Noted
35/14 Dorset Council	WNP35 Principal Residence Requirements 287. We have explored the issue of Second Homes in the Dorset Council area within a Background Paper in support of the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan. The report found that Weymouth has one of the lowest percentages of second home ownership in Dorset with between 0.6% (Council Tax) to 1.5% (Electoral Roll) depending on the source of evidence. 288. Of note is that the report recommends addressing the issue through council tax measures rather than through planning policy. Dorset Councillors have stated that this is something that they are seeking to explore in an article in March 2023. The Levelling Up and Regeneration Act introduces a "discretionary council tax premium on second homes and changes the qualifying period for use of the long term-empty homes premium", the notes say. The document says that "local authorities may levy a premium of up to an additional 100 per cent on council tax bills for second homes...". This is from the 1st April 2024. 289. As wider background, this is an issue explored by several other Neighbourhood Plan groups along the Heritage Coast, most notably in Portland, Bridport, Charmouth and Chesil Bank. The corresponding examiner reports provide a helpful discussion and loose benchmarks to help judge a level of second home ownership at which a policy could be justified. 290. Evidence - Policy WNP35 requires further justification as it is not clear the level of second homes is so high as to justify a policy. As part of the comments for the pre-regulation 14 draft it was asked if there is a specific area where the percentage of second homes is more significant? Information has not been provided on this point. 291. It is noted that 2021 Census data at the local level has recently been published. This data should be mapped, and the Policy could refer to localised areas with the greatest impact to maximise any chance of success. The ONS website shows this data in the following link. ONS Census maps - Second address type in England and Wales. The map indicates that there could be high levels in Preston and Lodmoor. If you go down to a more detailed area base, areas such as Overcombe, Wyke Regis and Nottingham have high	Noted comments and concerns from DC Recognise community support. Firm up local evidence. Consider scope of policy i.e. whether making policy only applicable to greenfield sites. Consider how other areas have dealt with this and justified such a policy. Delete definition of principal residency from policy and include definition in supporting text

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>figures. The data needs to be interrogated in order to get an appropriate policy position in the relevant areas.</p> <p>292. Vacant homes data can be found on the following link. Housing in England and Wales - Office for National Statistics (ons.gov.uk)</p> <p>293. Paragraph 9.146 of the Neighbourhood Plan outlines that 'the number of second homes and holiday lets in the area. Dorset Council, in October 2023 reported, that there are 857 properties which are registered, in Weymouth, as second homes and that 403 properties pay Business Rates as Holiday Homes (i.e. let for at least 70 days of the year, marketed for at least 140 days of the year)'. The paragraph goes on to note that there are approximately 300 properties in Weymouth listed on Airbnb for July 2023, however there is no way of knowing if these properties are being double counted and should therefore not be included in the figures.</p> <p>294. The information given is not clear or supported by sufficient evidence that would warrant such a stringent policy that could have unintended consequences for local residents, house prices and the existing housing stock.</p> <p>295. Within the policy, the term Principal residence is defined. This should not be written within the policy but should be referenced within the supporting text.</p>	
	WNP36 & paras 9.150-9.154	
36/1	WNP36 - strongly support	Support Noted
36/2	<p>WNP36/7. Agreed.</p> <p>S.106 Agreements should be embedded in the Charges Registers of Developers' registered titles to ensure provision of more than just adequate utility systems, i.e. sewers.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>comment(s) in support</p>
36/3	<p>WNP36</p> <p>garages that are large enough to house a modern car should be built with new build homes-most developments e.g. Officers field on Portland, have small garages; not large enough for modern cars therefore all the cars have to park on the road causing congestion</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>comment(s) in support</p>
36/4	<p>WNP36 Timing of Infrastructure</p> <p>recognises need for phased development to prevent overload of roads, sewers, and other services. Support: But public are concerned about infrastructure they also mean doctors, buses, shops, etc where can this be addressed in the NP.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>comment(s) in support</p>
36/5 Dorset Council	<p>WNP36 Timings of Infrastructure</p> <p>296. Approach - The draft Policy reads as an objective rather than a decision-making tool and consequently maybe better located in the list of objectives. The delivery and phasing of infrastructure is usually negotiated on a site-by-site basis with the agreement of infrastructure providers. There are a wide range of factors that can influence what infrastructure is required and when. The CIL/S106 Team also questions how the policy differs from the adopted Local Plan position?</p> <p>297. Community Infrastructure Levy - Policy COM1 states that "Community infrastructure will be phased to come forward in advance of, or at the same time as the development when negotiated through planning obligations. When delivered through the Community Infrastructure Levy, such provision will be expected to take place as soon as reasonably practicable after the funds are collected." Policy WNP29 however does not reference the levy but instead the infrastructure itself.</p> <p>298. Terms - CIL/S106 Team notes the policy introduces terms which make the requirements quite vague, e.g. 'logically', 'unacceptable'. These terms will make it harder to enforce and measure performance.</p> <p>299. Minor development - CIL/S106 Team question why this policy should just cover major development? Minor development can require infrastructure to mitigate the harm caused, e.g. biodiversity compensation. Cumulative minor development will also have an impact over time.</p> <p>300. Para 9.150 – CIL/S106 Team advise that it is not the purpose of development to address previous under-delivery of infrastructure. Additional infrastructure can only be secured to mitigate the impact of the new development not to solve existing problems. There is also contradiction in wording in this paragraph, saying more than adequate then inadequate in the next sentence.</p> <p>301. Para 9.152 – CIL/S106 Team ask if the requirement in this paragraph is achievable? 'Development proposals should include a realistic assessment of their impact on the existing local infrastructure, services and facilities and demonstrate how any such impacts will be addressed so as not to disbenefit existing residents and businesses or harm the natural or physical environment'. This requirement is however not referenced in the policy.</p> <p>302. Para 9.153 – CIL/S106 Team confirm this is an incorrect date. DC became the charging authority in April 2019 (taking on the responsibility of charging schedules developed by predecessor councils). The CIL doesn't always increase every year– it would be better to say 'it is adjusted each year to take account of changes in indexation and may increase or decrease'. Not all qualifying development will have to pay the levy – due to the ability to secure relief/exemptions there will be a proportion that do not pay.</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received.</p> <p>Correct date in para. 9.153 to "April 2019"</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>303. Para 9.154 - CIL/S106 Team queries if the neighbourhood plan covers infrastructure priorities? What are the objectives in relation to spending the CIL Neighbourhood Proportion money. It would be helpful to highlight the increase in the CIL Neighbourhood Proportion to 25% once the Neighbourhood Plan is made. This is even more important given that there will be an increase in the CIL Neighbourhood Proportion money. It is important that the Neighbourhood Plan sets out what it aims to achieve with this increase in CIL funds and provide a list of projects it intends to spend its CIL receipts on.</p>	
36/6	<p>The infrastructure section is weak and does not consider all the required infrastructure (health services etc) for the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2#consulting-on-and-publicising-a-neighbourhood-plan-or-order states:</p> <p>“Should a neighbourhood plan consider infrastructure? A qualifying body may wish to consider what infrastructure needs to be provided in their neighbourhood area from the earliest stages of plan-making (as set out in paragraph 102 of the National Planning Policy Framework) alongside development such as homes, shops or offices. Infrastructure is needed to support development and ensure that a neighbourhood can grow in a sustainable way. The following may be important considerations for a qualifying body to consider when addressing infrastructure in a neighbourhood plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what additional infrastructure may be needed to enable development proposed in a neighbourhood plan to be delivered in a sustainable way • how any additional infrastructure requirements might be delivered • what impact the infrastructure requirements may have on the viability of a proposal in a draft neighbourhood plan and therefore its delivery • what are the likely impacts of proposed site allocation options or policies on physical infrastructure and on the capacity of existing services, which could help shape decisions on the best site choices <p>Qualifying bodies should engage infrastructure providers (e.g. utility companies, transport infrastructure providers and local health commissioners) in this process, advised by the local planning authority. Paragraph: 045 Reference ID: 41-045-20190509” Also the https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/toolkits-and-guidance/create-neighbourhood-plan-step-by-step-roadmap-guide/ states that types evidence for a neighbourhood plan includes: “Community infrastructure. Community assets of an area, including community centres, key local shops (e.g. chemist, post office, newsagents), libraries, youth centres, parks, play areas, nurseries/crèches, pubs, health centres and surgeries. Sources include local plan, local community organisations, public health and education providers.” Also it states: “New or more localised evidence Existing evidence on many subjects may be sufficient to inform and justify the policies of the neighbourhood plan. However, much evidence tends to focus on ward, district or wider areas. Also, there may be gaps in existing evidence or it might be out-of-date. It may therefore be necessary to produce new evidence at neighbourhood level. Neighbourhood-level evidence could include things like a survey of vacant shop units, local businesses, audits of local community facilities, vehicle counts, or urban design analysis. It could also include housing needs assessment specific to the neighbourhood plan area, e.g. to identify housing mix requirements. This will vary for different neighbourhood areas according to the adequacy of existing evidence and the nature of the area in question. Examples of possible kinds of neighbourhood-level evidence are: Economic: Business surveys, vacancy/floorspace survey, available sites survey, land and property values. Social/community: Householder surveys, housing condition and/or occupancy survey, audit of community facilities, ‘Building for Life 12’ assessment of housing, housing needs assessment (neighbourhood). Environmental: Heritage assessments, review of local lists, urban design analysis, green space surveys, habitat surveys. Infrastructure: Transport services, schools and medical provision, transport capacity analysis, traffic/pedestrian flow surveys.” I do not think enough effort has gone in to the infrastructure part of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant evidence has not been generated. This needs to be updated for the next issue</p> <p>WNP37 & paras 9.155-9.160</p>	<p>Make reference to PPG guidance on NPs and the consideration of infrastructure.</p>
37/1	<p>WNP37</p> <p>I would like to be sure the council is aware of new wind turbine technology, specifically of the spinning ball type rather than the long arm type. See o-innovations.com. This is designed for urban areas and in my opinion would not pose a risk to birds. It may not create as much noise as the long-arm. I have seen on the planning site that applications for wind farms are being rejected, and it may be that the spinning ball type would be acceptable. I mention in particular a site that has permission for new homes but is proving difficult to build on, at Ferryman's Way at the northwest corner of the Portland-Weymouth bridge, and which may be suitable for a windfarm instead. I am not in any way connected to o-innovations; I simply want to do my bit for the planet by bringing this to your attention.</p>	<p>Noted comment.</p>
37/2	<p>WNP37</p>	<p>Noted comment.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	should be more explicit particularly 2(i) on SUDS and should incorporate sentence 2 of 9.156 in this policy statement.	
37/3	I feel there is going to be overdevelopment of the suggested building areas between Preston and Littlemoor. Where are the jobs for the owners of these houses? Wildlife is losing its habitats. I feel paving over of front drives should be discouraged to reduce flooding risks. Allow use of empty shops as residential homes rather than use green fields	Noted comment(s) in support
37/4	In general I do not understand why all new houses are not built with solar panels, rain water storage of some kind and enhanced insulation, all of which would be cheaper if built in at construction. I know these are building regs issues, but it would be good to have Weymouth stepping out of line in order to make a statement and try to initiate change. I am very concerned about traffic management in the town, particularly during the summer but all year round with heavy lorries coming straight along the A354.	Noted comment(s) in support
37/5	Again have not viewed your report but I would encourage you to support any new-builds to be of a passive house standard.	Noted comment(s) in support
37/6	At a glance, this rightly suggests that any developments should have adequate provision for walking, cycling, etc. and EV charging points. I cannot see any requirement for adequate car parking, or indeed, access to and from sites.	Noted comment(s) in support
37/7	WNP37 Sustainable Development Supported	Support Noted
37/8	All new development particularly larger sites are featured in the plan must feature a provision where renewable energy is an absolute bare minimum requirement. Some of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan – Environmental Targets are slightly woolly, when applied to the larger developments (where anything is achievable when compared to small retrofit single house. House build with south facing roof and solar installed both PV and Water. Rain water harvesting (in loft) for flushing toilets / garden. Provision for 1 x composting toilet to be fitted within homes. Super insulated. GS/ASHP Soft landscaping to prevent increased surface run off (along with commitments of homeowners not to grub out trees etc). If larger building companies are not able to commit to future proofing our housing stock, then small developers should be allowed.	Noted comment.
37/9	We need to build Passive homes. Builders should not be able re-negotiate the on the amount of affordable homes they build once planning has been approved.	Noted comment(s) in support
37/10	WNP37 Again I really hope we are not just paying lip service to this aim.	Noted comment(s) in support
37/11	Would like to see support for the Listed Building Guest House owners/leaseholders re the fitting of Double-glazed window units and general insulation, to assist with the huge energy loss currently experienced - To work with Conservation, Historic England and Planning to have a workable agreeable solution	Noted comment(s) in support
37/12 Weymouth Civic Society (P&E Cttee)	Internal Space Standards. We wish to emphasise the importance that recognised national space standards in new buildings should be adopted by Dorset Council. The need for adequate internal space should be set out clearly in the Neighbourhood Plan, covering all residential development.	Noted comment.
37/13 Lichfields for Haven Leisure	WNP37 Sustainable Development The representations are: 1. With reference to Part 1, reference to needing to align with the 'environmental objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan' should be removed or the objectives should be rewritten as policies and tested as part of the consultation process. 2. With reference to Part 2: a. Much, if not all, of the requirements in part 2(i) are already embedded in national or local policy and there is no requirement to repeat this in the emerging NP. b. The support for energy conservation measures and renewable technology in part 2(ii) is endorsed. The requirement for these to predominate (our emphasis) is onerous. At this stage of the advancement of technology, this requirement may not be feasible. There is no evidence provided for the policy to demonstrate the achievability of this requirement nor how this might align with other policies within the emerging NP. We therefore suggest that the requirement should be encouraged rather than mandated. c. There is no need to include part 2(iii) in the emerging NP as there are appropriate policies in the Local Plan that meet the same purpose. d. Not all properties need access to the fastest possible broadband, as is required in part 2(iv). For example, in holiday parks, the requirements for broadband should be dictated by operational needs. e. Reference to 'other community connections' is unclear. This requirement needs to be explained in greater detail so that it can be better understood before a representation can be made. f. There is no need for part 2(v) to be included given that it refers back to the Local Plan.	Noted comment.
37/14 Dorset Council	WNP37 Sustainable Development 304. Criterion 1 seeks to reflect Policy ENV13 which states, "New buildings and alterations / extensions to existing buildings are expected to achieve high standards of environmental performance." The wording of sustainable development is however not defined in the	Consider policy rewording to clauses 1 and 2 in the light of comments received.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>supporting text. If this policy is simply seeking to replicate ENV13 it is considered to be unnecessary duplication and should be deleted. As a minimum suggest replacing 'sustainable development' with 'sustainability' to avoid repetition of the word 'development'.</p> <p>305. Criteria 2 i) and ii) - 'fully integrated' sustainable construction methods, and 'energy conservation measures and renewable energy technology' requirements are potentially onerous without evidence in terms of viability testing. Viability testing is required in order to justify this policy.</p> <p>306. Criteria 2 (i) There is no further clarification around requirements relating to: Sustainable construction methods; Water conservation; SuDs; and Permeable surfaces. Details of requirements need to be provided in the supporting text.</p> <p>307. Criterion 2 (ii) refers to "energy conservation measures and renewable energy technology predominate". Details of which technologies and what standards to be met need to be defined in the supporting text. It is not clear what this might mean and how compliance or otherwise might be assessed through decision taking.</p> <p>308. Criterion 2 (iv) seeks that "provision is made for the fastest possible broadband and other communication connections to all new properties" however new Building Regulations The Building etc. (Amendment) (England) (No. 2) Regulations 2022 came into force on 26 December 2022. These regulations introduce gigabit broadband infrastructure and connectivity requirements for the construction of new homes in England. They amend The Building Regulations 2010 and The Building (Approved Inspectors etc.) Regulations 2010. The requirements are designed to ensure that during construction, new homes are installed with the fastest broadband connections available within a cost cap. Even where a gigabit-capable connection is not possible within this cost cap, the new homes will be future-proofed with physical infrastructure to support gigabit-capable connections when they become available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement RA1: install gigabit-ready physical infrastructure necessary for gigabit-capable connections up to a network distribution point, or as close as is reasonably practicable where the developer does not have the right to access land up to that distribution point; and • Requirement RA2: Subject to a £2,000 cost cap per dwelling, install a functional gigabit-capable connection. Where a developer is unable to secure a gigabit-capable connection within the cost cap, developers must install the next fastest connection available, provided this can be done without that connection also exceeding the cost cap. In these circumstances a policy may no longer be required. <p>Consequently, a Local or Neighbourhood Plan policy is no longer necessary and is covered under other legislation. This policy criterion should be deleted.</p> <p>309. Criterion 2 (v) refers to "adequate provision is made for the safe and secure parking and storage of bikes, and electric vehicles consistent with the prevailing standards of the Local Planning Authority" Policy COM9 i) refers to Parking standards in new development and cross refers to published local parking guidance. Car and cycle parking standards - Dorset Council Policy COM9 sets out the requirement for cycle parking facilities. This policy is duplicating existing policy and should be deleted.</p> <p>310. Criterion 3 - The retrofitting of energy conservation measures and renewable energy technology being supported reads as an objective rather than a policy. It would be helpful to understand what technology or conservation measures are being referred to and the scenarios that they can be supported with specific reference to the relevant Historic England documents in the supporting text.</p>	
	<p>10 Jobs and Local Economy</p>	
	<p>Section 10 General</p>	
J/1	<p>This whole section lacks ambition. The area needs to encourage skilled employment such as provided by the various defence companies in the area.</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
J/2	<p>Not much. The town does need to attract a few more jobs than what are currently available. Off peak season time they be little work available at all. So I wouldn't even know how you start addressing that thinking.</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
J/3	<p>Do we currently have the jobs to support further expansion of housing?</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
J/4	<p>There is a need for more well-paid skilled jobs and for Weymouth College to up its game.</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>
J/5	<p>Strongly support</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
J/6	<p>Weymouth does not have a strategy for employment beyond what is existing in tourism, retail, logistics and hospitality. Therefore, inward investment into the area that could spur on high value jobs and provide hope for the next generation, does not exist. The harbour development beyond the Pavilion has not been addressed since the ferry services were removed. The decline of the offshore wind development could have provided the Council to position Weymouth and Portland at the forefront of renewable energy, sadly this has not happened. The Council have been behind the curve in bidding and succeeding with Government funding, the recent £19.5m award paves the way for repairs, waterside leisure development and some homes, but this will not provide long term, high value</p>	<p>Noted comment</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	employment that could be secured if the Council were to use the assets available via the port facilities within the area.	
J/7	You seem to have an inability to encourage hi-tech firms and well-paid jobs to the area. Any well-educated young person will leave to find better jobs elsewhere, so the area stays a low-income area and the social impact that has on a town.	Noted comment
J/8	Section 10 There is very little industry in Weymouth and therefore most job opportunities are seasonal. Travel to other towns and cities will increase road use adding to congestion and pollution. The economy is mostly based on tourism and therefore housing for residents is unsustainable in that rent or mortgages will be unaffordable by seasonal workers. There is a risk that housing will be purchased by outsiders for use on the holiday let market.	Noted comment
J/9	Anything that brings jobs, investment and increased prosperity into the area is to be encouraged.	Noted comment
J/10	This section highlights the need to reconsider the proposed allocation of new housing in the WNP.	Noted comment
J/11	Map 27 identifies Weymouth's key employment sites. The only new site is north of Littlemoor Road. This area includes 500 houses and a proposed new primary school. The area available for employment is subsequently diminished from that shown on Map 27. The housing allocation requirements within the WNP cannot be justified until a supportive and reliable job expansion scheme is in place.	Noted comment
J/12	The policies in this section need to be supported by a policy commitment to prioritising the attraction of high tech and green job opportunities and industrial over retail sector jobs in order to support a higher wage economy.	Noted comment
J/13	Need to attract more high-tech industries not tourism related.	Noted comment
J/14	More should be done to attract high value technical jobs. The road and rail infrastructure needs improving	Noted comment
J/15	More permanent jobs need to be created. Weymouth has plenty of seasonal, part-time or zero-hour contract job opportunities but there needs to be a creation of businesses that take on permanent full-time staff.	Noted comment
J/16	A general comment on this section is that it is not strategic enough. Many of Weymouth's issues in this area are from the disappearance of a major sector of employment with the end of Portland Port as a major naval base. There should be a policy to encourage one or more strategically important employers to establish themselves and adopt policies with this in mind. To give one example, the success of inviting Cruise Ships to call would be much more sustainable with the adoption of suitable policies e.g. to enable a much better transport interchange, perhaps by using some of the old council office site.	Noted comment
J/17	The plan should look at how changes in retail sector are impacting shop usage, should more shops be converted to housing, and I think we should not allow any more out of town centre retail developments.	Noted comment
J/18	Ideally, we need any building land to be reallocated to industrial or employment land. There is a massive daily tide of about 4000 people that leave Weymouth via the A354 every morning and returning over the ridgeway at tea time. There are not enough jobs in the town. So, rather than more housing, which locals cannot hope to afford, we need jobs.	Noted comment
J/19	Section 10 - Weymouth Town The Harbour is a vibrant attractive area unfortunately, the main town shopping area is very seedy, dirty and unattractive. It has remained like this for many years and even if new shops open - they will only offer low paid jobs. The Mount Pleasant retail park has added to the move away from the town centre also, you can park for free at the retail park and not pay an exorbitant fee in town. The Council needs to address how to attract professional businesses to the area otherwise, we shall just have more and more retirees moving here because only outsiders can afford to live here. Working in the education sector, I spent five years travelling to Bournemouth and then ten years working further away for career progression. There were very limited opportunities available locally. My two offspring were educated in Weymouth, went to University but because of the lack of suitable employment locally, moved away to work. That was 20 years ago, and the situation hasn't changed.	Noted comment
J/20	Para. 10.6 There are few good jobs in Weymouth this dictates high levels of car journeys which the council want to reduce. As work opportunities are few it would be logical to create a new town to the east of Dorchester providing fast access to Poole and Bournemouth	Noted comment
J/21	Section 10 Where in the proposal are you creating job opportunities? Existing work is mainly poorly paid and predominantly seasonal. This is counter-productive for those that have mortgages and high rent to pay therefore increasing job opportunities will enable people to live 'comfortably' in Weymouth.	Noted comment
J/22	Unable to properly read the details on mobile but the only jobs are, retail, care work, hospitality. Whilst many people are happy doing these jobs there is a large number of	Noted comment

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	individuals who are looking for professional careers- this is not easily attained in Weymouth	
J/23	No info structure or employment development plans. All existing are failing.	Noted comment
J/24	I don't see any 'volume' employment opportunities within the proposals. It's all very well trying to increase startups and night time economy but we all know that these jobs don't pay well and are hardly going to support mortgages on 3- and 4-bedroom homes.	Noted comment
J/25	Clearly local people need good jobs with promotional and development opportunities within the area. This is currently largely restricted to a few companies and the public sector. Simply increasing retail is not the way to go. We need to rely less on consumer spending and more on less impactful industries. A lot of the local retail shops are full of good coming from China that will eventually end up on landfill. This is not sustainable. We should be looking at attracting investment in the green energy sector and IT companies that allow home working.	Noted comment
J/26	More jobs for sustainable construction, renewable energy schemes, public transport, bio-diversity and green spaces. Windy Weymouth equals on-shore and off-shore energy generating schemes at scale. Let's get on with it.	Noted comment
J/27	Can there be more commitment or policy on the use of land for Solar Farm or BESS or small-scale, land-based wind power?	Noted comment.
J/28	WNP 38 – WNP 50 Nothing concrete to say how the jobs will be created, its's a wish list.	Noted comment
J/29	Weymouth is a low economy job area. A considerable amount of seasonable jobs is the nature of the town. Where are all these people who move here are going to find full time employment and afford houses or are we to get people from other councils moved here e.g. Gloucestershire as has already happened at Littlemoor and causing trouble with the police already!!! If this is the case, they won't be looking for work but depending on benefits.!!	Noted comment
J/30	I support improving local employment choices.	Support Noted
J/31	The issue I have here is that the wider context for jobs and the local economy is not being defined for Weymouth. If you have no economic vision or strategy for Weymouth, how can you adequately put in place enabling policies and enabling education and training? Basically the Forgotten Towns report nicely describes how we've got to where we are in Weymouth and Portland (see 'Initiatives to address the crisis in South Dorset' on p46). An economic strategy/vision would probably identify tourism, outdoor pursuits, digital, "green" tech and construction and modern ways of working as our new focus in Weymouth and thus our policies could reflect and enable this in a better way.	Noted comment
J/32	Generally support, especially WNP 39, 40, 44, 47, 49, 50	Support Noted
J/33	Think your plans for stimulating a move from a 'low wage' economy, tourism based to potentially a renewed retail and aspirational 'high tech' industry led based upon the energy projects planned (covered in section 11 that follows) is a good vision. There is no doubt with careful nurturing and the proximity of many coastal features that have the potential to harvest 'energy' we must be attractive to high tech industries keen to have a demonstrable example of what can be achieved as a microcosm of the UK.	Noted comment
J/34	It is disappointing and a significant flaw in the Neighbourhood Plan that it did not start with a new vision for retail and residential development in the town centre but, instead, relied on a near decade old town centre masterplan (2015). In the intervening years since that strategy was produced the nature of retail and high street services such as banking has changed fundamentally and will continue to do so. Weymouth, like most other high streets, seems doomed to become a depressing gap-toothed shopping experience with numerous vacant properties, and an increasingly proportion of low rent thrift, vaping and betting shops. Arguably Weymouth faces even greater challenges than other town centres because it already has a comparatively sprawling shopping centre, is very close to the rival retail opportunities in Dorchester and has and has acquiesced to a large edge of town retail development at Weymouth Gateway. The lack of an up-to-date strategy and masterplan for the town centre, when combined with policy WPN38, represents a missed opportunity to work towards a more compact but far more sustainable and thriving retail quarter and the potential release of significant numbers of high street properties for residential and affordable housing development. Such town centre housing development could put the heart back into the old town and itself generate new retail opportunities. The proposed 'refresh' of the 2015 town centre masterplan sounds inadequate. It should be scrapped and drafted from scratch with better intelligence, foresight and vision. It should also have led the Neighbourhood Plan process: not trailed in its wake.	Noted comment
J/35	Weymouth suffers from having 5 major supermarkets for a population of 50000 - independent food retailers are few and far between, most towns manage to support at least one greengrocer, especially in these days of food awareness, and I'm sure the 2 things are related. Can 'encouragement of small independent businesses' be specified in the Plan?	Consider whether the "encouragement of small independent businesses" should be referred to in the Introduction to section 10.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
J/36	I heard at one of the meetings giving by the council for the plan, that large employers in Wool were given as an example of business needing workers in relation to more housing. There are a number of jobs advertised but building more housing in Weymouth will not attract the workers. Many temporary staff seem to prefer the Poole/Bournemouth areas, for the diversity of life. The perceived lack of housing is not preventing these job positions from being filled it is other impacts of life.	Noted comment
J/37	There are issues with the policy to create job opportunities by promoting new business development (WNP 39). In Weymouth as referred to in the plan, the basic economy is based on the holiday/tourism/hospitality industries. There should be affordable homes available to local first-time buyers (not 2nd homes and holiday lets), thus encouraging local young people to train in these areas and be able to live where they grew up and their families are.	Noted comment
J/38	We need to encourage a jobs-for-all local value. More disability friendly employment. Small business hubs to support and encourage independent businesses to come to Weymouth. Make use of empty shops and businesses. Discourage shops that sell unhealthy products - vapes, American candy.	Noted comment
J/39	any development in the specified areas needs to ensure Weymouth's overburdened roads can cope. At the moment they struggle.	Noted comment
J/40	To encourage entrepreneurs/businesses to Weymouth/Portland does there need to be an increase in the amount of freehold industrial units available rather than businesses just renting. Should a new industrial unit be created on the outskirts of the town, rather than traffic having to come through the town/local roads.	Noted comment
J/41	Again, it is hard to take issue with the aims under this policy save to say that housing development outside the Defined Development Boundary will not lead to significant additional jobs, rather it will lead to more traffic in and out of Weymouth for residents in the new developments travelling to and from work.	Noted comment
J/42	Poor transport infrastructure is a large factor in not being able to attract business to the area	Noted comment
J/43	I agree to all.	Support Noted
J/44	I cannot really see anything in this huge document that talks about jobs, job creation etc. This needs more effort and more focus. Currently the net traffic flow in the morning is out of Weymouth to Dorchester and North and eastwards towards Poole. There are not enough jobs in Weymouth at the present time, which leads to excessive commuting, without jobs in the local area, why build lots more houses. There are many undeveloped sites throughout rural Dorset, specifically east towards Poole and Bournemouth that should be considered for development.	Noted comment
J/45	Most jobs are in Dorchester - is there any continuity between this plan and the Dorchester plan? I couldn't find any breakdown of where people who live in Weymouth actually work. Traffic travels out of Weymouth in the morning, to the East and North - which is where the jobs are, but there is a shortage of housing, in Dorchester in particular. When developing a local plan - is where people work, as opposed to just where they currently live taken into account? Most people would like to live near their work, but often can't because of house prices and availability. Just building houses in the area where people currently live exacerbate the problem, rather than dealing with the root issue.	Noted comment
J/46	Although I agree generally with the policy to create job opportunities by promoting new business development (WNP 39) there are issues with such schemes. The plan quite rightly indicates that the basic economy is based on the holiday/tourism/hospitality industries and to some degree agriculture. Weymouth is a very pleasant place to visit, and efforts should be put into this with encouraging young people to stay in the area and train in these industries. But keeping people means providing housing at affordable prices. I suggest that all affordable houses and a good proportion of houses should only be available to first time buyers and also be used as their only residence.	Noted comment
J/47	The plan should look at changes in the retail sector and how these are impacting shop usage, should more shops in the town centre be converted to housing? Also, I think we should not allow any more out of town centre retail developments if they impact the town centre and only on brown field sites.	Noted comment
J/48	Weymouth has been plagued by poor transport infrastructure for as long as anyone can remember. With no easy access to truck roads or motorways and with a single-track railway connection taking 3 hours to get to London, the area is never going to attract big business. The economic development is always going to be constrained until and transport issue is addressed. This is one of the major reasons for supporting the idea of a new town to address the work and housing issues in this part of Dorset. Everything in this section is therefore just speculation.	Noted comment
J/49	I would broadly concur with aims/objectives. Weymouth, I would submit, needs more sustainable, long-term employment. While tourism is very important along with a move towards 'staycations', it cannot be the 'be all and end all' of employment objectives in Weymouth. This is a low wage area with a requirement for well-paid employment, even if not high salary/wage for everybody in the work force or jobs for life, more secure work is	Noted comment

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	essential for residents to save up and buy a house/flat or afford to rent a comfortable property; also to accrue enough in their pension pots to live securely in retirement.	
J/50	Need to identify new industries/businesses that we can bring to the area	Noted comment
J/51	Its outside of the scope of this report, but the reason Weymouth has deprivation, is its isolation. The developed world seems to stop at Bournemouth, and the A31 becomes a country lane. If Weymouth is to ever get away from its current status, it needs better transport links. Better links, better paid jobs. Healthier and more educated population. As it stands, anyone who finishes education who wishes to progress will leave Weymouth. Perhaps to return when they retire. I predict 20 years' time, this report will read very similar, if there is no grander vision for the town.	Noted comment
J/52	Overall I found there was very little in the plan relating to town centre buildings. I'm concerned that the focus on new out of town developments will drive people away from the town centre. I feel more should be done to support new businesses in town and look after the historic buildings rather than leaving them to crumble. Pages 116-117 do address this issue but basically say no more than "we need to review the situation". Really this should not be seen as a separate issue, the proposed plan will undoubtedly have an impact on the town centre so it should be considered alongside and assess how both projects can support each other not as 2 separate considerations.	Noted comment
J/53 Turley for Morrish Homes	Jobs and Economy (Section 10) My client supports the approach to regenerating, reinvigorating and diversifying the economy and attractiveness of Weymouth as a place to invest and live. The relationship between the delivery of new housing, and affordable housing in particular, is particularly noted and supported as critical to ensuring that the economically active younger generation do not migrate away from the town. Providing housing that is genuinely affordable in combination with attractive employment opportunities is paramount to the town's future. This is rightly engrained within the NP Vision (see response to Q6 above) and given a suitable level of primacy in determining related policies.	Noted comment
J/54 Weymouth Civic Society (P&E Cttee)	10. Jobs and the Local Economy We think there is a lack of emphasis on the promotion of sustainable economic growth, as outlined in para. 10.11. We note that no new sites with available vacant land for employment uses are listed except Littlemoor Urban Extension, which is largely outside the Neighbourhood Plan area. In the past there has been a regrettable pattern of out-of-centre retail or residential uses being granted permission on land allocated or intended for employment purposes. There should be adequate safeguards to prevent this.	Noted comment
J/55 Dorset Council	311. Para. 10.4 - Census data included at para 10.4 is not referenced.	Noted comment.
J/56 Dorset Council	312. Para. 10.6 - The penultimate sentence of para 10.6 doesn't seem to read correctly. (Weymouth college and nearby...)	Review and re-word para. 10.6, sentence 5.
J/57 Dorset Council	313. Para. 10.8 - No source/ref for data at para 10.8 (presume it's the census).	Add reference in para. 10.8 - to 2021 Census.
J/58	JOBS 10 re: WNP24 and WNP25. where are the high paid jobs for residents to afford large profitable Builds? Residents required to travel to Poole, Bournemouth or outside County. Council require Traffic Miles to be manageable. More 4/5-bedroom housing is contrary to policy aims.	Noted comment
J/59 Weymouth BID	The Plan does not centre on Tourism as the lifeblood of the Town. The effect that the Neighbourhood plan will have on Tourism and the future viability of the Town Centre and Retail space will be worryingly negative	Noted comment
J/60 Weymouth BID	Other than the natural attractions and outdoor pursuits there is no other reason for anyone to visit Weymouth and it has to change. Building on car parks and not prioritising tourism and leisure within the plan is foolhardy. Other coastal towns are thriving in the winter and ours is embarrassing.	Noted comment
J/61 Weymouth BID	Weymouth is a seaside resort, people come from all over the world to enjoy our great restaurants, nightlife entertainment, beach, gardens, attractions, heritage and browse our many independent shops for gifts, they need carparks and accommodation to do this. If housing becomes a priority in our town centre and seafront locations, we will lose the attraction of visiting our great town; pubs and live entertainment venues will be gone after complaints of noise from the residents who occupy these premises	Noted comment
	Section 10 Introduction	
J/59	Lack of opportunities for young people (and an increasingly local elderly population) WNP38 & paras 10.14-10.18	Noted comment
38/1	WNP38 Agreed	Support Noted

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
38/2	WNP38 "Existing employment land will be available for housing providing the land owner just sits on it for 2 years. Given that residential land is much more valuable the owner will simply ask an unrealistic price, until that period is up. This period should be extended to at least 5 years.	Noted comment(s) in support
38/3	WNP38: Loss of Business Premises Support. Particularly 24 months as demand is low.	Noted comment(s) in support
38/4 Dorset Council	<p>WNP38: Loss of Business Premises</p> <p>314. Approach - Draft Policy WNP38 seems to apply to all existing employment land, including that identified by the adopted local plan as being 'key'. However, it takes a much more flexible approach to the redevelopment of these sites than WDWPLP Policy ECON2 which does not permit any uses that do not provide direct, on-going local employment opportunities. Additionally, even employment uses outside B1/B2/B8 are required by the local plan to demonstrate economic enhancement (para 4.3.2 of the LP provides additional information on what factors will be assessed) or that they are providing on-site support. The neighbourhood plan policy does not seem to have any comparable requirements. Similarly, Policy ECON3 of the local plan lists a number of circumstances in which the redevelopment of other employment sites can be considered but no such exceptions are applied by the neighbourhood plan policy. For example, Policy ECON3 would permit in principle the change of use of a non-key employment site where it would offer important community benefits (and subject to it not prejudicing the efficient and effective use of the remainder of the employment area). No such exception is made by WNP38. It is suggested that the draft Policy could go further by outlining these additional measures to bring it in line with ECON2 and ECON3.</p> <p>315. Definition of Employment land - Draft Policy WNP38 does not define the 'employment land and premises' it applies to. Would any use that generated a job be considered acceptable?</p> <p>316. 24 months marketing - The policy requires 'all reasonable steps' to have been taken to let/sell the site for employment purposes for a period of 24 months. The supporting text clarifies that Weymouth is in a period of transition and 24 months is necessary to allow maximum retention of employment sites'. However, there is little other information provided on the evidence that will be sought to demonstrate that the applicant has made 'every effort' or the evidence that had helped define the length of the period prescribed by the policy. A shorter time frame such as 12 months is preferred.</p> <p>317. Thought should also be given to whether it is reasonable to require the demonstration that steps have been taken to let/sell the property where it can be otherwise adequately demonstrated that the employment use is not viable. Some flexibility should also be introduced into the marketing period of the policy. The addition of 'or other agreed period' at the end of the sentence would be helpful.</p> <p>318. The CIL/S106 Team agree that the 24-month restriction on change of use of employment land and premises is too long a period. Businesses, owner/tenants will presumably be expected to keep paying business rates and other costs during this 24-month period, which could be seen as being unfair. Is there also a risk of premises being left empty for prolonged periods, with the added danger of damage and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>319. The CIL/S106 Team also note that this approach could also impact the ability for applicants who apply for change of use, to qualify for and in-use credit for the building floor area for CIL purposes. Buildings must be in use for at least 6 months of the 3-year period up to planning permission being granted. If the employment use has to cease for 24-months before they can even submit an application, then that automatically reduces the time down to 1 year.</p>	Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received.
	WNP39 & paras 10.19-10.25	
39/1	WNP39 This policy should include something that safeguards against a knock-on impact to existing business. For example development on the harbourside which reduces ability to land fish; an incinerator which risks pollution of aquaculture stocks.	Consider policy rewording to clause 1 in the light of comments received.
39/2	WNP39 Agreed	Support Noted
39/3	As someone who was forced to work from home during the Covid pandemic and for whom hybrid working has since become the norm, I fully support the principles set out in Para 10.25	Support Noted
39/4	I am pleased to see that Policy WNP39 recognises the need for home workers to have a dedicated space and as such, an extension or small-scale development within a property's curtilage, provided it will not result in any unacceptable impact on neighbours or the environment, is something that should be supported.	Noted comment(s) in support
39/5	WNP39	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	There are few decent jobs in Weymouth therefore occupants of the new houses built would become extra commuters out of Weymouth and add to the already congested roads to Dorchester and Poole.	
39/6	Proposals that provide more jobs and more facilities for families are good, but with emphasis on day time rather than night time opportunities.	Noted comment(s) in support
39/7	WNP39 Support.	Support Noted
39/8	WNP39 Weymouth is mainly a seasonal town, so I agree that jobs need to be created. Therefore affordable housing needs to be built to encourage people to stay. But somehow, we need to ensure that a good percentage of these houses are for first time buyers and to be used as their only residence.	Noted comment(s) in support
39/9	The Weymouth Area suffers from a lack of well-paid employment. Presently there are approximately 800 houses being built at Nottingham and Bincombe Park. Where will the buyers come from? Are we building second homes? No-one on minimum wage can afford any of these houses. The Council's focus should be on encouraging more up market employers to set up in the area.	Noted comment(s) in support
39/10 Dorset Council	WNP39 New Business Development 321. Criterion 1 - The Growth and Economic Regeneration service consider that the policy wording seems overly prohibitive particularly in respect of ii) and iv). 322. Criterion 1 (iii) only supports development where it does not have 'cumulative negative impacts on highway safety and the local transport network'. However, this would seem to go further than the requirements of Local Plan Policy COM7. 323. Criterion 1 (iv) specifically refers to the provision of retail uses and seeks to limit such development where it would result in an over-provision in the locality. While there is a general requirement for proposals to be in conformity with other relevant policies of the development plan, it would be prudent to specifically highlight somewhere that many commercial uses, such as retail, are also considered town centre development and that there may be additional considerations in this regard. For example, 'over-provision' would not be a planning matter in a town centre location. The policy and text as drafted makes no reference to the requirement for retail and other town centre uses to follow a sequential approach in terms of location. 324. Criterion 2 – The inclusion of a criterion regarding greenfield development is welcomed however as this policy is primarily a cross reference to other policies in the Development Plan it is suggested further criteria could be added. For example, the need to cross reference could be removed by listing the scenarios set out in Policy ECON1 (i) of the adopted West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan. 325. Criterion 3 - The neighbourhood plan supports 'proposals to facilitate homeworking'. The explanatory text indicates that this support is limited to an extension of an existing dwelling or small-scale development in its curtilage, however the policy text itself does not impose any such limitations (it currently reads though it might support the development of a new live-work unit). Would a proposal for a significant residential extension or outbuilding be supported if it were to facilitate office space? Is 'homeworking' taken to mean potentially any business that is operated by an individual who also resides at the same premises? What about a B&B or a shop? 326. Paragraph 10.21 - The explanatory text talks about 'supporting new business development that will generate jobs' but there is no clarity on the uses which might be supported under this policy. For example, would tourist accommodation be considered acceptable?	Consider policy rewording to clause 2 in the light of comments received. Add text to para. 10.21 to express preference for the types of jobs that would be most welcomed.
	WNP40 & paras 10.26-10.31	
40/1	WNP40 Absolutely, the future of the town centre must I think lie with smaller multi use units, preferably local organisations offering special services and products.	Noted comment(s) in support
40/2	WNP40 The problem with 'mixed use' is that it will always end up as almost all residential. Look what's happened at Littlemoor and Bincleaves. Jubilee sidings, at least, should be entirely employment. And the Peninsula is also completely unsuitable to meet local residential needs and, whatever homes are built as, they will end up primarily providing second homes. The Peninsula should be kept for wet weather attractions, perhaps some retail, event space and parking. Space should also be reserved for a future ferry facility that might link the harbour to Bowleaze, Lodmoor and Portland.	Noted comment(s) in support
40/3	WNP40 Support.	Support Noted
40/4	Is retention of at least 30% a condition – can this be moved to Policy Statement?	Noted comment.
40/5	I would like to add that Weymouth should canvas investment in the town for a 4–5-star luxury hotel and spa. This would be particularly good at the site of the old council building on North Quay. A golden opportunity to raise the profile of Weymouth and attract more people to the area. I believe such a hotel will add value to the town, increase footfall in the town centre and would enhance the businesses already in the town. Quality hotels attract customers not necessarily looking at specific areas but looking for a quality break and what better location than a hotel and spa overlooking the inner harbour.	Noted comment(s) in support

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
<p>40/6 Dorset Council</p>	<p>WNP40 Mixed-Use Employment Schemes</p> <p>327. Approach – It is unclear if this policy applies to ‘Key Employment sites’ listed in the WDWPLP, Table 4.1? Policy ECON2 of the Local Plan seeks to resist the redevelopment of key-employment sites and does not permit residential development. It is also not clear how this policy would interact with draft Policy WNP38 concerning the ‘loss of business premises’.</p> <p>328. Criterion i – This criterion requires a mix and balance of uses that is consistent with the needs and character of the locality. Paragraph 10.29 explains that 30% of the previous number of jobs on the site is considered to be a reasonable target for employment and 50% affordable homes for residential development. This is significantly less than the adopted local plan policy ECON2 paragraph 4.3.4 position, where on non-key sites mixed-use development is considered through an intensification of uses and redevelopment is expected to retain an equivalent number of jobs.</p> <p>329. Criterion iii - The policy refers to retail uses and should therefore refer to the need for compliance with national policy on town centre uses and sequential/impact tests etc.</p> <p>330. Criterion v - The policy’s approach to the replacement and reconstruction is not clear. The first sentence talks about the ‘redevelopment of buildings and sites’ but this criterion refers to a need to be ‘capable of conversion without the need for complete reconstruction’.</p> <p>331. Criteria v and vi - There seems to be an issue with the numbering of the policy criteria.</p> <p>332. Paragraph 10.27 - We are not clear what document (‘The Dorset Strategic Economic Strategy’) is being referred to? Dorset Council has produced an Economic Growth Strategy. The LEP has produced a Strategic Economic Plan as well as an Investment Prospectus. It could very well be referring to another document – maybe a reference as a footnote might provide clarity?</p> <p>333. Para 10.27 refers to a number of mixed-use town centre redevelopment sites with ‘major employment opportunities’. However, in keeping with the other neighbourhood plan policies, ‘employment’ is not defined. Consequently, it’s difficult to see how these aspirations relate to the expectations for these sites in the adopted local plan and the Weymouth Town Centre Masterplan SPD (which tend to be focused on the provision of retail and other town centre commercial uses rather than conventional employment).</p> <p>336. Paragraph 10.29 - How will previous job numbers be assessed in the case of vacant or underused sites? A requirement for 50% affordable housing should be justified by viability evidence.</p>	<p>Change first sentence of policy WNP40 to read: <i>“Outside of the key Employment Sites identified in the Local Plan, development proposals for”</i></p> <p>Correct criteria numbering</p> <p>Change criterion v. to read: <i>“where appropriate, conversion opportunities are taken to eliminate the need for complete reconstruction ...”</i></p>
<p>40/7</p>	<p>334. Paragraph 10.27 - Throughout the document peninsula is incorrectly spelled peninsular.</p>	<p>Correct spelling to read: “Peninsula” in paras. 8.59, 10.41, and the key to Map 16B.</p>
<p>40/8</p>	<p>335. Paragraph 10.28 - The first sentence of paragraph 10.28 appears to be incomplete.</p>	<p>Add missing date (2023) to the end of para. 10.28.</p>
<p>WNP41 & paras 10.33-10.38</p>		
<p>41/1</p>	<p>WNP41</p> <p>The problem with ‘mixed use’ is that it will always end up as almost all residential. Look what’s happened at Littlemoor and Bincleaves. Jubilee sidings, at least, should be entirely employment. And the Peninsula is also completely unsuitable to meet local residential needs and, whatever homes are built as, they will end up primarily providing second homes. The Peninsula should be kept for wet weather attractions, perhaps some retail, event space and parking. Space should also be reserved for a future ferry facility that might link the harbour to Bowleaze, Lodmoor and Portland.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
<p>41/2</p>	<p>Land at Jubilee sidings seems ideal and residential developments around stations often help re-generate town centres and help with a shift to more sustainable transport.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
<p>41/3</p>	<p>WNP 41</p> <p>really think housing and retail a good idea here with skills centre training etc (not sure about workshops unless at the craft end)</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
<p>41/4</p>	<p>WNP41</p> <p>I would basically agree but, as I know the Jubilee Sidings location well, methinks that there would be only space for very limited housing development. I'm not suggesting that high density should be excluded but there is not as much space on the extent of the business park as some might think; also, there’s the traffic consideration to be factored in.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
<p>41/5</p>	<p>WNP41 Mixed-Use Scheme at Jubilee Sidings</p> <p>Support. We should favour 2ii rather than 2i can this emphasis be changed.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
<p>41/6 Weymouth Civic Society (P&E Cttee)</p>	<p>WNP 41 Mixed-use Scheme at Jubilee Sidings</p> <p>We consider that Jubilee Sidings should be for station car parking or employment use.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
41/7 Weymouth Civic Society (P&E Cttee)	We do not support residential or retail use for this site.	Noted objection to policy
41/8 Dorset Council	<p>WNP41: Mixed-Use Scheme at Jubilee Sidings</p> <p>337. Availability – A ‘call for sites’ process was carried out between September and October 2021 to identify land which would be suitable for allocation. Land at Jubilee Sidings was submitted to Weymouth Town Council through this process and is therefore considered available.</p> <p>338. Achievability – The site has not been subject to specific viability testing.</p> <p>339. Basic conditions</p> <p>340. Policy WEY3 states “The station area will be developed as a transport hub, including a mix of retail, commercial businesses and residential to help improve the first impressions of the area through the introduction of positive and active frontage development and creation of a high-quality public realm.” Draft Policy WNP41 broadly reflects this aspiration and can be supported.</p> <p>341. Policy Criteria</p> <p>342. Criterion 2 (i) – Reference to ‘particularly social housing’ is considered imprecise. A policy test should be clear and precise.</p> <p>343. Criterion 2 (ii) - The policy refers to retail uses and should therefore refer to the need for compliance with national policy on town centre uses and sequential/impact tests.</p> <p>344. Criterion 4 – Reference to a Flood Risk Assessment is welcomed however this should usually be prepared before site allocation.</p> <p>345. Criterion 4 – Reference to a Contamination Report is welcomed.</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording to clause 2 in the light of comments received.</p> <p>Add criterion with regard to flood risk and the standing advice of the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Include reference to national policy on town centre uses and sequential/impact tests in the supporting text.</p>
41/9 Historic England	<p>WNP41 (Jubilee Sidings) advocates a height limit, the former of 6 storeys and the latter of 5. It will be important to the realisation of these development aspirations for the evidence base in each case to demonstrate that such height thresholds can be delivered without causing harm to heritage assets.</p> <p>WNP41 lies within the principal approach and visual corridor to the town and therefore has strategic significance in terms of what development here can mean for the broader profile of the town. We would therefore encourage specific liaison with the Dorset Council heritage team on these (and the other) site allocation policies if this has not already taken place.</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording to clause 3 in the light of comments received.</p> <p>Include advice from Historic England in the supporting text</p>
41/10	<p>There is a lot of space in the jubilee sidings not yet utilised and as such an excellent area to build additional housing.</p> <p>WNP42 & paras 10.39-10.49</p>	Noted comment(s) in support
42/1	Also, we need more car parking, not less, so we shouldn't consider building on existing car parks unless we plan for new car parks of at least the same size and in convenient location, and without major cost implications.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
42/2	No development of any car parks in the Weymouth area. Weymouth relies heavily on tourism and visitors. The loss of any carparking close to the town centre is to be avoided at all costs.	Noted objection to policy
42/3	<p>WNP42</p> <p>The policy seems to have been developed based on an assertion that staying visitors (i.e. those staying overnight) are prepared to use park and ride schemes. In my limited experience, they are not. People expect to be able to park their car within sight of where they are staying. Please provide appropriate independent, validated evidence that a requirement (either explicit or through penal charging) to use a park and ride scheme does not have a detrimental effect upon the tourist experience and the willingness of the tourist to visit. It is also suggested that the transport hub should be located a considerable distance from the town, at the failed park and ride scheme. This is not realistic, when First, who have intimate knowledge of the cost effectiveness of bus routes in the area, have declined to serve it. A much better use location would be to use Jubilee Sidings for this purpose, as it enjoys excellent links to the main roads, the railway line and the existing bus depot.</p>	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
42/4	<p>WNP42</p> <p>Insufficient thought has been given to the needs of residents and visitors. For example, the Swannery car park may be near-empty on a wet November day but is too far from the shops to be of use to many disabled residents and on peak summer days it is difficult to park in many areas of Weymouth. It is a very common experience that all disabled spaces are full.</p>	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
42/5	We should remember that central Weymouth has high-density, poor-quality housing. Too many people are crammed into a relatively small urban area. There is little green space in the town. Too many people lack light and space within their living areas. The town centre of Melcombe scores badly on the index of multiple deprivation. Suggestions that the population density, that is already saturated, should be further augmented is to make living conditions in the town centre much worse. Parking is already a major headache for residents. There is a separate programme of development led by Dorset Council that will	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	lead to the eventual loss of North Quay to a mixed housing scheme, the bowling site to housing and the peninsula to mixed housing/entertainment/commercial. This will be a substantial and permanent loss of parking spaces. So, the few remaining smaller car parks dotted around the town, like Governor's Land and those along the inner harbour will become much busier. To consider building on them rather shows that the town plan is being developed in isolation from broader Dorset Council plans. The town council should be subservient to Dorset Council in housing planning and site allocations. Any developments must include an integrated grand redesign of road layouts and bus/cycle routes. It is not helpful for the town council to jump the gun on a more comprehensive and integrated scheme for Melcombe. I oppose loss of car parks.	
42/6	I have no idea as to the page and policy number. However, I do not agree with building on East Street car park and the old bowling alley car park. These are essential for local business, owners, home owners, people staying in hotels and shoppers and tourists alike. These areas are used all the time showing a need for them, if they were not needed, they would not be used! You write that you want to support a thriving town as Weymouth is an important tourist and recreation destination.... Closing car parking areas is not going to help at all. Tourists with a car full of children buggies wind breakers, buckets and spades do not want a park and ride. They want park and cross the road to the beach and hop back into the car to go home at the end of the day, not drag it all to the bus stop with tired fractious children and travel to their far-off car. Many of the people who stay in the hotels are of an age where they do not want to walk to and from the multi storey with suitcases and the Park and Ride would not be of use to them.	Noted objection to policy
42/7	WNP42 Car parking should be pushed to the edges of town and stop cars in the centre unless they have specific access needs (residents or shops taking delivery). Multi-storey the Swannery - off season it could function as a covered market. If a shuttle could run along the prom into town Lodmoor could also be a multi-storey. Need to identify a space on the Portland access side to keep cars out too. Build affordable homes which from day 1 would not have parking -unless they were on the ground floor footprint of the development. Also could build apartments for older people who do not drive and would welcome being able to walk to the shops which are on their front doorstep.	Noted comment(s) in support
42/8	WNP42 Town Centre Car Parks Although mentioned later, this should highlight the need for an adequate Park and Ride scheme. The current one is unsatisfactory and could have used levelling up funding to improve it (instead of being wasted on knocking down buildings). The policy itself does not acknowledge that town centre parking (short term) is essential to encourage use of town centre businesses, which is an aspiration of this plan. The focus appears to be on residents. As I read WNP42 it does not seem to have anything which will prevent building on all town centre car parks. Should some central car parks be nominated as protected?	Noted comment(s) in support
42/9	I support WNP42 which achieves a sensible policy balance given the large number of car parks in prime town centre sites	Support Noted
42/10	WNP42 Weymouth has very little parking especially in the summer months and it's some of the most expensive in the country. Building on any car park would be a ridiculous plan and only put of yet more tourists and cause locals to have to pay even more for less spaces.	Noted objection to policy
42/11	WNP42 Town Centre Car Parks Why do we keep encouraging the use of cars through our small-town streets?? What about hop on hop off electric buses, a park and ride that works. How are you going to meet the reduce carbon objectives without clean fuel transport alternatives??	Noted comment(s) in support
42/12	WNP42 Town Centre Car Parks I object to this policy. Although there is spare capacity at times, there are many other times when the car parks are full, and visitors cannot find spaces. Development of these important spaces would not be reversible and the car parking areas in my opinion should remain undeveloped to attract visitors and cater for local need for parking.	Noted objection to policy
42/13	WNP 42 Car parks could be developed without losing car parking spaces (as in Bristol) i.e. apartments /flats built on stilts above car park	Noted comment(s) in support
42/14	The proposed residential development on Town Centre car parks is not a good idea. The car parking facilities are not sufficient at present and would not encourage new businesses and visitors to the Town Centre.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
42/15	WNP42 Development on the town centre car parks will: 1) Increase the (already rising) housing density in town to an unacceptable level. The plan will create ghettos 2) Remove much needed breathing spaces in town 3) Conflict with the night-time economy 4) Make the town less attractive for locals and tourists to visit	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	5) Particularly disadvantage the elderly and others with limited mobility who need to park near their destinations. Retaining car parks near the harbour is especially important as a facility for yachtsmen, divers, anglers etc who need to bring equipment with them.	
42/16	WNP 42 Disagree with the need for equivalent parking to be provided. Discourage car use, promote use of public transport schemes. Promote active travel.	Noted comment(s) in support
42/17	WNP42 Town Centre Car Parks allows residential development only if alternative equivalent parking provision is provided. Support. But suggest changing to say no development unless ... stated criteria i to v are met. As this has different emphasis and supports the need to retain sufficient car parking for businesses in the Town Centre.	Noted comment.
42/18	WNPP42 I support building on North Quay and the Bowling Alley in Nicholas Street even if this becomes a car park. But I am worried about where additional, or alternate can be located. To reduce the reliance on cars in town a small bus service around the town would help people with walking restrictions.	Noted comment(s) in support
42/19	WNP42 is crazy and will kill Weymouth Town Centre. The town is already filled with Vape and Phone repair shops with very little real shops. This will be the nail in the coffin.	Noted objection to policy
42/20	10 car parks town centre - retain and maintain	Noted objection to policy
42/21	WNP42 Town Centre Car Parks are essential for the business model of Weymouth - i.e. a town with a very good beach and access for the visitor. building on them is not a good idea.	Noted objection to policy
42/22	The data used to support WNP42 is vastly out of date and does not reflect reality. High charges and 'bully boy' parking charge enforcement companies are pushing both locals and tourists away from the town not attracting them!	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
42/23	Para. 10.47 states that 2015 plan found "adequate resident parking except in the summer when spaces are occupied by visitors". As a resident living in Rodwell the impact of lack of parking through many summer months is significant. Since then we have seen 2 car parks turned to development sites reducing parking further. Policy WNP42 will cause further displacement from car parks to residential streets. I do not support. If they progress residential parking schemes must be introduced.	Noted objection to policy
42/24 Weymouth Civic Society (P&E Cttee)	WNP 42 Loss of Town Centre Car Parks - our strong opposition to the proposed redevelopment of the Town Centre car parks. These are needed for access to the shops, businesses, services and community facilities such as churches and meeting places. Developing these car parks for affordable housing as proposed would risk cramming people into urban flats with no amenity space, resulting in excessive overall density in the town centre.	Noted objection to policy
42/25 Weymouth Civic Society (P&E Cttee)	We are strongly opposed to the proposals for housing development on the town centre shoppers' car parks. For affordable homes, this could result in young families being confined in urban flats with no amenity space.	Noted objection to policy
42/26 Weymouth Civic Society (P&E Cttee)	WNP42 Town Centre Car Parks We object most strongly to the redevelopment of the town centre car parks. These are highly popular shoppers' car parks, very well used, and incidentally, providing a good income for Dorset Council. They give direct pedestrian access into the heart of the shopping and business area, including the range of offices, healthcare facilities, churches, cafes, etc. Without the good accessibility which these car parks provide, the viability of the whole town centre could be at serious risk.	Noted objection to policy
42/27 Dorset Council	WNP42 Town Centre Car Parks 346. Criterion i – This criterion considers alternative off-road provision should be available in appropriate locations. NPPF, paragraph 108 advises "In town centres, local authorities should seek to improve the quality of parking so that it is convenient, safe and secure, alongside measures to promote accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists." 347. Criterion ii – This criterion is considered insufficiently flexible as there may be solutions other than a park and ride scheme that address peak demand. 348. Criterion iii – This criterion is considered insufficiently flexible as there may be solutions other than on-site parking that address operational requirements. For example, a town centre location with access to public transport options. 349. Criterion iv – Growth and Economic Regeneration note that many of the car parks are in Dorset Council ownership and are in key, prime locations. Dorset Council objects to these being used for solely affordable housing instead of market-led housing. There needs to be the ability to provide affordable housing at alternative sites / locations. Reference to affordable housing should be removed. 350. Criterion v – A requirement for any scheme to not increase traffic flow to the area is considered overly onerous. NPPF, Paragraph 111 explains "Development should only be	Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.” 351. Paragraph 10.43 - Transport Planning note that paragraph 10.43 refers to the latest Transport Strategy report which was published in 2019. Transport Planning are currently involved in the process of refreshing this strategy using updated parking data.	
42/28 Weymouth BID	93% of businesses object to residential building on any of the town centre car parks. Car parking spaces are needed for the local and tourism economy to allow for both day visitors, locals, and holiday makers to access the town and for customers to park, dwell and spend within the town. The local economy depends on visitors during high season to survive during the quieter months building on car parks will deter locals and visitors from choosing Weymouth as their holiday designation as well as deter locals from shopping in Weymouth, add this to the over pricing and the neighbourhood proposal will have a largely detrimental and negative impact on the bricks and mortar businesses within the town.	Noted objection to policy
42/29 Weymouth BID	Dorset Council places culture at the heart of quality of life and in their cultural strategy (1) outlines that they want to achieve: 1. a thriving, competitive economy that delivers good quality employment for people in Dorset. 2. a resilient infrastructure providing access to cultural and leisure opportunities. 3. understanding, enjoying and safeguarding Dorset's environment with planning for the future. 4. opportunities for people to enjoy and achieve promoting health and wellbeing within safe and thriving communities. Any increase in the density of housing in Melcombe Regis will increase conflict with the night-time economy and generally reduced the attractiveness of the town as a visitor centre. With housing anticipated near public houses, there could be increases in complaints regarding noise at night and a risk for public houses to close. Weymouth relies on its vibrant 'live music' scene not only for the local and visitor economy but additionally these feed into the town and county's cultural heritage and Dorset council's cultural strategy(1). Cultural Tourism is a big driver for economic growth and the creation of year-round jobs in Dorset – it is also the reason that many tourists come back to Dorset year on year. The NTE actively contributes to Cultural Tourism and employment throughout the year which is not being addressed Town centre Car parks- allows residential development only if alternative equivalent parking is provided. Needs to be totally reworded to be more directive such as: Town centre Car parks - allows development for mixed use with retail, commercial, workshops/studios offices on the ground floor but only if equivalent public car parking is provided within the town centre with an emphasis that no spaces are lost for that location. If some car parks should become surplus to requirement (evidenced by parking statistics proving they are not being utilised) at some time in the future, 85% of the business community request these sites should be prioritised for employment or leisure use. In these circumstances the priority for car parks should not be housing as this does not support the town's economic growth or provide jobs for those already living in affordable homes. However mixed-use developments with a focus on leisure activities are recognised as a solution. This objective needs to be made clear in the reworded proposal to Dorset council	Noted objection to policy
42/30 Weymouth BID	Even if the council could get the park and ride operating properly - and that's a big if - the town absolutely needs all the car parking that already exists in the town centre. Weymouth businesses need every tourist we can get. The car parks are full throughout the season.	Noted objection to policy
42/31 Weymouth BID	Carparks are vital, even in a changing world, to encourage visitors into town to support businesses and the economy. If public transport is dramatically improved and a carpark may become redundant, it should then and only then become a green open space or a visitor attraction - play space, crazy golf, outdoor theatre etc. Housing could be accommodated for example, around the marina such as the old gasworks or council offices site but not within the town centre zone.	Noted objection to policy
42/32 Weymouth BID	Good to reduce town centre parking but only if we invest in a proper park and ride or another scheme. However, if reducing the current car parks, we should be prioritizing this space for tourist attractions not housing.	Noted comment
WNP43 & paras 10.50-10.52		
43/1	WNP43 “No adverse impact on” character, residential amenity and traffic generation is too restrictive. Please see the wording used in WNP 39 for 'New Business Development' which would also be appropriate here.	Noted comment.
43/2	WNP43 New Workshops and Business Hubs Support.	Noted comment.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	Should this be combined with WNP 39?	
43/3 Dorset Council	<p>WNP43 New Workshops and Business Hub</p> <p>352. Criterion 1 - The phrase 'micro enterprises' needs to be defined in the supporting text to avoid ambiguity.</p> <p>353. Criterion 2 - Although para 10.52 states that outside the DDB Local Plan Policy SUS3 would have preference this policy only relates to the adaptation and re-use of rural buildings. Paragraph 84 of the NPPF and WDWPLP Policies SUS2 and ECON1 are, in principle, supportive of new build employment development outside DBBs, subject to other considerations. Criterion 2 and paragraph 10.52 could be better worded to reflect this.</p>	Consider policy rewording to clause 2 in the light of comments received.
	WNP44 & paras 10.53-10.54	
44/1	<p>WNP44 Higher and Further Education and Skills Provision – Support.</p> <p>Is condition i) necessary? – I would say high quality and design is desirable, but the need is so great it shouldn't drive up costs prohibitively.</p>	Noted comment.
44/2	<p>Is there any reference to education in the 'jobs and economy' section?</p> <p>Can the neighbourhood plan acknowledge the importance of lifelong learning in growing a vibrant community?</p>	Noted comment.
44/3	<p>WNP44 Para. 10.43:</p> <p>states that the approach is" ...improving prospects for the young... retaining our young talent... encourage creativity, technology" Comment: this is all good stuff, but Policy WNP 44 does not actually do that. Even if the young acquire the future skills, they will need training opportunities and at the end of training they will need jobs with structured career development and progression if Weymouth is to retain them.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <p>1) what are 2-3 green job opportunities that benefit from coastal location?</p> <p>2) How are you going to bring those future opportunities and jobs and career prospects to Weymouth?</p> <p>3) What investments is Weymouth proposing</p>	Noted comment.
44/4	<p>Strongly support. Pleased to read suggestions for extending role of Weymouth College.</p> <p>Over the past 40 years Weymouth has suffered a decline in its employment and education opportunities with the closure of the Dorset Institute of Higher Education being a component. It is noted that other resort areas benefit considerably from having further education facilities beyond the usual Primary, Secondary and Tertiary range. This can help to retain younger people within the area, broaden their opportunities, and bring other young people to the area with the accommodation needs of the latter tying in well with those times of the year when tourism accommodation is less likely to be in strong demand. It is also likely to add to the vitality of the area and the economy of the Town Centre.</p>	Support Noted
44/5 Dorset Council	<p>WNP44 Higher and Further Education and Skills Provision</p> <p>354. Title - Growth and Economic Regeneration note that the policy title refers to Higher and Further Education, yet the policy text only refers to higher education proposals. Is it the intention that it should apply to both?</p> <p>355. Approach – The Growth and Economic Regeneration service consider the wording and comments could go further, for instance University level provision should be encouraged, which is also supported in the Weymouth Town Centre Masterplan (Jobs P5).</p> <p>356. Criterion 1 (i-iv) – These criteria are considered appropriate.</p>	Consider policy rewording to clause 1 in the light of comments received.
	WNP45 & paras 10.55-10.62	
45/1	<p>Overall I would like to see greater investment/improvement in the town centre included. The area is a tourist area as indicated and supported by the comments on increased traffic and parking during the peak times. However, Weymouth Town centre is undesirable, dirty and lacks any decent shops. Many of the building have not seen a coat of paint or even a wash in decades and the beautiful and many historic facades look a mess as does the block paving. The tourists staying here will drive to Poole or elsewhere to shop. We should be getting them to leave their cars in the campsites etc, stay in Weymouth and spend their money in Weymouth. As a resident I also have to drive out of the town to find decent shops at Poole or Bournemouth. Weymouth needs to see an investment and incentive for the major retailers to come here creating jobs and investment for the residents as well the tourists. This will encourage people to visit Weymouth all year rounds, not just in the summer. There also needs to be greater investment in reducing the drugs and other antisocial behaviour in the town centre. I have taken my grandchildren into town and have witnessed drug dealing, excess alcohol consumption, vomiting and other undesirable activities in front of the children in the town centre and that is during the day. This needs to be a priority as it will have a positive impact for the businesses, residents and visitors.</p>	Noted comment(s) in support
45/2	<p>WNP45 para 10.59.</p> <p>This suggests 400 new homes could be introduced to the town centre. This seems a lot and does not lead to a balanced "diverse" town centre as aspired to. An example is the loss of the bowling alley to accommodation. Taking an all-year, all-weather business and</p>	Noted comment.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>converting it to flats is not very diverse. Too late now, but this policy must be written to prevent similar happening again.</p> <p>Is there any data on what a "diverse" town centre consists of?</p>	
45/3	<p>There is no point insisting on keeping shops in the town centre as shops when they are empty, and you say more residential properties are needed. Allow empty shops to be turned into homes. Encourage new businesses into town by offering business rates holidays</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
45/4	<p>WNP45 Weymouth Town Centre</p> <p>I feel strongly that the town centre should be made affordable to young start up retail businesses - to allow the emergence of craft and artisan producers which in turn will widen the appeal of the town centre to tourists (reference Narberth, Pembrokeshire) and encourage a weekly market</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
45/5	<p>WNP45 Weymouth Town Centre</p> <p>supports an update and review of the town centre strategy and masterplan Support.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
45/6	<p>We need to encourage people to come into town, not necessarily by car. This means a serious look at public transport in the town which is rubbish unless you happen to live on one of the major bus routes. The needs of the elderly, infirm, those with children, those carrying heavy bags need to be considered, otherwise people will become more isolated and not chose to shop in town but online. It's not about the individual's wealth but their individual circumstances.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
45/7	<p>The town centre and harbour area should keep its old building frontages, and these should be enhanced. There should be a reduction in garish shop frontages/signage and all buildings/shop fronts should be coordinated with a paler colour pallet. Therefore without the clashing colour schemes/designs it will give the town/harbour a more classic look and more attractive, similar to other countries/cities and enhanced their historic towns.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
45/8	<p>Smarten up the town centre. Looks really shabby. Empty buildings not good. Need to encourage better shops.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
45/9	<p>The Pier Bandstand, minus pier, has been an eyesore for decades giving a down-at-the heel image to that section of the Seafront. I know the Council earn revenue from it and there is a cost to demolition, but the Seafront is the jewel in Weymouth's crown and this ugly edifice needs removing so that the full sweep of The Bay can be shown to best effect. No direct financial gain but the improvement to the town's image would have a positive secondary effect on tourism and pleasure for residents alike.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
45/10 Dorset Council	<p>WNP45 Weymouth Town Centre</p> <p>357. Approach - The drafted policy references local plan policy and the masterplan (adopted as supplementary planning document) and appears to be in general conformity with both local plan policies and the masterplan.</p> <p>358. Criterion 2 – This is a long sentence and should be simplified.</p> <p>359. Criterion 4 - In which circumstances would the underused floor space be considered for alternative use? Is it certain locations, after a certain timeframe? Do they need to have a marketing strategy that meets certain criteria?</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording to clause 2 in the light of comments received.</p>
45/11 Historic England	<p>Elsewhere, we note policy WNP45 in its application to Weymouth Town Centre, and reference in the supporting text to the 2015 Weymouth Town Centre Masterplan needing a review. The Masterplan was very much a legacy product of the 2012 Olympics events held in the area and a review would certainly seem to be appropriate. We are therefore surprised that the Plan doesn't go beyond identifying acceptance criteria for any change proposed and make more provision in policy for this need, or indeed identify other aspects of a possible town centre agenda for which dedicated policy might be desirable on a pro-active basis.</p> <p>This observation is made following a period in which the town centre has faced, and no doubt continues to face, significant challenges, not just due to the effects of covid and the changing face of high streets generally, which were responsible for the Conservation Area being on the national Heritage At Risk Register for some years until this summer. While much good work has been achieved collectively by public and private sector interests over recent years in tackling issues which were originally responsible for this status there remains an opportunity through the Plan to highlight and promote additional areas of need and intervention, such as shopfront design and signage, or public realm enhancement for example, or possibly even finesse aspirations for the peninsular site. Liaison with Dorset Council's heritage team would also help identify what these potential areas might be and how to accommodate them in the Plan.</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received.</p> <p>Include reference in the supporting text to WNP45 to the views of Historic England and the significance of the historic environment.</p>
45/12	<p>I wonder if there is any provision to reprocess empty properties?</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
45/13	<p>Proposals which provide facilities for family use during the evening should be welcomed, particularly if they replaced the current over provision of Public Houses and other alcohol outlets.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
45/14	<p>With regard to what is referred to as the Night Time Economy. I consider this presents a very poor image to a Town that purports to be a Family Holiday Resort and the WNP</p>	<p>Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	should set out measures to greatly reduce the opening hours of licenced premises and fast food outlets.	
45/15	I agree that the town centre needs to be regenerated but I would not like to see all the empty buildings and shops being turned into residential units as this would reduce the town centres appeal more should be done to encourage permanent residents to visit the town such as independent retailers and ease of access why not introduce a discount for residents' scheme for parking.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
45/16 Weymouth BID	What is accepted is that in the UK generally the high street as we knew it is gone and we need radical plans to reshape our town centres, and this must include plans to solve our chronic housing crisis. Many other towns and cities have shown that town centre living can regenerate local economies and stabilise business. Why not in Weymouth?	Noted comment(s) in support
45/17 Weymouth BID	Existing vacant commercial property should be used as residential developments before any new builds!	Noted comment(s) in support
45/18 Weymouth BID	The town centre needs to concentrate on bringing in more parking not reducing it. We also need new retail for the town centre to make it a shopping destination along with indoor activities so that tourists and residents have indoor activities during the ever-changing weather here. We do not need more housing as there is plenty happening already. Develop the empty properties we have and make Weymouth an attraction for Dorset. This plan will drive 'spend' and ultimately economic growth to Poole, Dorchester, Bournemouth, and Southampton.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
45/19 Weymouth BID	By all means build housing but harbour side housing is only ever going to be prohibitively expensive, and our car parks need to be full of tourists to boost the local economy. It's a folly to think that things like the park-and-ride could be substantial alternatives because the general public visiting do not demonstrate an interest in using this type of service. We do have an extensive amount of retail space with two high streets, a harbour, and the seafront so there is an opportunity to increase residential living within this extended area but I'm not sure mixing existing late-night businesses with a residential area is in the long-term benefit for either.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
WNP46 & paras 10.63-10.67		
46/1	WNP46 Support. Note WEY8 is potentially at odds with WNP29a to c. Can this be squared off to enable broader development as described in WNP29a to c?	Noted comment(s) in support
46/2 Lichfields for Haven Leisure	WNP46 Temporary Activities and Use The representations are: 1. Haven welcomes the emerging policy support for temporary use of buildings and open spaces for organised events. Such activities bring benefits to local communities, to local businesses and to visitors. 2. The requirement for such activities to have clear community support is at odds with the NPPF where no such requirement is set out. 3. Retaining the requirement for community support risks undermining the wider benefits of undertaking temporary activities and uses. It will often be difficult to demonstrate clear community support if there are any mobilised individuals or groups who are against the proposal. 4. Temporary activities and uses by their nature have a defined, often limited, period of operation. The impacts of temporary activities will be assessed against impact policies elsewhere in the NP and the Local Plan so as to protect the amenity of the local community. Representations on such impacts can be made to the LPA by the community at the time of an application. 5. The policy, as drafted risks undermining the need to contribute to sustainable development, a basic condition of an NP. 6. With reference to Part 2, reference to needing to align with the 'environmental objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan' should be removed or the objectives should be re-written as policies and tested as part of the consultation process.	Noted comment.
46/3 Dorset Council	WNP46: Temporary Activities and Uses The policy seeks to allow temporary permissions for events or activities. It should be noted that most uses are allowed for a period of 28 days or less throughout the year. Several uses would only require a license from the relevant authority for certain events in parks etc. It may therefore mean that this policy is covered under other legislation.	Noted comment.
WNP47 & paras 10.68-10.72		
47/1	WNP47 There is a strong emphasis on 'high quality' throughout the policy, but the timid strategy proposed runs counter to this. There is no recognition that many of the listed properties in the area, not least along the Esplanade, are not physically capable of providing the 'high quality' accommodation, which is envisaged by the plan, and unless this is changed, the opportunity for upgrading from the 'cheap and cheerful' to the high quality will be extremely limited. Major structural changes, including the development of much larger hotels / other accommodation including facilities such as swimming pools, comprehensive	Consider policy rewording to clause 2 in the light of comments received.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	fitness centres and extensive private parking, are essential if the value added from the tourist offering is to grow. There is also no discussion of the accommodation types provided for the tourist within the plan, other than a presumption against holiday letting. Without a strategy in this area, the status quo is likely to persist, with the result that the low-quality offering which prevails is likely to persist and restrain the willingness of visitors to visit. It is also unclear whether Weymouth actually want their tourist offering to grow? There is no explicit reference to enhancing the tourist experience, no additional land allocated to its development, no recognition that the town centre will require different buildings to accommodate emergent tourist attractions (for example, there is not a single vacant unit in Weymouth town centre capable of hosting an indoor mini golf), but there are extensive vacant sites which could be readily demolished and more appropriate buildings provided, but no mention of such development is made in the plan.	
47/2	WNP47 is there any plan to reinstate a 'ferry' link with France?	Noted comment(s) in support
47/3	WNP47 In the absence of a plan that provides alternative employment, it really is important that we protect our tourism. I'm shocked by the statement that "tourism has not always been in the best interests of the area". It is really being suggested that tourism has driven away other businesses and "repressed economic growth"? Of course, sustainable development is desirable but that must always be balanced against the need for local jobs and to support the local economy. This policy should be revised to take into account resulting job creation and economic benefit of any proposed development.	Noted comment.
47/4	WNP47 Sustainable Tourism Development Support	Support Noted
47/5	Para. 10.72 important	Support Noted
47/6 Lichfields for Haven Leisure	WNP47 (Sustainable Tourism Development) The representations are: 1. Support for extensions and expansions to tourism uses to enhance the visitor economy area is endorsed by Haven. 2. Parts 3 and 4 of the emerging policy need to be reworded to be positively framed. 3. Part 3 of the policy should include the support for measures to mitigate any adverse impacts of the proposed development.	Noted comment.
47/7 Dorset Council	WNP47 Sustainable Tourism Development 360. Approach - Growth and Economic Regeneration service consider the wording and comments could go further. There should be more of a focus on year-round tourism than indicated in paragraphs 10:70-72. 361. Criterion 1 - Could the 'hierarchy of preference in the local plan' referred to in the text include a relevant paragraph or table? Is this in relation to ECON6?	Emphasise in para. 10.72 the need more focus on year-round tourism as called for by DC. Describe hierarchy of preference (from LP) in supporting text with cross-reference.
	WNP48 & paras 10.73-10.74	
48/1	WNP48 Building Access Support. But isn't this standard under Equalities Act and/or WDW&P	Noted comment(s) in support
48/2 Dorset Council	WNP48 Building Access Approach – This policy reads as an objective rather than a decision-making framework. Access to public buildings is subject to Approved Document M: Access to and use for buildings Volume 2: Buildings other than dwellings 363. For 'Historic Buildings' this guidance states "the need to conserve the special characteristic of such historic buildings must be recognised. They are a finite resource with cultural importance, in such work the aim should be to improve accessibility where and to the extent that it is practically possible, always provided that the work does not prejudice the character of the historic building or increase the risk of long-term deterioration to the building fabric or fittings. In arriving at an appropriate balance between historic building conservation and accessibility, it would be appropriate to take into account the advice of the local authority's conservation and access officers, and Historic England as well as the views of local access groups, in order to make the building as accessible as possible." 364. It is unclear what local guidance Policy WNP48 is adding. It is recommended that this policy is either redrafted as criteria to aid the decision maker or deleted.	Delete draft policy. Include reference to accessibility in other appropriate policies.
	WNP49 & paras 10.75-10.79	
49/1	The supporting text to policy WNP49 is too focused on wind energy and should also identify the policy intent to support tidal and emerging opportunities such as green hydrogen generation given the coastal location in one of the sunniest places in the UK.	Include reference to other potential off- shore technologies in supporting text.
49/2	WNP49 Offshore Renewable Energy Projects	Change policy title

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	supports conditional development of low and zero carbon energy initiatives Support. But the policy is confusing it needs to more clearly state that is only concerned with shore-based land-use as the NP has no remit over use of the sea	Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received.
49/3	Para. 10.78 Offshore wind farms offer a promising avenue for generating renewable energy, capitalising on the consistent and robust wind speeds experienced at sea. Positioned away from populated areas, these installations have the advantage of minimising visual impact on landscapes while taking advantage of the vast potential of offshore wind resources. Moreover, the development of offshore wind projects stimulates job creation across various sectors, from manufacturing and installation to ongoing maintenance, providing economic benefits to local communities. Additionally, the conservation of land resources is a notable advantage, as offshore wind farms avoid the substantial land use associated with onshore alternatives, preserving terrestrial ecosystems. Despite the benefits, challenges exist in the form of high initial costs (£1.5 bn), potential environmental impact on marine ecosystems, and the complexities of offshore maintenance. The feasibility of an offshore wind project must be carefully assessed, considering factors such as technological advancements, environmental conservation measures, and community engagement. Ongoing research and innovations aim to address these challenges and improve the overall viability of offshore wind farms as a sustainable and efficient source of clean energy for the future.	Noted comment(s) in support
49/4	WNP49 Agreed but we need greater clarification.	Support Noted
49/5 Weymouth Civic Society (P&E Cttee)	Offshore Renewable Energy Projects. (Draft Policy WNP 49) We would suggest an additional, important criterion – that there will be no significant adverse impact on views from the coast.	Noted comment.
49/6 Dorset Council	WNP49 Offshore Renewable Energy Projects 365. Approach – The Growth and Economic Regeneration service support the policy, but the wording may be too restrictive. Offshore wind is becoming increasingly unviable in the current market. There was no take up of HM Government's recent licences and additionally there are a number of major international producers who are struggling. 366. Criterion iii – The criterion is not specific and can be deleted. 367. Paragraph 10.78 - The Growth and Economic Regeneration service note that manufacture (of wind turbines) would be unlikely to take place in Dorset, as the County doesn't have suitable locations that reflect the size of the manufacturing space which would be needed.	Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received.
11 Communities and Transport		
Section 11 General		
C/1	It is important to be realistic. People cannot all walk or cycle to work. Jobs cannot all be local. Some people actually work in the community and need to travel.	Noted comment
C/2	A non-motor access is far more agreeable other than delivery vehicles and bus service With paths to Littlemore shops and park and ride and out of town shopping areas also linking to Lodmoor Park for recreation	Noted comment
C/3	The late in the day entry of people in this speaks volumes.	Noted comment
C/4	Doctors, Dentist	Review list in para. 11.3 of community priorities in the light of recent consultations.
C/5	Provision of an art gallery	Review list in para. 11.3 of community priorities in the light of recent consultations.
C/7	No. But I will say that a good English community is a thing that is getting lost to the history books. Communities just don't come together like they once did.	Noted comment
C/8	I strongly support the policies in this section. WNP 59 should be strengthened through inclusion of support for new public houses where demand exists particularly as social hubs on existing and new large residential developments.	Noted comment.
C/9	Where is the mention of the "Jurassic highway" or even a mention that it may happen? Are we just going to have to accept every bit of traffic to Portland will have to pass through Wyke for ever, and there is no alternative? Dream big.	Noted comment.
C/10	There needs to be more investment in activities for young people. Young people are under-represented in this area.	Noted comment
C/11	There will be no community left as we know it if green spaces are gone or greatly reduced and so many houses built. We will become a suburb of Dorchester before long and lose our identity and will no longer be the delightful town that is Weymouth. There will be light and noise pollution, Wildlife will be disseminated. If built on, the hills behind me	Noted comment

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	contain lots of natural springs, the structure of the ground will become unstable causing huge drainage problems, land slippage, making building very unsafe and unsuitable	
C/12	I agree with the Communities Policies.	Support Noted
C/13	This section is very transport-centric and thus maybe transport and Active Travel should be dealt with separately? This section really should've laid out the common and unique aspirations of each individual community in Weymouth (i.e. Wyke, Westham, Preston, Upwey, Town Centre etc) as articulated in the consultations (and I guess it still could). This may've gone some way to mitigate the large geographic scope challenge of the plan and, indeed, prompt those communities to start to think about their own needs and maybe even their own NPs in the future.	Consider whether transport matters should be a separate Section.
C/14	Support, especially WNP 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 62	Support Noted
C/15	Support this.	Support Noted
C/16	The communities here seem to fit better than the one at the start of the document (unless I am missing something!)	Noted comment
C/17	Extremely important that we retain the unique character of the existing neighbourhood, but that doesn't appear feasible in light of the proposals to build such a large percentage of affordable and rental properties.	Noted comment
C/18	No to ULEZ/15-minute cities/40-minute cities/Low emission zones etc. No one should be forced to remain in a limited area. It is not good for the economy, for employment, for health, etc. This is about control, not the environment. If people cannot travel local businesses suffer and are forced to close. This can already be seen in Oxford and other cities where these zones are being implemented, with residents leaving the area. That hits the amount of council tax collected, i.e. the money that pays your running costs and salaries. The elderly and disabled are suffering due to not being able to see their families or carers, and are being left isolated in their homes, without access to care. This is inhumane, and every councillor needs to do a lot more research before committing themselves and their residents to these policies, which are being enforced by our government, which seems to be fully in line with the diktats of unelected bureaucrats from the World Economic Forum, the United Nations, the World Health Organisation, and their like, none of whom have been elected by UK citizens. Furthermore, the outskirts of those cities are seeing record levels of emissions as motorists have to travel further to reach their employment, or to schools etc, not to mention the limited number of times they can leave the small areas where they live and the endless fines - a money making exercise for the usual despicable specimens enforcing this. This is not about saving the environment.	Noted comment
C/19	Pedestrianize the town - remove as much driving as possible. Remove many car parks. Encourage use of Park and Rides.	Noted comment
C/20 Turley for Morrish Homes	Communities (Section 11) My client is broadly supportive of the related policies insofar as the seek to promote clean, safe, sustainable, and affordable travel and reduce reliance on the car, safeguard community facilities, encouraging sports and recreation, safeguarding our heritage and enhancing public spaces.	Noted comment(s) in support
C/21	The area covered by the plan is too big and not truly a neighbourhood plan. There should be a small neighbourhood plan as there is for Sutton Poyntz. The Weymouth plan should be split into the individual villages that make up Weymouth, like Wyke, Upwey, Littlemore etc. A true neighbourhood centric plan could be achieved by creating smaller separate plans.	Noted comment
C/22 National Highways	Thank you for providing National Highways with the opportunity to comment on the pre-submission draft of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan. I hope that providing our comments by email is acceptable. As you are aware, National Highways is responsible for operating, maintaining and improving the strategic road network (SRN) which in this case comprises the A35 trunk road which passes to the north of the plan area. The plan area is bisected by the A354 which provides a direct connection to the A35 at the Stadium Roundabout south of Dorchester. Large scale development in Weymouth therefore has the potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN, which experiences congestion particularly during the network peak hours.	Noted comment
C/23 National Highways	In terms of the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan, we are continuing to work with the Council in developing their transport evidence base to understand the impact of the proposed spatial strategy on the SRN, and any requirements for mitigation at key strategic junctions which may be necessary to accommodate the proposed levels of growth. This does not however prejudice any future responses National Highways may make on site specific applications as they come forward through the planning process, which will be considered by us on their merits under the prevailing policy at the time.	Noted interest and need to continue to consult with National Highways.
C/24 Weymouth BID	I cannot agree with anything that is not prioritising more facilities for children/ teenagers. Building more housing is pointless as there isn't much for anyone to do in this town already. Children/ teenagers are not considered at all in the plan but get moaned at for	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	hanging around on the streets. Give them somewhere to go this needs sorting not more housing	
	Section 11 Introduction	
C/24	Communities Prevent wholesale destruction of areas like Curtis Field. Trails and spaces must be safe for all, at all times, unlike what happens down the Rodwell Trail where drug dealing is a constant problem and threat to all.	Noted comment
	WNP50 & paras 11.5-11.9	
50/1	I like the idea of promoting Community Energy schemes using geothermal energy, I think it is a shame there is not more emphasis on it nationally but maybe it needs to be pushed locally!	Noted comment(s) in support
50/2	Community Energy Schemes – Support but it could include a condition which states that there is a demonstrable financial or energy benefit to the adjacent communities. This will distinguish it from WNP 49+	Noted comment.
50/3	The requirement for community energy, I am sure that solar farm on a number of the greenfield sites earmarked for housing would have a great enhancement to community life and ecology than that of housing. Does it have to be a quick buck that always wins the day.	Noted comment(s) in support
50/4 Lichfields for Haven Leisure	Draft Policy WNP50 (Community Energy Scheme) The representations are: 1. Reference within the emerging policy to the need to ensure that there is not an unacceptable impact on the amenities of residents should be amended to also address potential impacts upon visitors staying in accommodation in Weymouth. 2. Part ii of the draft policy could either include 'or visitors' after 'residents' or 'residents' could be amended to 'neighbouring uses'.	Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received.
50/5 Dorset Council	WNP50: Community Energy Schemes 368. Approach – It is unclear what type of 'Community Energy Schemes' the Policy applies to. Community-owned renewable electricity installations can include solar photovoltaic (PV) panels, wind turbines or hydroelectric generation as well as groups jointly switching to a heat pump or biomass boiler. 369. Planning practice guidance on Renewable and low carbon energy - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) outlines the role criteria-based policies can have on planning for renewable energy. In shaping criteria it is important that the need for renewable or low carbon energy does not automatically override environmental protections. Policies should also consider the cumulative impact (especially for wind and solar), local topography and the effect on the landscape, heritage assets, proposals in any AONB designation and the protection of local amenity. 370. There are also technical considerations for each type of technology, for example, for biomass, appropriate transport links, hydro-electric power a source of water and wind turbines a predicted wind source, air safeguarding, electromagnetic interference, and access for large vehicles. Planning practice guidance goes into greater detail on the planning considerations for hydropower, active solar technology, solar farms and wind turbines. 371. Criterion ii) - Will all proposals providing energy schemes be required to provide data on electromagnetic interference? Planning practice guidance, Paragraph: 017 Reference ID: 5-017-20140306 implies this issue only relates to wind energy. "Wind turbines can potentially affect electromagnetic transmissions (eg radio, television and phone signals). Specialist organisations responsible for the operation of electromagnetic links typically require 100m clearance either side of a line-of-sight link from the swept area of turbine blades. Ofcom acts as a central point of contact for identifying specific consultees relevant to a site." 372. Criterion iii) –The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, Part 14 Renewable Energy, Class G Air Source Heat Pumps on domestic premises and Class H Wind Turbines on domestic premises both require Microgeneration Certification (MCS) Planning Standards to be met however in order to introduce a policy beyond the GDPO, the financial burden of the policy should be assessed through a viability assessment. 373. Paragraph 11.9 – The supporting text suggests community investment opportunities should be offered first to those residing within the area and at least 33% of the project must be owned by residents in the area. Both co-operatives and community benefit societies are recognised by the Co-operative and Community Benefit Societies Act 2014 however it is unclear whether a 33% community share is recognised in law or can be justified? 374. Further guidance on Community Energy has been produced by the Centre for sustainable energy. neighbourhood-planning-in-a-climate-emergency-feb-2020.pdf (centreforsustainableenergy.ams3.digitaloceanspaces.com)	Noted comment.
	WNP51 & paras 11.10-11.12	

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
51/1	<p>WNP51</p> <p>Generally agree. As a holiday destination significant EV charging facilities are urgently required to All car parks and park and rides significant infra structure is required to meet future demands. There is little sign of additional power capacity to Weymouth over the next 25, 50 and 100 years. Government must provide enormous financial resources for this change. Ev are very expensive to purchase and economical life expectancy short. They are heavy and Will require upgrade roads. As previously stated, the UK as a whole have no real idea the hardships and cost expected for our future.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
51/2	<p>WNP51 Transport</p> <p>The words seem right and yet experience shows that Dorset Council do not follow this in practice. 80 lorries a day transiting the plan area from/to an incinerator were deemed acceptable. A plan to build flats on Portland Road without parking space is also acceptable to Dorset Council as it is a "town centre" rather than a major through road to Portland with already overcrowded on-street parking.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
51/3	<p>WNP51 Transport and Travel</p> <p>The inclusion of the comment '... and most commuters still go to work by car,' contradicts previous observations on the rise in home working. This sentence perhaps needs rewording along the lines of '... and of those workers unable to work remotely from home, the majority still commute by car.'</p>	<p>Change para. 11.10 end of 1st sentence to read: <i>"and most workers unable to work remotely from home, continue to commute by car."</i></p>
51/4	<p>Some areas have a poor public transport provision, likely caused by a lack of demand. However, if the Park and Ride was brought back into full use, combined with high town centre car park charging, more people would use it.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
51/5	<p>Transport and Travel</p> <p>Support. Could be included in Sustainable Development WNP37.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
51/6	<p>Better transport infrastructure so that communities can get to work and socialise without using their car. Disability aware transport too.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
51/7	<p>WNP51</p> <p>This is a really important area we should be driving change. Prioritise pedestrians. Lower / dissuade car use for short journeys by making it more difficult to use the can and more pleasant to walk, wide well-kept paths which are safe for young children to run along without constant worries they will be knocked over by cars (or bikes).</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
51/8	<p>Numerous residents, including myself (elderly with certain disabilities) do not drive and are consequently reliant on public transport. Fortunately, I live near Lodmoor Hill with regular bus services to and from Weymouth town, Dorchester and Littlemoor.</p>	<p>Noted comment(s) in support</p>
51/9 National Highways	<p>Whilst policy WNP51 Transport and Travel does require development to consider the traffic impacts of their development, we consider that this should be strengthened and the need for an assessment of traffic impacts could also usefully be referenced within individual policies also. We would expect any large-scale development to be supported by an appropriate assessment of traffic impacts and travel plan measures. The assessment should consider the impact of the development on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN in line with national planning practice guidance and DfT Circular 01/2022 The strategic road network and the delivery of sustainable development. Where proposals would result in a severe congestion or unacceptable safety impact, mitigation will be required in line with current policy. We would therefore welcome additional wording to this effect within policy WNP51 at least.</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording to clause 1 in the light of comments received.</p> <p>Ensure individual allocation policies include reference to the need for an appropriate assessment of traffic impacts and travel plan measures.</p>
51/10 Dorset Council	<p>WNP51 Transport and Travel</p> <p>375. Criterion 1 (i) – The policy team note that this criterion is in effect a request for a transport assessment/ statement. The Council's Planning Application Validation Checklist (1 October 2021) explains all applications for proposals which will generate significant amounts of traffic or movement will require a transport assessment, statement or travel plan. The scope and detail of the Transport Assessment or Statement should be guided by the information set out in the Planning Practice Guidance: Travel plans, transport assessments and statements in decision-taking and by the Highways Development Officers. As this is a consistent and well understood process, it is recommended that criterion i) is either deleted or rephrased to better align with the wording of the Validation Checklist.</p> <p>376. Criterion 1 (i) – The Transport Planning Team have suggested the following rewording. "identify the realistic level of traffic it is likely to generate. Schemes that generate 'significant amounts of traffic movements' should provide a transport assessment or statement, and a travel plan as required by the Local Planning Authority and set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)."</p> <p>377. Criterion 2 – The two sub-criteria would read better if they were moved under the criterion 1 heading. i.e. Development proposals should: i Identify the realistic level of traffic it is likely to generate, ii maximise opportunities to walk and cycle and iii support public transport schemes.</p>	<p>Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	WNP52 & paras 11.13-11.15	
52/1	Para. 11.14 I would dispute that Westham has a "reasonable array of public transport facilities and access". There is no mention of the Lanehouse area where there is no public transport.	Review para. 11.14 in the light of comments relating to the public transport service in certain areas.
52/2	Support. Public Transport – supports the development of public transport facilities.	Support Noted
52/3	Laudable aim but needs backbone. We need to consider the Public Transport facilities in parts of Weymouth which are less fortunate. Are the current transport models (a) fit for purpose (b) imbued with adequate vision combined with practicality? Residents of the (Weymouth) town area and possibly Westham and Wyke Regis lack the retail facilities available to us in South Radipole. Elderly and/or disabled people find carrying heavy shopping very problematic and the motorists, especially at out-of-town shopping locations, have excessive advantages over non-motorists. Fortunately the First Bus Service 2 (Weymouth-Littlemoor-Weymouth) runs frequently; just as well with increasing development on Weymouth Gateway site. I would suggest to First Bus (or whoever) to introduce electric or hydrogen(?) powered buses on fairly flat routes - better for the environment. The rail services need to be run more efficiently so customers are more inclined to use them	Noted comment(s) in support
52/4	A comprehensive and efficient bus service would make people less reliant on cars and release more space for necessary homes or jobs or leisure.	Noted comment(s) in support
52/5 Wyke Regis Society	Para. 11.14 Public transport "access in Wyke Regis and beyond is more adequate with numerous bus stops" Unfortunately the bus stops in Wyke Regis, except on Portland Road, have not been in use since June 2023 when the bus provider withdrew their service. Previous to this, ten years ago we had 4 buses an hour through Old Wyke. We gave up one of our buses to serve Portland and had 2 an hour until about 2021.	Review para. 11.14 in the light of comments relating to the public transport service in certain areas.
52/6 Dorset Council	WNP52 Public Transport 378. Approach – The CIL/S106 Team query if this policy implies that if your development provides improvements to public transport infrastructure it will generally be supported, for example a bus stop? This is considered too broad a statement to be effective. Paragraph 11.15 would be better as the main policy wording.	Noted comment.
52/7 Dorset Council	379. Paragraph 11.34 - Is this meant to read 2022 rather than 2002?	Check typo
	WNP53 & paras 11.16-11.18	
53/1	WNP53 supporting the space for reducing on street parking in new developments is excellent. Home owners will always have visitors or more than 2 cars if teenagers still at home and the relatively new developments off Littlemoor road highlight the disastrous lack of space to park a car anywhere.	Noted comment(s) in support
53/2	WNP53 will cause further displacement from car parks to residential streets. I do not support. If they progress residential parking schemes must be introduced.	Noted objection to policy
53/3	Development should be designed to reduce existing on-street parking.	Noted comment(s) in support
53/4	Off-Street Parking Support.	Support Noted
53/5 Chickerell Town Council	WNP53 Off St Parking. Para. 11.18 suggest ensuring adequate car spaces in urban developments. A check to ensure Dorset Council's published guidance regarding this is up-to-date and referenced. HMG guidance may indicate not so many spaces are required in urban areas - this may be acceptable in cities, but in a county such as Dorset?	Noted comment(s) in support
53/6	WNP53 Off-Street Parking while it is sensible for off street parking for property residents, there is an essential need for parking for carers, engineers and property maintenance. deliveries, as well as family visitors.	Noted comment(s) in support
53/7	Rather nebulous. This regrettable situation whereby (some) homeowners convert their front gardens into vehicle spaces is detrimental to the natural world.	Noted comment(s) in support
53/8 Dorset Council	WNP53 Off-Street Parking 380. Approach - The wording is largely the same as Sutton Poyntz policy GA2 On street Traffic congestion and can be supported. 381. Criterion 2 - The Transport Planning Team are seeking clarification on the statement "Dorset Council's published off-street parking local parking guidance". Can it be clarified if the above statement is referring to Car and cycle parking standards - Dorset Council? Transport planning aims to refresh the parking guidance and will seek to establish parking guidance for bicycles and mobility scooters. Additionally, the word "minimum" should be	Consider policy rewording to clause 2 in the light of comments received. Add to para. 11.18 - itemised latest published guidance by

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	discouraged, and the policy should support forms of lower car development where appropriate, especially in town centres. We should be using car parking standards as a starting point for assessing development proposals, rather than having a minimum acceptance point.	Dorset Council and its intention to establish parking guidance for bicycles and mobility scooters
	WNP54 & paras 11.19-11.23	
54/1	There is a section of the park and ride, which is frequently used but the local community for running training as we do not have any athletics facilities in Weymouth. Since the council making a small investment in this area our local running club has won the Dorset Road Race league (men and women's) increasing confidence and community spirit. It's also a safe place for children to learn to ride bikes, indeed both of my children learnt to ride there as it is flat, without obstacles and traffic. It would be a real shame if we lost that asset.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/2	My running club, Egdon Heath Harriers currently use the running track at the park and ride as our athletic track. We train here weekly, and others use this too. It is also a safe place for children to cycle on a smooth surface. Loss of this would be a loss to our club and others. People come from far and wide to use it. We lost our previous track at the marsh, and it would be a shame to lose this too.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/3	The running track is not mentioned, this is a well-used asset used by many individuals and local clubs on a weekly basis. It is an excellent asset for local residents to keep fit.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/4	My running club, Egdon Heath Harriers currently use the running track at the park and ride as our athletic track. We train here weekly, and others use this too. It is also a safe place for children to cycle on a smooth surface. Loss of this would be a loss to our club and others. People come from far and wide to use it. We lost our previous track at the marsh, and it would be a shame to lose this too.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/5 Accessible Cycling	The running/cycling track on Weymouth's park and ride carpark must be retained. There is no other facility like it nearby. The track is extensively used by runners and by adults and young people with additional needs for safe exercise on adapted trikes and quads. Accessible Cycling (funded by Dorset CC but run by volunteers) currently have two containers in which we store and maintain our cycles).	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/6	Don't build over our running track. My running club, Egdon Heath Harriers currently use the running track at the park and ride as our athletic track. We train here weekly, and others use this too. It is also a safe place for children to cycle on a smooth surface. Loss of this would be a loss to our club and others. People come from far and wide to use it. We lost our previous track at the marsh, and it would be a shame to lose this too.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/7	My running club, Egdon Heath Harriers currently use the running track at the park and ride as our athletic track. We train here weekly, and others use this too. It is also a safe place for children to cycle on a smooth surface. Loss of this would be a loss to our club and others. People come from far and wide to use it. We lost our previous track at the marsh, and it would be a shame to lose this too.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/8	WNP54 map 30 This is where there is a well-established community running track is located and it is used by hundreds of local runners for training and there is no other facility in the area.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/9	WNP54 map 30. This is where the well-established Community running track is located and it is used by hundreds of local runners from Weymouth and surrounding areas for training and there is no other facility in the area.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/10	WNP54 map 30. Community running track located used hundreds of local runners for training. Only facility in the area. So important to promote fitness and wellbeing.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/11	WNP54 map 30 This is where a well-established community running track is located that it is used by hundreds of local runners for training including children. It is used by hundreds of families as a place to go with bikes, scooters, and roller skates - it is safe, sheltered from the elements and children are able to access the track without the threat of any traffic. There is no other facility in the area.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/13	This is where the well-established community running track is located and it is used by hundreds of local runners for training. There is no other facility in the area. Leave the track as it is!!!	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/13 Accessible Cycling	WNP54 Map 30 The track at Weymouth's park and ride carpark is extensively used by local runners. There is no other similar facility in the area. The track is also used by Accessible Cycling, a Dorset CC funded initiative, which enables adults and young people with additional needs to	Add clause to policy addressing need to retain or relocate the running track and

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	exercise safely on pedal trikes and quads. Accessible Cycling currently have two containers on the park and ride carpark in which we store and maintain our cycles.	provide better facilities overall.
54/14	WNP54 map 30 I note that this is where the well-established Community running track is located which is used regularly by myself and hundreds of other local runners for training, bringing a huge benefit to the physical and mental health of our community. There is no other similar facility in the area.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/15	WNP54 Map 30 This area includes the community running track at the park and ride, where hundreds of local runners train on a regular basis. This is the only track in the area.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/16	WNP54 map 30 This area is where a well-established community running track is located. It is used by hundreds of local runners for training. There are no alternative facilities in the area.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/17	There is no mention in the plan about the running track which not only needs to be preserved but should be developed into a proper running track. There are many local running clubs that are benefitting from this facility including one that is currently the top club in Dorset. There is an opportunity to create an integrated sports hub by linking with the adjacent rugby club. There are many towns in the UK the same size and smaller than Weymouth with much better facilities many funded by lottery grants combined with local fund raising. The need to build new homes for locals will further increase our population. The plan needs to explicitly recognise this facility and contribute to its protection. Page 123 Para 11.4 mentions safeguarding community facilities and encouraging sports and recreation, yet the running track is identified as an area for redevelopment.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/18	WNP54 map 30 This is where the local running track is which is used by hundreds of local runners each week. There is no alternative track and should be kept, to help keep local people fit and active.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/19	WNP54 - Map 30 This is where the well-established community running track is located and is used by hundreds of runners for training daily. There are no other training tracks like this available to runners locally	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/20	WNP54 Map 30 Note, that on this map, although not mentioned (query local knowledge/research) there is a well-established community running track which is used by hundreds of runners in Weymouth, but also from Dorchester and Portland.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/21	WNP54 map 30 This is where the well-established community running track is located and it is used by hundreds of local runners for training and there is no other facility in the area.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/22	WNP54 map 30 This is our community running track it is used by hundreds of local runners for training and there is no other facility in the area. Often when training I share the use of the track with runners/walkers and cyclists from our community in all shapes and sizes, what a great facility we have. It is fitting that a site built to support our Olympic games in 2012 is now used to help our community stay fit and healthy and in a safe place.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/23	This is a really popular running track.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/24	WNP54 Map 30 This is where the well-established running track is located and used by hundreds of local runners for training as there is no other facility locally	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/25	WNP54 map 30 This where the tarmac running track is located and is used regularly by running clubs and all sorts of individuals for training and outdoor fitness. There is no other facility like this in the local area with the Athletics track gone	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/26	WNP54 Map 30 The plan fails to mention that in this area is a well-established running track that is well used by hundreds of local runners. There are few free facilities in Weymouth which really promote public health of the local community which is supposed to be a priority. Since the marsh track can no longer be used, this is the only facility for use by individual runners and clubs from the Weymouth, Dorchester, and Portland areas.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/27	WNP54 map 30 This is a well-established running track used by hundreds of local runners. There is no other public facility available.	Noted

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
		comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/28	WNP54 map 30 The location of our only running track used by hundreds of active people in the community. Our last 'proper' track was taken away so we have no other alternative to run structured community sessions.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/29	WNP54 map30 I am 77 years old and currently, together with multiple groups use the area as a 'make shift' running track as there is absolutely no other facilities in the area. The council kindly tarmacked it and marked it out. To lose it would be detrimental to the wellbeing and health or a large proportion of Weymouth's growing health-conscious population.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/30	WNP54 map30 This is space used for the only running track in Weymouth and hundreds of runners use this weekly	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/31	WNP54 map 30 This area refers to the location of the community running track. This facility is used by a large number of running groups as well as individuals, with the numbers using this facility running into the hundreds. It is a vital training facility and there is currently no other facility like this within Weymouth, Portland, or Dorchester. To lose it would be of huge detriment to the local running community.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/32	My running club, Egdon Heath Harriers currently use the running track at the park and ride as our athletic track. We train here weekly, and others use this too. It is also a safe place for children to cycle on a smooth surface. Loss of this would be a loss to our club and others. People come from far and wide to use it. We lost our previous track at the marsh, and it would be a shame to lose this too.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/33	WNP54 map 30 This is where a well-established community running track is located and used by hundreds of local runners for training and there's no other facility in the area.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/34	WNP54 map 30 This is the running track used by hundreds of runners on a weekly basis. Our last track at the Marsh was grassed over and redeveloped. This is a safe traffic free area that runners of all ages can use safely. This must remain a community asset.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/35	WNP54 Map 30 There is a well-established running track used by 100s of local runners and running clubs. There is no other facility in Weymouth for us to use.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/36	WNP54 map 30 Currently this is where the well-established Community running track is located and it is used by hundreds of local runners for training and there is no other facility in the area. I feel extremely disappointed that the running track has been completely disregarded, not even a mention. We have a serious issue with obesity here in Dorset and running and fitness should be encouraged for our local people. It's the only space local people can use as the marsh also got removed. As a running community we have fought hard to look after this area, we have cleaned it up ourselves on several occasions when the travelling community have left it in appalling conditions. We have bought our own mobile lighting so we can continue to use it in the winter. We have some really good runners representing Dorset that use this track and it's all we have. It gets used every day by runners and different clubs on different days. I can't believe it's even at risk of going. Please save our running track, it's all we have!	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/37	WNP54 map 30 You refer to creating a mobility hub on the overflow car park using it for an out-of-town bus depot. It is currently a community running track which was resurfaced by Dorset Council in 2021 and used by residents and over 10 local running clubs and training groups for running training. You mention in your section under Leisure and recreation you "maintain support for local recreational and sport facilities". Parking buses on top of a well-used and established community sports facility does not demonstrate this.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/38	WNP54 map 30 You refer to creating a mobility hub on the overflow car park using it for an out-of-town bus depot. It is currently a community running track which was resurfaced by Dorset Council in 2021 and used by residents and over 10 local running clubs and training groups for running training. You mention in your section under Leisure and recreation you "maintain support for local recreational and sport facilities". Parking buses on top of a well-used and established community sports facility does not demonstrate this.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/39	WNP54	Support Noted

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	I particularly like the idea of a transport interchange under policy. This could well be an asset	
54/40	WNP54 Map 30 This is where the well-established community running track is and is used by hundreds of locals for training and there is no other facility in the area.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/41	WNP54 map 30 The overspill part of the Park and Ride is a well-established and used community running track with a 400-metre measurement and rounded corners, there appears no mention of this in the report. The track is the only place in the whole town where members of both Weymouth St Paul's Harriers and Egdon Heath Harriers can do speed work training as well as all the individual runners who also use this track at all different times of the day. There is no purpose built track in the town, in fact the nearest running tracks are Yeovil and Poole. The major value this track has to the community is that it is free to use and hard wearing, so low in ongoing costs to the tax payer. As we are living at a time of a cost-of-living crisis, this is a free to use facility that all can use regardless of income, all any one needs is a pair of trainers. This is of further value to the Dorset tax payer as those who use it will be putting less of a strain on the National Health Service by being outdoors in the fresh air getting fit. It is of great value as is a place where runners can go to run with purpose and not be inconveniencing other walkers or pedestrians as they would if trying to sprint on the esplanade or beach road. An alternative idea would be to contractually mandate any developer of the land to pay for the building of a purpose-built athletics track that can be used by the community on another site in the town, e.g. Redlands Sports area on Dorchester Road. The nearest athletics track in Poole is very well used by both Poole Runners and Poole Athletics Club with many young athletes from under 11 to adults, so a track in Weymouth would surely be used by the people of Weymouth and Dorchester were it to be built.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/42	WNP54 should be mandatory. It is one of the worst park-and-rides I have ever seen and needs to be improved as a cornerstone to this plan.	Noted comment(s) in support
54/43	Some areas have a poor public transport provision, likely caused by a lack of demand. However, if the Park and Ride was brought back into full use, combined with high town centre car park charging, more people would use it.	Noted comment(s) in support
54/44	I also support a multi-facility transport interchange with possible park and ride.	Noted comment(s) in support
54/45	Mount Pleasant Old Tip – gives conditional support for a multi-facility transport Interchange, with accessible park and ride, charging and facilities for overnight motorhomes. Support. But Condition 3ii needs to include solar pv on the ground. Condition 6 is too stringent and will potentially inhibit this development. Suggest 6i landscaping is sufficient to reduce visual impact from nearby – the land is overlooked by the distant ridge to the north. 6ii the nearby SSSI is protected. Enhancement is not achievable within this site. 6iii more weakly repeats 3ii – suggest delete 6iii. 6iv could be a separate condition i.e. 8	Consider policy rewording to clause 6 in the light of comments received.
54/46	I really like the plans for the transport Interchange (WNP54) on page 127. By making such a hub for visitors it may divert many away from the town parking and spawn other retail presence like those we may refer to adjacent to the M27 in Hampshire such as Hedge End and Whiteley. As well as improved bus services from the site, we may also present opportunities for cycling to and from the site including the emerging service for free 'Trishaw rides' run by the charity 'Cycling without age'. The point being that it should be predominantly the first point of call for all visitors to Weymouth and may become the enabler to deliver the plans for reworking the town and waterfront locations including the Pavilion peninsular which will be an obvious loss of carparking that may be offset by affordable parking at the interchange.	Noted comment(s) in support
54/47	My running club, Egdon Heath Harriers currently use the running track at the park and ride as our athletic track. We train here weekly, and others use this too. It is also a safe place for children to cycle on a smooth surface. Loss of this would be a loss to our club and others. People come from far and wide to use it. We lost our previous track at the marsh, and it would be a shame to lose this too.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/48	Map 30 It would be a great shame to the running community if the 'new' running track were lost so shortly after being created - especially given the previous track at the Marsh was removed. The track is used by many of the local running clubs and individuals - ultimately helping to make locals fitter and healthier.	Noted comment criticising aspect of policy (likely loss of running track)
54/49 Dorset Council	WNP54: Mount Pleasant Old Tip The site is owned by Dorset Council.	Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>382. Park and Ride - Mount Pleasant is identified as a proposed strategic bus-based Park and Ride location. Local Transport Plan 3, policy LTP H-4 explains that "Strategic Park and Ride capacity will be developed at appropriate locations, where adequate demand exists, to assist sustainable transport movement to and from town centres. The implementation of individual sites will take into account impacts on the environment and the surrounding road and bus networks, in addition to financial sustainability. Implementation of new sites will be phased in conjunction with reviews of town centre car parking and measures to influence travel behaviour, particularly for commuter trips."</p> <p>383. The Transport team add "The Park and Ride is inadequate and requires improved facilities – the Dorset BSIP (Bus Service Improvement Plan) includes plans for a dedicated site which would include toilets and EV charging, served by a fleet of electric buses. This would have the effect of reducing the number of vehicles circulating in the town centre while looking for parking – particularly in the tourist season which stretches now from Easter through to the end of October. Although Dorset did not receive BSIP funding, the upgrade of the site is still an aim and will be progressed when funding is available."</p> <p>384. Availability – The Assets Team have confirmed that "Dorset Council supports this site coming forward for employment, leisure or transport as part of the enhancement to the Park and Ride to create a multi-modal mobility hub and the encouragement of mass transport."</p> <p>385. Criterion 5 - Leisure is a town centre use that is subject to both the impact (proposals greater than 1000sqm) and sequential test, except for small-scale rural development.</p> <p>386. Criterion 5 - The Renewable and low carbon energy PPG includes useful guidance relating to renewable energy developments, including guidance specific to solar farm developments, their normally temporary nature, and the potential to mitigate visual impacts.</p> <p>387. Criterion 6 ii) The site is adjacent to Lodmoor SSSI and SNCI, requiring consultation with the Council's Natural Environment Team and Natural England.</p> <p>388. The potential for contamination - Investigations would be required to determine whether the site is contaminated. If this reveals contamination, remediation would be needed to address this issue. Remediation measures can be costly and often affect development viability.</p>	<p>Include clause relating to contamination and elaborate requirements in supporting text.</p> <p>Discuss with DWT. Refer in supporting text to the need to liaise with Council's Natural Environment Team and Natural England in the supporting text</p>
<p>54/60 Dorset Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>This site was also newly promoted in response to the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan call for sites and some of our comments made in response to the public engagement undertaken in January 2023 are repeated here. The site assessment published then failed to recognise that the eastern part of the site is mapped as part of the Lorton Valley Nature Park and the current draft also fails to recognise this. It is not clear whether the boundaries of the LVNP have changed or the reason for this omission. As per the map in the draft Dorset Council Local Plan (p205 in the Options Consultation document dated January 2021) this area does appear to still be included.</p> <p>The majority of the grassland is mapped as a Habitat Restoration Site having undergone grassland restoration work as part of habitat enhancement required in association with the construction of the Weymouth Relief Road and alongside the extension and restoration of habitats now part of DWT's Lorton Meadows reserve. The inclusion of this area in the Nature Park was intended to enhance the integrity of the Lodmoor SSSI (Lorton Valley Nature Park; Green Infrastructure Case Study (NE388). Natural England 2013)</p> <p>As this work was undertaken as a condition of planning approval associated with the Weymouth Relief Road, it is essential that this habitat is maintained and managed in the long term to deliver biodiversity enhancement in the local area.</p> <p>While this may be compatible with the allocation of this area for leisure use as described in draft policy WNP54, the use of the area for renewable energy generation may not be appropriate. Any development that results in the loss of the restored grassland habitats here is not acceptable.</p> <p>DWT is aware and have previously been involved in discussions regarding proposals for this site, including the possibility of creating a visitor centre and gateway to the Nature Park on this site, potentially managed by a partnership of conservation organisations. We are generally supportive of this idea depending on the associated funding and responsibilities associated with this function.</p>	<p>Review the site boundary shown on Map 30 to which the policy applies to exclude land that is part of +Lorton Valley Nature Park.</p> <p>Ensure grassland habitat area is protected from any form of inappropriate development.</p> <p>Consider including additional clause in the policy facilitating a visitor centre, subject to further discussions with DWT.</p>
	<p>WNP55 & paras 11.24-11.27</p>	
<p>55/1</p>	<p>Ev charge Hub built in Car park Map 26c Also Overcomb car park</p>	<p>Noted comment.</p>
<p>55/2</p>	<p>Vehicle Charging Facilities - Support.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
<p>55/3</p>	<p>Does not seem to take into consideration the impact of personal EVs such as mobility scooters, electric bikes and scooters. How are these going to be catered for and deconflicted with pedestrians and other road users. The increase in recent years in the use of mobility scooters around the town centre and promenade will only increase. There appears to be no policy/plan for this mode of transport.</p>	<p>Ensure in para. 11.25 it is recognised that "vehicles" also means mobility scooters, electric bikes and scooters.</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
55/4 Dorset Council	WNP55 Vehicle Charging Facilities 389. Criterion 1 – This criterion is perhaps unnecessary as the requirement for EV charging infrastructure for new development is covered by Building Regulations Approved Document S.	Consider policy rewording to clause 1 in the light of comments received.
55/5 Dorset Council	390. Paragraph 11.24 – The Transport Planning Team suggest that this sentence should be updated to reflect the government's decision to push back the ban of the sale of new diesel cars to 2035.	Change date in para. 11.24 to read "2035"
WNP56 & paras 11.28-11.33		
56/1	WNP56 The proposed development of the cycle network looks very good especially the extension along the South Dorset Ridgeway west from the Weymouth-Dorchester trail This should extend as far as Hardy's Monument to make it a 'Destination' trail. The proposed cycle lane along Ulswater Crescent would link both sides of Radipole Lake creating a loop that can be accessed from many points. The Rodwell Trail is hugely popular and the remainder of the disused Weymouth to Portland railway line should be exploited in similar fashion giving a link all the way to Easton on Portland. The hardcore base is already there and only needs surfacing. From Easton to Portland Bill a new trail would link Hardy' Monument to Portland Bill creating one of the finest long-distance routes in the country. The Two Towers Trail? Much of the groundwork and infrastructure is already in place so not as grand a project as it may initially seem.	Noted comment(s) in support
56/2	WNP56 I am fully supportive of the need to extend and improve cycle routes. The Rodwell Trail is cited as a great success and this largely the case however, it also highlights the negative aspects of shared paths. Wherever possible cyclists and pedestrians need to be segregated. Shared paths can be extremely hazardous with dog walkers (long leads, uncontrolled dogs etc.) interacting with cyclists a key hazard. The scheme on Dorchester road using rubber 'hedgehogs' and poles to separate cyclists and motorists is a significantly better solution.	Noted comment(s) in support
56/3	WNP56 Cycle Routes While I support the expansion of cycle routes in the Weymouth area on principle, I am also a pedestrian and a motor vehicle owner, so cyclist affect me in multiple ways. Many cyclists I encounter as a motor vehicle operator seem to follow the rules, however there are times where there are cycle paths available, but the cyclist decides that they want to ride on the road causing road congestion. This is not only an inconvenience to all road users but also a danger. As a pedestrian, I have encountered many situations where cyclists are riding on pedestrian only designated pavements. Either the rider is not aware of the rules, or they just disregard them for their own convenience. This seems to occur a lot along the Esplanade where there are sections that are pedestrian only sections, some cyclists do not observe these areas. Better signage, more education, or better enforcement is required to allow motorists, cyclist, and pedestrians to coexist in a safer environment.	Noted comment(s) in support
56/4	WNP56 I fully support the need to safely connect the various cycle ways around Weymouth. It is impossible to traverse the plan area on a bike without travelling on a busy major road.	Support Noted
56/5	Map 31 cycle network proposed extensions. Whilst it's great that the cycle path that abruptly stops along Littlemoor road (Preston end), looks like it will be addressed, extending it down to Chalbury Corner, there is then a glaring gap between Chalbury Corner and overcome corner. Oakbury Drive is a far more suitable route, with plenty of room for a dedicated cycle lane, instead of parking both sides of the road. Linking this to Chalbury Corner and also Littlemoor road is required. There is already a lane between Chalbury Close and Wyke Oliver Road that perhaps could be widened. Also the proposed development land at Wyke Oliver farm area could include a provision to link these two major cycle networks up. I believe having a properly linked up, safe and well-maintained cycle network is critical to getting people out of the car mindset.	Include in para. 11.32 - worthwhile suggestions for extensions to the network especially those that address safety issues.
56/6	WNP56 Cycling Connectivity Weymouth has gained an excellent network of cycle-ways during the past 15 years. However, I wish to highlight a 'connectivity gap' on Radipole Lane between the football stadium roundabout and the Fiveways junction, (Chickerell Road). A new shared cycle path would connect two established and well used cycleways. It would provide a safer route, especially for students to local schools. Radipole Lane is dangerous along this stretch for cycling, being narrow and uphill.	Include in para. 11.32 - worthwhile suggestions for extensions to the network especially those that address safety issues.
56/7	WNP56 I agree we need to link up cycle routes and also provide more places to park and lock bikes for instance the entrance to Greenhill gardens. There is adequate room at the end of the esplanade.	Noted comment(s) in support
56/8	WNP56	Include in para. 11.32 - worthwhile suggestions

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	increasing cycle routes is a great plan. Link to Easton via incline railway route through Portland Port. A family cycle route to Abbotsbury and Portesham via the old railway line too.	for extensions to the network especially those that address safety issues.
56/9	Yes, to more cycle routes - the separation of cycles and cars wherever possible would encourage more people to cycle. Better public transport always a good thing, use smaller vehicles/buses-more environmental	Noted comment(s) in support
56/10	I think updating and joining up cycle routes is very much needed. It is true to say that very few people use cycling as a regular commute, either for pleasure or work, is down to the poor siting of cycle paths, the poor upkeep of some current designated cycle paths (through Lodmoor nature reserve).	Noted comment(s) in support
56/11	Cycle Routes Support. But suggest priority links be better identified in 11.33 and shown on a separate map.	Consider when drafting next version and mapping suggestion
56/12	Para. 11.28 et seq. Improvements to the cycle network in the area are definitely needed. This is a good proposal.	Support Noted
56/13	WNP56 agree with cycle routes but need to ensure that pedestrians are not being disadvantaged sharing spaces where bikes are taken off the roads. I have had a few close calls with bikes, but elderly people may not hear a bike approaching and young children would just not be aware of the danger - their safety must remain paramount as the most vulnerable users	Noted comment(s) in support
56/14 The Ramblers (Dorset Area)	WNP56 Cycle routes Whilst the provision of cycle routes is welcome, it is important that facilities for cyclists are not provided at the expense of facilities for walkers. Walkers are the most vulnerable group of users. Any routes which are to be shared-use (i.e. shared between cyclists and pedestrians) will ideally be at least 3m wide, with 2m an absolute minimum. In determining appropriate widths, is important to take account of local conditions including expected levels of use, and the different types of walkers and cyclists, the existence of physical constraints, such as hedgerows, fencing/railing and furniture, 'pinch points', the gradient of the route and whether there is to segregation.	Consider how better Map 31 can highlight proposed and potential extensions to the network.
56/15 Dorset Council	WNP56 Cycle Routes 391. Approach - The Policy is in line with COM7 criterion V) which states "The delivery of a strategic cycle network and improvements to the public rights of way network will be supported." The policy is largely in line with Local plan policy.	Noted comment(s) in support
WNP57 & paras 11.34-11.38		
57/1	The Park and Ride site is hopelessly underused and a joke as the buses have not entered the site for years. This should be sorted out as a priority and would probably have been a more important matter than Weymouth railway station upgrades. The Park and Ride site surely has so much potential for housing and employment bearing in mind the large Mercery Road scheme next to it. It could be a proper transport hub and a gateway to the town with parking, amenities and what about trying to integrate it with a railway station for a shuttle into Weymouth by relocating the current Upwey station.	Noted comment(s) in support
57/2	Against motorists. Having lived at Southill for 21 years, we have spent the last 11 years without a bus service. We have a temporary one now but no guarantee that it will remain. As we get older, walking to town or indeed cycling becomes impossible, so the car is still essential as to many others. Please do not put any more speed bumps in the roads or traffic calming measures which cause so much harm to cars. some are positively dangerous if you come across them in the dark. Radipole village and Radipole park drive are classic examples. Please don't develop the land which is the most convenient car park behind The Range. Alternatives are not acceptable.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
57/3	We see no real plans for the increased population.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
57/4	I would urge a radical look at the traffic flow in Weymouth and consider limiting access to the Weymouth sea front. An excellent opportunity to be bold and create a really great space for shopping, eating, access to the beach and other leisure activities. If you get this right and avoid developing the better areas of Weymouth - such as Lodmoor, Weymouth could be transformed into an even more attractive place to visit.	Noted comment(s) in support
57/5	WNP57 paras. 11.34 to 12.37 Traffic impact can seriously undermine community expectations and cost in time and fuel / charging. This has got worse yearly. A gridlocked society is frustrated and by default and charges to residents are increased.	Noted comment(s) in support
57/6	Walking and cycling are not realistic modes of transport from Preston into Weymouth. Any new development in Preston would not be able to provide realistic alternatives to car dependency.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
57/7	Traffic Impact	Support Noted

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	supports proposals to reduce traffic volume and speed subject to community consultation. Support.	
57/8	Traffic situation south of Manor Roundabout, especially at/after Radipole Spa is rather dire.	Noted comment(s) in support
57/9 Dorset Council	WNP57 Traffic Impact 392. Approach - The policy reads as a list of 'projects' rather than policy criteria. It is suggested that projects are moved to a monitoring and implementation section. 393. Criterion 1 (iii) A Park and Ride facility is supported but no delivery mechanism is listed. This detail could be provided in a monitoring and implementation section. 394. Criterion 1 (iv) Growth and Economic Regeneration support the inclusion of this project.	Change WNP57 to read: "and v. the provision dedicated cycle or public transport lanes will be supported provided they...."
	WNP58 & paras 11.39-11.43	
58/1	Para. 11.43 Agree with the importance of retaining community buildings	Support Noted
58/2	The majority of community facilities have access for wheelchairs but the paths leading to the facilities are an accident waiting to happen - they are uneven, on a camber and when they are reported an able-bodied person looks at the problem and says it is suitable! This is an absolute disgrace and wheelchair users should be listened to.	Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received. Include reference in supporting text to accessibility issues at several community facilities.
58/3	WNP58 Existing Community Buildings I support this policy	Support Noted
58/4	I support the protection of existing community hubs.	Support Noted
58/5	Existing Community Buildings retention of community social hubs by protecting from redevelopment. Support.	Support Noted
58/6	Buildings important to communities. What about Weymouth Bay Methodist Church and Westham Methodist Church?	Add to the table at para. 11.43: Weymouth Bay Methodist Church and Westham Methodist Church
58/7	Agreed. Social contact, i.e. for mothers and babies/infants, elderly folk (often socially isolated, clubs/societies, very important. Sports provision, i.e. Redlands, Swimming Pool, very important.	Noted comment(s) in support
58/8	Table of community buildings Add Emmanuel Church, Southill (or replace "St. Emmanuels" with that if that is the intended building. I am not aware of a St Emmanuels in Weymouth).	Change table at para. 11.43 to include: Emmanuel Church, Southill (delete Emmanuel Church, Southill if that is the same premises)
58/9	NB St Aldhems should be spelt St Aldhelms.	Correct typo in para 11.43 table - correct spelling is "St. Aldhelms"
58/10 Dorset Council	WNP58: Existing Community Buildings 395. Approach - At present, the policy wording does not add much value to the existing Local Plan policy, in particular to criteria 1 and 2 on top of the Local Plan policy. If there is concern that the WDWPLP does not go far enough, consideration should be given to strengthening the policy. For example, consideration should be given to criteria that demonstrates local engagement having taken place or that an assessment of the suitable scale of the proposed infrastructure is proportionate to the local area and needs. 396. Criterion 1 (ii) should consider there being improvements to accessibility if the facility is to be moved. 397. Criterion 2 – There is no requirement in the policy for the developer to try to utilise the site for alternative community uses. This part of the criteria could be much more strongly worded with this being an essential part of the evidence having been explored, prior to application. 398. Criterion 3 – The specific wording doesn't make sense and does not read well. The criterion wording appears to deal with the loss of floor space for a community facility, but the introduction discusses extensions or alterations. This last criterion needs revising. Development proposals that would result in the loss or adverse impact upon community facilities should consider a robust marketing campaign, that there is a lack of need for the existing facility, or an equivalent community use; or alternative community facilities are provided in the vicinity. Details of the marketing requirements should be set out in the supporting text.	Consider policy rewording to clauses 1, 2 and 3 in the light of comments received.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	399. Marketing - Should this not be subject to a marketing exercise demonstrating that no alternative community user is interested where a loss of a use is sought?	
	WNP59 & paras 11.44-11.48	
59/1	WNP59 Can this policy include something to protect established pubs in delivering live music? There have been recent cases where pubs have been forced to reduce business due to complaints from people newly arrived in the area. You cannot have a diverse town centre if residents complain about music noise from pubs or food smells from chippies.	Noted comment.
59/2	Allow empty public houses to be developed into residential homes. You cannot penalise car drivers and reduce traffic in town with such a poor public transport service as there is in Dorset. No one can rely on train's for getting to work - they are too unreliable	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
59/3	WNP59 It should be easier and quicker to remove a public house and redevelop it (e.g. as a restaurant or other community facility) than the currently worded policy allows. The draft policy is a recipe for quite a large number of unused buildings, especially in central Weymouth.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
59/4	I am not against Public Houses in principle but there is a difference between one based in a local community such as quoted in para.11.45. However, in the Town Centre that is not the case. If Weymouth had some good quality restaurants instead of so many Public Houses, this would not attract people whose sole ambition is to over participate in alcohol consumption to the annoyance of other people. It is a fact that at during weekend evenings the Town Centre is an almost no-go area due to drunkenness and hooliganism.	Noted comment.
59/5	Does this policy prevent a public house being converted to a restaurant of coffee house? Does an alcohol-free bar like the Dry Dock qualify as a public house? The plan should surely not be promoting the sale of alcohol, which already causes the town huge problems. I agree that we don't want pubs being converted to residential but if that is the intention then the wording should be more precise.	Noted comment.
59/6	Public Houses – retention as community social hubs by protecting from redevelopment. Support.	Support Noted
59/7 Dorset Council	WNP59 Public Houses The Growth and Economic Regeneration department particularly support this policy. 400. Approach – The NPPF, paragraph 93.c) advises that planning policies and decisions should “guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community’s ability to meet its day-to-day needs”. The blanket referral to all public houses as important community facilities is not backed up in evidence. For example, in the Town Centre where there is a plethora of public houses in walking distance. The loss in the town centre would be subject to the same criteria as those areas with one public house. Consideration should be given to merging this policy with policy WNP58 and referring to important community facilities. A list or description of important community facilities could be provided in the supporting text. 401. Marketing – Proposals that involve the loss of a public house with heritage, cultural, economic, or social value must demonstrate that its use as a public housing is unviable, and its retention has been fully explored. The policy continues “A period of at least 12 months vacancy should precede any change of use application, which should be accompanied by authoritative evidence of continued marketing over at least a 24-month period and no market interest in the building as a public house forthcoming, nor interest from local communities for the space to be used for alternative community uses.” 402. A marketing period of 24 months is however considered excessive and likely to result in unmaintained properties for extensive periods of time to the detriment of the street scene. It is recommended that the marketing time is reduced to 12 months. The reduction in timescales could be offset by improvements to the quality of marketing and it is suggested the following requirements could be added to the supporting text. The information and level of detail will depend on the nature of the proposal but could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what consultation there had been with local community groups / service providers and details of representations received; • evidence to confirm that the property or site has been appropriately marketed for a meaningful period and that there is no realistic interest in its future community use. (This should include details of the marketing approach, sales literature, the length of time that the marketing was active and any changes during this period, and the asking price, the level of interest generated, and any offers received); • where the current use is no longer viable, a viability assessment which shows that this is the case. The applicant will be expected to fund the independent verification of the submitted viability assessment by a person appointed by the council. 	Consider policy rewording to clause 1 in the light of comments received. Extend para. 11.47 or add additional paragraph regarding the quality of marketing and level of detail provided.
	WNP60 & paras 11.49-11.55	
60/1	The table listing existing sport and recreation facilities mentions a cycle and skate track at Mount Pleasant. No mention of a running track. Weymouth Athletics Centre is a	Consider in para 11.55 - whether the running

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	misnomer as there is no proper running track available. This could lead people to think that facilities already exist.	track should be added to the table.
60/2	WNP60 Should we include beaches as Sports and Recreation areas? Again experience has shown how Sandsfoot beach lost significant public access due to development of a sailing club. With swimming, sup'ing and kayaking on the rise probably more recreation is undertaken on our beaches than anywhere else. Also Lodmoor Park has an exercise trail with workout stations and the Park Run, so should this be declared a recreation space too?	Noted comment.
60/3	Agree in principle and support all groups striving to keep our residents active and fulfilled. We also need a decent swimming pool and activity centre for all age groups. Site a Centre Parcs facilities to aspire the existing and future generations. It's a pity that Politics gets in the way!!	Noted comment(s) in support
60/4	WNP60 I am fully supportive of the need to maintain and improve public sports facilities. The development of a sea pool would enhance these facilities.	Noted comment(s) in support
60/5	I support the protection and provision of outdoor sports and recreational facilities, especially for families. Consideration must also be given to educational facilities, bearing in mind that many of the Weymouth schools, particularly secondary, are oversubscribed already.	Noted comment(s) in support
60/6	Sports and Recreation Support.	Support Noted
60/7	Priority should be Weymouth Swimming Pool there needs to be a planned replacement with CIL payments supporting the pool until this is in place. Outdoor Swimming is increasingly popular. Support facilities such as showers and changing facilities are required adjacent to the sea at Greenhill, Castle Cove, Overcombe Corner and Newton's Cove. Other recreation/sports on the beach should be better supported with storage facilities, improved access and viewing areas. Redlands Sports Hub is the only Public indoor multi-sport centre has been saved from closure but needs to continue to receive CIL payments for enhancement on its indoor and outdoor facilities.	Noted comment.
60/8	The list of facilities is far from complete. For example it omits the tennis at Radipole Park Drive, and the golf course in Lodmoor park. There are also smaller "exercise machines " in Lodmoor and at Littlemoor	Noted comment.
60/9	Improve swimming pool facilities this will benefit residents and visitors bringing more income into Weymouth and surrounding areas set sights on Centre Parcs Facilities. Visitors are the life blood of Weymouth. Maintain traffic flow and access without loss of green areas, views	Noted comment(s) in support
60/10 Dorset Council	WNP60 Sports and Recreation 403. Criterion 1 – the policy refers to a table below, but the table is found on page 139. Consideration should be given to numbering the tables and referring to the table number in the policy text. The criterion simply states that the area should be protected. The policy should be more positively worded with phrasing such as 'Development should be resisted except in the following circumstances'. 404. Criterion 3 (ii) It would be useful to understand which standards you are referring to here? 405. Criterion 4 - Contact with Weymouth Town Council is an action, better located in the supporting text. 406. Para11.51 – Should be a new paragraph from 'School-based swimming pools...'	Consider policy rewording to clauses 1 and 4 in the light of comments received. Split para. 11.51. Start new paragraph at "School-based swimming pools ..."
60/11 Dorset Council	407. Para 11.52 and 11.55 – Should refer to policy WNP60 not WNP59.	Correct typo in para. 11.52 policy reference to "Policy WNP60" (or whatever is the new sequential number of the 'Sports and Recreation' policy after other policy changes). Correct typo in para. 11.55 correct policy reference to "Policy WNP60" (as above)
	WNP61 & paras 11.56-11.61	
61/1	I support the provision of more sport and recreational facilities	Support Noted
61/2	Public Spaces Support.	Support Noted
61/3	Agreed	Support Noted
61/4 Dorset Council	WNP61 Public Spaces 408. Approach - Public realm improvements are specified in several of the Weymouth specific policies in the DWWPLP. This policy would be in line with the Local Plan.	Noted comment(s) in support
	WNP62 & paras 11.62-11.65	
62/1	Para. 11:65 increasing allotments and community growing spaces and orchards is good.	Support Noted

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
62/2	There is a demand for more community allotment. This should be encouraged. For example there are no allotments in Littlemoor where there is a high level of food poverty. Residents can be encouraged to grow their own food at low cost.	Noted comment(s) in support
62/3	Para. 11.68 Policy WNP62 supports the provision of additional burial space on sites that are deemed suitable for such a purpose - shouldn't that be WNP 63?	Correct reference to "WNP63"
62/4	Allotment and Community Gardening Provision - Support.	Support Noted
62/5	Agreed	Support Noted
62/6	Allotments extend existing Field above Brakendown Ave with road access via Louviers will open to Littlemoor community	Consider suggestion for new allotment site in the context of other policy decisions.
62/7 Dorset Council	WNP62 Allotment and Community Gardening Provision The policy is identical to Portland NP Policy No. Port/CR3 Allotments. The policy seeks to retain and provide further allotments in the Weymouth NP area.	Noted comment(s) in support
62/8 Dorset Council	410. Site 4: WEY15 Land at Tumbledown Farm, in the WDWPLP, is allocated for allotments, and these have been implemented in part, as community gardens.	Noted comment.
WNP63 & paras 11.66-11.68		
63/1 Wyke Regis Society	Cemeteries I propose a natural burial ground, which are increasing in popularity. They include wild meadows and tree planting and would help in the problem of burial demand. They are attractive places to visit and preserve or improve the wildlife and diversity of marginal areas. They might be compatible with a new orchard.	Noted comment.
63/2	WNP63 New Burial Grounds Will Weymouth beach be nominated as a new burial ground?	Ensure photos are relevant to the topic/policy.
63/3	Burial Grounds Support. But is this necessary in LP.	Consider when drafting next version
63/4	We should not use new ground for burials. Vertical stacking and encouraging cremation.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
63/5	I would prefer interment to be on a 'natural' site or else cremation.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of policy
63/6 Dorset Council	WNP63 New Burial Grounds Although land at Tumbledown Farm (WEY15) is allocated for additional burial space, it is understood that this future use no longer forms part of Weymouth Town Council's current plans on this site. 411. Approach - In general, cemeteries are allowed in the countryside provided they meet need and accord to other policies in the Plan, such as landscape, residential amenity, and access. Consideration should be given to local need, landscape and suitable access as part of the policy criteria.	Consider policy rewording in the light of comments received.
12 Monitoring		
R/1 Dorset Council	Chapter 12 Monitoring and Reviewing the Neighbourhood Plan 412. This chapter is welcomed and reflects the principles of plan, monitor and manage (Review). 413. Paragraph 12.2 - Dorset Council can supply planning data but not an annual report. This paragraph should be revised to reflect this.	Acknowledge in para. 12.2 the offer of help from DC with monitoring.
R/2	Paras. 12.1 to 12.4 If there is no statutory requirement for the Town Council to monitor progress with the implementation of the WNP then the Dorset Council is best placed to do so. The Dorset Council employs qualified Planning staff and holds all the relevant data, so they are best placed to consider how well adjacent Neighbourhood Plans are working together and whether changes are needed. For example the plans for Weymouth, Portland, Chickerell, Sutton Poyntz and possibly Osmington need to be reviewed as a whole, as they are all interrelated.	Noted comment
14 Glossary		
D/1 Dorset Council	Chapter 14 Glossary 420. Affordable housing - NPPF definition of Affordable housing is 'Housing for sale or rent, for those whose needs are not met by the market (including housing that provides a subsidised route to home ownership and/or is for essential local workers);' Including, starter homes, discounted market housing, and affordable routes to home ownership.	Replace with NPPF definition
D/2 Dorset Council	421. Community Infrastructure Levy – The CIL/S106 Team explains CIL is not a tax. It is a developer contribution sought from new development to help fund the infrastructure, facilities, and services, needed to support new homes and businesses.	Change text to read: "A developer financial contribution sought from on certain forms of development to

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
		<i>contribute to local infrastructure."</i>
D/3 Dorset Council	422. Curtilage - Permitted development Rights for Householders defines Curtilage as 'land which forms part and parcel with the house. Usually it is the area of land within which the house sits, or to which it is attached, such as the garden, but for some houses, especially in the case of properties with large grounds, it may be a smaller area.'	Noted comment.
D/4 Dorset Council	423. General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) - The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) allows permitted development rights for a specified range of development, meaning that they do not require an application for planning permission. Some types of development such as agricultural buildings and certain telecommunications equipment are also subject to a prior approval procedure.	Change to read: <i>"The Town and Country Planning GPDO 2015 (as amended) allows permitted development rights for a specified range of development, meaning that those activities do not require an application for planning permission. Some types of development such as agricultural buildings and certain telecommunications equipment are also subject to a prior approval procedure."</i>
D/5 Dorset Council	424. Infill Development – More consideration should be given to this definition. There does not appear to be any national definition of infill. Dorset Council defines it as 'subdivision of existing garden land in established residential areas to form building plots. These can range from single plots to larger developments if a number of gardens are assembled'. The Greater London Authority in their briefing paper 2015 defines infill as 'the development of vacant or underutilised sites at all scales, within existing communities and so with some supporting infrastructure already in place'.	Noted comment.
D/6 Dorset Council	425. Infrastructure - is generally considered to be energy, transport, utilities and communication. The Planning Advisory Service in the report 'A steps approach to infrastructure and delivery' outlines that Infrastructure can take many forms. It can be defined in physical, green and community terms and is essential to support objectives of increased housing provision, economic growth and mitigating climate change, and of creating thriving and sustainable communities. In addition to housing and job opportunities, supporting infrastructure including green energy, utility services, transport, schools, open space, community, health and leisure services, are all needed.	Noted comment.
D/7 Dorset Council	426. PPG, Planning Practice Guidance – title should read Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)	Change to read: <i>"Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) ..."</i>
D/8 Dorset Council	427. Ramsar sites –title should read as RAMSAR site	Change to read: <i>"RAMSAR site"</i>
D/9 Dorset Council	428. Section 106 - The section of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) that provided for the creation of planning obligations, now replaced by Section 46 of the 2004 Act. Section 106 agreements allow local authorities to ensure that developers provide the infrastructure needed to support new developments. Often referred to as "planning gain".	Delete: <i>"now replaced by Section 46 of the 2004 Act"</i> and final sentence referring to <i>"planning gain"</i> . Change to read: <i>"The section of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that provided for the creation of planning obligations. Section 106 agreements allow local authorities to ensure that developers provide the infrastructure needed to support new developments."</i>
D/10 Dorset Council	429. Supplementary planning documents (SPDs) - build upon and provide more detailed advice or guidance on policies in an adopted local plan. They do not form part of the	Noted comment.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	development plan; they cannot introduce new planning policies into the development plan.	
D/11 Dorset Council	430. Sustainability Appraisals – The NPPF defined its role is to promote sustainable development by assessing the extent to which the emerging plan, when judged against reasonable alternatives, will help to achieve relevant environmental, economic and social objectives (including opportunities for net gains).	Noted comment.
D/12 Dorset Council	431. Use classes – the legislation should be written as follows: Town and country Planning (use classes) order 1987 (as amended)	Change to read: "The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) put uses of land and"
Non-Land Use Comments and Suggestions		
NL/1	We have never been asked whether we wanted a town council in addition to a Dorset Council. The WTC is expensive, has grown in size and is not needed. The members of the town council seem to spend too much time inserting themselves into process that does not need them. The councillors do not represent resident's views. They interfere needlessly. There is no point in making comments about the plans. The council and councillors will do whatever they want and ignore any contrary views. They will increase our precept without prior approval and spend my money on their own ideas.	Refer to Town Council
NL/2	Scrap Weymouth Town Council. Remove the WTC precept from the DC budget, save our money. A simple majority of respondents should not be taken as support for any part of any plan. It must a majority of all the electorate. No spend should be undertaken without a majority of all of the tax payers in support, again not just of those that responded. Too often we have seen after these consultations we see an abuse of statistics.	Refer to Town Council
NL/3	Car Parking - ensure that the car parking fees are fair to the local community and our visitors to ensure people can visit the town economically and encourage businesses to thrive.	Refer to Town Council
NL/4	Public Transport I understand that the illegal migrants housed on the Bobby Stockholm have the benefit of a shuttle bus once an hour into Weymouth and return. Would it be possible to divert the bus along Wyke Road as we have recently lost our bus service.	Refer to Town Council
NL/5	Seaweed accumulation on our beaches poses significant challenges for tourism, affecting the overall visitor experience and the local economy. One of the primary issues is the aesthetic impact, as excessive seaweed deposits can create an unsightly and unappealing visual environment for beachgoers. The presence of large seaweed mats along the shoreline may deter tourists seeking pristine, clean beaches, potentially leading to a decline in visitor numbers. The unpleasant smell associated with decomposing seaweed can further contribute to a negative atmosphere, diminishing the overall allure of the beach destination. Beyond aesthetics, the accumulation of seaweed can impede recreational activities and access to the shoreline. Thick layers of seaweed may create obstacles for beachgoers, limiting the space available for sunbathing, beach sports, and other leisure activities. The inconvenience caused by navigating through seaweed-covered areas can result in a less enjoyable experience for tourists. Additionally, if not promptly managed, decaying seaweed can release sulphurous compounds, contributing to unpleasant odours that may repel beach visitors. Effective strategies for seaweed management and clean-up are crucial for maintaining our vibrant tourism industry in coastal areas.	Refer to Town Council
NL/6	More green spaces where dogs are permitted off lead to be exercised	Refer to Town Council
NL/7 Wyke Regis Society	The Fleet Coastal Access Area is largely impassible. Inappropriate and unlawful clearing of scrub by the Chesil Caravan Park undermined the path and attempts to reinstate it have been unsuccessful.	Refer to Town Council
NL/8	More dog walking areas with bins	Refer to Town Council
NL/9	Community housing schemes It would be good for the WTC to be seen leading the way in setting up a community land trust. Other councils such as Cornwall County Council have done this, and properties are already built and occupied there.	Refer to Town Council
NL/10	Can business rates or similar be managed to encourage small businesses into the town centre?	Refer to Town Council
NL/11	WNP42 Town Centre Car Parks Town centre car parking is not really designed for the local community, it seems to be something that is a cash-generating machine for the tourists that visit the town. What this means in practice is that local residents are forced to pay extortionate rates for car parking to conduct their normal lives. The alternative is to use public transport which is not regular enough to allow someone to make use of it without some serious planning. Then we get to the off season where the buses become nearly non-existent, this is	Refer to Town Council

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	especially acute during the evening, the only other option is to use your vehicle or use an expensive cab. There needs to be a scheme where someone can park during the peak season without incurring tourist rates and the bus service needs to be enhanced so that 40+ minute waits for a bus are not common.	
NL/12	reference to the town centre masterplan: Masterplan p10 "Regenerating the town centre through enhancing the mix of uses particularly along Commercial Road, the Harbourside and around Weymouth station by diversifying the retail offer, providing office and living accommodation, new public space and places to eat and enjoy leisure time" Suggestion: Business rate relief and other incentives should be applied to try and attract a more diverse range of independent start-up shops to promote a more diverse cultural quarter. This relief could be tapered off as the businesses develop and establish. This is surely better than having empty shops yielding no business rate income.	Refer to Town Council
NL/13	There needs to be a reduction in vehicle speed in residential areas or physical restrictions/preventions such as road narrowing, chicanes and islands. We cannot rely on speed signs where road layout, width and design permits than ability to speed, putting lives at risk. But we don't want to see the Welsh method of reducing everything to 20mph as this has an impact on pollution and human behaviour and does not in my view solve the problem. Radipole lane has seen several dangerous car incidents this year alone between the junction with Field Barn drive and the Wessex roundabout. These all resulted in damage to properties and to a lamp post. There were 2 incidents in 2 days this weekend. This section of the road is wide and encourages speeding and the junction with field barn Drive has no centre island so there are constantly near misses as people speed from Radipole Lane north approach and cut across the junction as they turn left into the next section of Radipole Lane. This road has to be a priority, or someone will be killed.	Refer to Town Council
NL/14	Make sure pedestrian crossing timings (so you are not waiting in the rain for the lights to change) and desired crossing positions (too many current ones make you walk further than is needed to cross) prioritises pedestrians (cars will just have to wait) Need to integrate public transport especially around the train station with a bus interchange. Could the council/town council remove the waiting bus stops at the sea front and pedestrianize the area? (would remove the need for an underpass to the sea side from the Swannery car park - you have to make walking attractive for the less able bodied too) Agree with bringing back park and ride and the use of solar energy to be used to charge cars / bike hire etc and making it a very positive first impression to feature of Weymouth's aspiring green credentials (charge far more to park in town)	Refer to Town Council
NL/15	WNP51. Portland cruise ships currently stopping on double yellow lines with no appropriate facilities, causing obstructions to the highway and pavement. Given continued growth of these visitors this neighbourhood plan needs to identify a more suitable coach stop for visitors to access town. Suggestions include a section of the Pavilion car park or Swannery. This needs to be added like the motorhome provision.	Refer to Town Council
NL/16	WNP52: With the expansion of housing on the peripheries of Weymouth a rethink is necessary on bus routes. The 1 and 10 routes should be combine giving a long-distance route from Poundbury to Portland. The Dorset County Hospital is on the 10 route, but currently accessing from Wyke, Rodwell and Portland involves an uncertain change at the King's Statue making planning journeys to the hospital by public transport from most of Weymouth (and Portland) far more difficult than it needs to be. The expanded development at Littlemoor will be better saved by a loop service rather than the linear route 2 service. In one direction Kings Statue, Dorchester Road, Littlemoor Road, Preston Road back to the Statue with another bus operating in the opposite direction along the same route. Besides providing a much-improved public transport service to Littlemore which has much affordable housing it would provide a much needed 'cross town' link between Upwey/Redlands and Preston avoiding unnecessary journey into the town centre and 2 separate buses	Refer to Town Council
NL/17	Para. 11.29 The reference to Rodwell Trail is misleading, as it is neither high quality nor safe for cycling. Whilst it has the potential to be, the absence of functional CCTV leads to drug use and muggings, and the failure to maintain the route through road sweeping often results in a slippery surface. In addition, as a mixed-use trail, cyclists do not adhere to the speed limit and are often irritated by slower users, who are equally distressed by having to dive out of the way of cyclists travelling in excess of 25 mph. Please highlight these challenges to ensure a balanced perspective of any future proposals is taken and fully considered."	Refer to Town Council
NL/18	The current bus network is not for purpose, the current provider (first) has cut services even on the main routes like no.2. The live timing doesn't work, most of the busses aren't fitted with live trackers (so you can't see them in the app). Both of these are barriers that prevent people using the busses. You simply can't rely on them to be there when they should be. There is no way I could use a bus for work, it's simply too hit-and-miss.	Refer to Town Council

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
C/6	<p>The escalation of parking charges in the area is deemed detrimental to Weymouth businesses. Despite Dorset Council attributing the increase to the rising costs of operating and maintaining the sites, they remain in a state of disrepair, acting more as a discouragement for visitors looking to extend their stay. This situation, as highlighted by the President of the Weymouth and Portland Chamber of Commerce, is perceived as unfavourable for both local businesses and the council. The plea is for Dorset Council to reconsider and reverse the implemented charges. I believe there is untapped potential in enhancing the Park and Ride facilities by exploring vertical development, incorporating solar panels above the parking structures. This innovative approach could serve dual purposes by utilising unused space for renewable energy generation while providing shade and protection for parked vehicles. The installation of solar panels in car parks has several advantages, such as promoting sustainability, reducing the carbon footprint of the facility, and contributing to local energy generation. Electric buses are generally more expensive than their traditional counterparts for several reasons. Firstly, the upfront cost of manufacturing electric buses is higher due to the expensive technology involved in developing electric propulsion systems, battery packs, and charging infrastructure. The batteries, which constitute a significant portion of the cost, are expensive due to the advanced lithium-ion or alternative battery technologies used to provide the necessary range for public transportation. Moreover, the charging infrastructure required to support electric buses adds to the overall cost. Establishing charging stations and the necessary electrical grid upgrades can be a significant investment. Maintenance costs for electric buses will be higher, particularly as specialised training and tools are needed for repairs. I express my disappointment regarding the denial of planning permission for the Caddy Shack. I request a reconsideration of this decision. Furthermore, I propose exploring the Weymouth Household Recycling Centre as a potential site for the development of a commercial estate; not a residential one. The facts indicate that Weymouth is not currently facing a housing crisis, making it a strategic choice for alternative development that aligns with the community's needs.</p>	<p>Refer to Town Council</p>
NL/19	<p>WNP56 The plans appear to be commendable but as will always be the case, with the mixture of wide, narrow and non-existent pavements there will always be a need to leave the protection of a cycleway to rejoin the road. I make this simple request, as a cyclist myself, that roads are clearly marked by a 'hashed white line' where the need to use the road is obvious. The marking should be 1.5 metres from the kerb and afford the cyclist right of way when approaching a road island. I would be delighted to use 'Preston Road' as an example of what I state. Elements of some of what I state is covered in the latest 'Highway code' and should be enforced by traffic calming initiatives to support the cycleway plans.</p>	<p>Refer to Town Council</p>
NL/20	<p>WNP56 Cycle Routes the Weymouth council should actively oppose the stupid cycle schemes such as the Mercery Road scheme which has increased pollution in the area. Adding a cycle lane which is rarely used while removing a left filter lane is already impacting the area. Increased activity in the Mount Pleasant will only make things worse.</p>	<p>Refer to Town Council</p>
NL/21	<p>WNP56 the layout for the Dorchester Rd./Mercery Road entrance/exit is, as Gandhi remarked of English civilisation: -"A very good idea", but in practical terms, it does not really work out that way. The cycle lane structure is rather confusing and the pedestrian crossing facility is welcome but pedestrian times to cross need a 5-10 second extension. I've noticed motorists turning right off D. Road foolishly ignoring this facility (and pedestrians using it!). Pedestrians, by and large, have a raw deal.</p>	<p>Refer to Town Council</p>
NL/22	<p>Para. 11.44 The Weatherbury Hotel is currently burdened with both business and residential rates for their new manager, putting a financial strain on this small business. This situation warrants reconsideration and potential relief to alleviate the financial pressure on the hotel.</p>	<p>Refer to Town Council</p>
NL/23	<p>WNP60 The tennis court in Greenhill Gardens receive very little use and could easily be transformed into a younger children's play area with a covered open-sided pavilion (shelter from rain and sun) plus picnic benches. It would be a bonus to the many parents and children of the Park District which has nothing of this nature and could be reached with a walk along the sea front and up through the Greenhill Gardens, all push chair friendly.</p>	<p>Refer to Town Council</p>
NL/24	<p>Provide rubbish bins on non-council sites with publics access particularly where the land is owned by Dorset Council e.g. Lorton Lane, Lorton Valley Nature Park, RSPB Lodmoor.</p>	<p>Refer to Town Council</p>
NL/25	<p>The provision of allotments is very much neglected in certain areas as stated, although Preston is not mentioned. Speaking personally, Preston has only 1 allotment with 7 pitches. The site was promised over a decade ago and was only released last year. In the intervening years it has been very neglected. This means that there is no secure boundary which allows entrance to damaging wildlife. It is also a very windy site. The lack of funding</p>	<p>Refer to Town Council</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	towards allotments means that it has been further neglected in terms of the upkeep of the communal areas, which are the council's responsibility. I understand that those wishing to develop the farm land behind the site, would like to use part of the allotment for access. This would further limit its areas. Possibly this is one of the reasons for its neglect.	
	13 Community Aspirations	
AC/1	Generally the area benefits from good air quality but some areas are blighted by traffic pollution in terms of congestion, noise, and effects on air quality by reason of exhaust fumes and tyre and brake particulates. The problem is not confined to Boot Hill. The reference to possible alternative traffic routes to Portland is unclear given the background that a Western By Pass is not proposed or safeguarded in the Draft Local Plan and no alternative route is identifiable to the current A354 and B3156 routes.	Noted comment
AC/2	With reference to empty and derelict buildings the suggestion that action should be taken to refurbish them and bring back into use is welcome. Such action, which could I understand include use of powers under Section 17 of the Housing Act, 1985, and Circular 06/04, would reverse the decline in the condition of many buildings (particularly in Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area - the special character of which has been declared as at risk by Historic England) and increase the number of homes and the vitality of the area. The Neighbourhood Plan, if approved is, in my opinion, an excellent document and has the potential to support and strengthen the existing Development Plan.	Noted comment
AC/3	I welcome the inclusion of Community Aspirations within the Plan and believe these need to be facilitated through Weymouth Town Council working with local communities.	Noted comment
AC/4	I am disappointed, too, that the issues of crime, anti-social behaviour, and problems with drink and drug-related concerns in the area haven't been adequately addressed in this plan, which was a fear expressed by a large proportion (32%) in the initial survey. Instead, proposals for speed restrictions on the front and roads around Weymouth are favoured, which was not identified as an issue in the initial survey. I also understand that I have limited time to respond to what is a 221-page document created over a two-and-a-half-year period, with many documents sitting behind it, which is undoubtedly frustrating for many in Weymouth who wish to engage with this plan. The 5pm submission deadline creates barriers for those who are working, as I had to take the afternoon off to respond. This shouldn't be the case, as there's little chance anyone will read the responses after 5pm today. Midnight today would have been a far more sensible review time considering the weekend. I hope the residents of Weymouth will have more opportunities to respond to this plan.	Noted comment
AC/5	Point 1: Council Owned Farm "Higher South Buckland Farm": Is there goals/encouragement for certain type of farming within the tenancy for the council owned farm. Could / should this become slightly more experimental, so the Council knows firsthand regarding land regeneration. I believe this farm should not have Solar generation on it and should be a beacon for land improvement (if it is indeed degraded.)	Noted comment
AC/6 The Ramblers (Dorset Area)	In the section on Footpaths, it is preferable that any new paths are dedicated as public rights of way to secure them for the public in perpetuity and also to ensure that they are shown on OS map, There are a number of different mechanisms by which the status 'public right of way' can be achieved. Glossary: p.160 Suggest that you amend the definition of public right of way to that used on the Dorset Council website: "A public right of way is a path that anyone has the legal right to use on foot, and sometimes other modes of transport. Public footpaths can be used by walkers, public bridleways can be used by walkers, horse riders and pedal cyclists. Public rights of way are highways in law."	Noted comment
AC/7 Weymouth Civic Society (P&E Cttee)	Part 13 – Weymouth Community Aspirations We commend many of the local Weymouth community's aspirations and practical ideas in this full and very detailed section, under the headings of landscapes and green spaces, homes, jobs, a sustainable environment, and community matters.	Noted comment
AC/8 Dorset Council	Chapter 13: Weymouth Community Aspirations Chapter 13 lists a set of community aspirations captured during early rounds of consultation. 414. Formatting –The chapter is laid out based on other chapters however the formatting makes it difficult to read for the user. The chapter should read as a list of potential projects identified in a table for clarity. Ideally these projects should be linked back to the vision and aims with specific projects to be achieved, an outline of how they will be delivered, by whom and with progress indicators, achievement indicators and an estimated timeframe. 415. Paragraph 13.5 – The CIL/S106 Team are unclear on how the CIL neighbourhood proportion will be spent. Will projects be wholly funded by CIL or will it be used to part fund the projects, will other funding sources be considered?	Noted comments

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	<p>416. The CIL/S106 Team continue, this chapter should provide justification for developer contributions from development projects where S106 contributions are sort. This should be based on the aims and objectives and will help to evidence the infrastructure requirements and justify requests for S106 and CIL funding.</p> <p>417. The CIL/S106 Team ask if the neighbourhood plan could identify specific items of infrastructure and projects that could be funded by the developer contributions both the CIL neighbourhood proportion and S106.</p> <p>418. Landscape and Greenspaces, Footpaths – The Definitive Map Team note that this should include bridleways not just footpaths to provide wider access for walker, horse riders and cyclists.</p> <p>419. Sustainable Environment, Improved Public and Sustainable Transport Provision – The Definitive Map Team again note that this should include bridleways not just footpaths to provide wider access for walker, horse riders and cyclists.</p>	
	<p>Appendix A</p>	
<p>ET/1 Chapman Lily Planning Ltd for Bellway homes</p>	<p>General Presentation Points: - Appendix A 'Weymouth Strategic Environmental Targets' - header and section is not clear. –</p>	<p>Adress layout when drafting next version</p>
<p>T/2 Chapman Lily Planning Ltd for Bellway homes</p>	<p>The content of Appendix A seems prescriptive and doesn't align with the wider Neighbourhood Plan policies, which doesn't come across as user friendly and concise. Therefore it creates conflict in what the NP is trying to achieve. –</p>	<p>Consider when drafting next version</p>
<p>ET/3 Chapman Lily Planning Ltd for Bellway homes</p>	<p>Policy and 'Environmental Targets' need to be consistent.... e.g. - BNG in the Policy WNP 05 sets out to be in line with 'National Legislation' [p8.39] which is to be 10% minimum from January 2024. However, target 23 in Appendix A sets out 'a minimum of 20% net gain on all new development sites'. This provides a lack of clarity for developers. - Reference in each of the targets do not make sense and do not align with the wider neighbourhood plan. - To be helpful, we would suggest that these targets be removed from the NP and appended in a separate annual monitoring report. This would remove content that is already covered through the provision of building regs (and likely to be superseded).</p>	<p>Consider when drafting next version</p>
<p>ET/4 Chapman Lily Planning Ltd for Bellway homes</p>	<p>Environmental Targets- Page 158-169: - Possibly goes beyond what a neighbourhood plan should cover as it seems to contain a lot of matter and considerations which are of a technical nature which is normally dealt with post planning.</p>	<p>Consider when drafting next version</p>
<p>ET/5</p>	<p>The Environmental Targets in Appendix A are applauded for their ambition but the statement in para 7.7 that "developers will be expected to achieve and exceed the Appendix A targets" may be practically impossible to achieve if it is not backed up by Building Regulations, which builders/developers use as the essential requirement. As a useful check list for designers/developers it might be more useful.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
<p>ET/6</p>	<p>Appendix 1 – I fully support that only brownfield sites should be built on and green open spaces should be retained to benefit the environment and for peoples mental and physical health.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
<p>ET/7</p>	<p>I commend the inclusion of Strategic Environmental Targets in Appendix A for their pro-activity and recognition of the importance of measurement. It will be important to review and revise these and I suggest that Weymouth Town Council is the appropriate body to do so as well promoting these in its engagement with the various statutory and other organisations as well as individuals.</p>	<p>Support Noted</p>
<p>ET/8</p>	<p>The plan talks about 1.5 degrees warming as if it is still achievable. My understanding is that we may well soon be passing this threshold, and certainly it's possible before any of this plan comes into force. It might be more realistic to be talking about a 2-degree ambition and a 4 degree back-stop (which would still require urgent action).</p>	<p>Consider when drafting next version</p>
<p>ET/9 Dorset Council</p>	<p>Appendix A: Weymouth Strategic Environmental Targets Appendix A has been written in response to Weymouth Town Council declaring a local climate and ecological emergency in 2019. This committed Weymouth Town Council to making the Council's activities net zero carbon by 2030, which included ensuring all planning comments to Dorset Council are consistent with a shift to net-zero carbon by 2030. Following extensive public consultation, the initial draft Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan established a series of 'environmental objectives' as defined and explained within section 7. Environmental Sustainability.</p>	<p>Consider when drafting next version</p>

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions
	The targets are largely based upon information provided in the LETI Net Zero Carbon Toolkit from which quantitative reference values are abstracted with some reference for purposes of alignment to the Dorset Council Sustainability statement and checklist for planning applications interim guidance note.	
ET/10 Dorset Council	432. Dorset Council also declared a climate and ecological emergency in 2019 and adopted its Climate and Ecological Emergency Strategy in 2020 which recognised the importance of Planning to achieve its ambition. The Council has published (December 2023) an Interim Guidance and Position Statement in relation to planning for climate change. The interim guidance is supported by a sustainability statement and checklist for planning applications with an implementation date of 15 January 2024. Planning for climate change - Dorset Council 433. Appendix A states it is guidance, and the wording is open to interpretation with few strict requirements. However, as the document is referred to in the policies, the document would become a requirement. The status of policy means that the document needs to be viability tested as there are costs with complying with the proposed targets.	Consider when drafting next version
ET/11 Dorset Council	434. Considering housing development in Weymouth is already struggling to provide affordable housing it is likely to be found that a number of these targets are not viable. It is strongly recommended that the objectives are removed from all policies and the appendix is rebranded as a vision to overcome the concerns raised.	Consider when drafting next version
ET/12 Dorset Council	435. Appendix A goes over and above the requirements of the Draft Dorset Council sustainability statement and checklist. Requiring this in an area known for issues with viability is a concern. If the document is to remain as is, a viability assessment is needed to determine if the requirements of the document would hinder development.	Consider when drafting next version
ET/13 Dorset Council	436. Dorset Council is further concerned that this appendix will result in 2 checklists being created, leading to confusion. The requirements and suggestions for the developer, whilst in many instances are suggestions, lead to more administration and report writing. These are likely to either dissuade development through additional costs of commissioning reports and implementing the requirements or hinder development completely as the developer would be unable to comply.	Consider when drafting next version
ET/14	I do not agree with limiting the use of private motor vehicles as, on some occasions, these are necessary, i.e. having to take an animal to the vet, when using public transport would cause the animal distress, and there being a long walk at either end of the process, or urgent medical attention is needed. Some taxi drivers refuse to take animals in their cabs now. That also applies to the disabled, who have mobility problems, and carers trying to take patients to hospital etc, or when specialist equipment needs to be transported with them. I also do not agree with EVs, which appear to be catching fire with alarming regularity, notwithstanding the cost to children in other countries subjected to harms through mining the lithium required for the batteries, and the fact that the materials employed are notorious for being non-recyclable, causing more harm to the environment than petrol or diesel vehicles.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of Env Targets document
ET/15	Page 162 Target 2 Photovoltaic panels on existing residential buildings. I do not agree with forcing the public to install solar panels on their homes. The cost is astronomical, they only last 25 years, and the cost far outweighs the benefits. I have a free-standing system and it takes a very long time to charge the batteries with disappointing results.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of Env Targets document
ET/16	Page 162, Target 3. Smart devices. I do not agree with forcing the public to install smart devices against their will. Smart meters have been known to catch fire over the years. They use cheap batteries from China (the same as the EVs), and there is no surge protection in the devices. They can also be used to switch off someone's energy supply, or charge more at certain times of the day. They can cause health issues to those affected by them, and sometimes they do not work at all, or are more likely to be faulty.	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of Env Targets document
ET/17	Page 164 Objective 2. Heat Pumps. I do not agree with forcing the public to install heat pumps. These are costly and ineffective, require a lot of space and upheaval to install, as well as cause noise disturbance. People who have had these installed, costing £15,000, have said that their homes are colder, and it costs more to heat as they are having to resort to alternative means. And as for using solar panels to heat them that adds insult to injury. Are the government and local council trying to intentionally bankrupt residents?	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of Env Targets document
ET/18	Page 165 Target 10. Water rationing. I do not agree with the UK government's target to ration people to 110 litres of water per day. This is more about control than the fallacy of 'saving the planet' and 'climate change' being the reason behind such draconian measures. 110 or 95 litres per day? That will do down well with the public, paying your salaries. Not!"	Noted comment criticising aspect(s) of Env Targets document
	Appendix B	
AH/1 Dorset Council	Appendix B: Affordable Housing Definition from the NPPF (page 64)	Noted comment.

No.	Respondents' Comments	SG Conclusions				
	437. The definition of affordable housing in the NPPF should be read alongside the Written Ministerial Statement on 24 May 2021. Affordable Homes update. Written statements - Written questions, answers and statements - UK Parliament					
	Appendix C					
GM/1 Dorset Council	439. Figure adjacent to Figure 4 is not numbered. This should be Figure 3.	Consider when drafting next version				
	Appendix D					
GM/2 Dorset Council	<p>Appendix D: Incidental Open Space Maps</p> <p>Comments provided within the incidental open space policy.</p> <p>440. Whilst it is useful to have these general images, a more specific map outlining each individual space would be useful. For example as per figure 1 of Appendix C instead of map 14D.</p> <p>441. The image of Weymouth Town Council at the end of the Appendix is not relevant to the topic open spaces. We suggest an image of an example incidental open space or no image at all.</p>	Consider when drafting next version				
SP/1	<p>Appendix E (pages 203 - 218)</p> <p>This appendix compares the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan (SPNP) with the Draft Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan (WNP) and identifies areas where the WNP would replicate or enhance the SPNP. Firstly, I support option (b) of the two possible ways that the SPNP could be incorporated into the WNP and having studied the cross-mapping table and read the comments, I am happy that the Draft Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan both preserves and enhances the policies set out in the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Support Noted				
SP/2 Dorset Council	<p>Appendix E: Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Policies</p> <p>442. We welcome the cross-mapping of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Policies against the Proposed Policies in the Pre-Submission Version of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan. This information could however be considerably condensed by moving the report into the supporting evidence base and summarising the table as simply policy references. For example.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="402 1048 1050 1173"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="402 1048 689 1070">Sutton Poyntz Policy</th> <th data-bbox="689 1048 1050 1070">Weymouth Policy(s)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="402 1070 689 1128">BNE1: Protection and enhancement of wildlife habitat in relation to new development</td> <td data-bbox="689 1070 1050 1173"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Policy WNP03: Wildlife Habitats and Areas • Draft Policy WNP04: Wildlife Corridors • Draft Policy WNP05: Ecological Impact of Development </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Sutton Poyntz Policy	Weymouth Policy(s)	BNE1: Protection and enhancement of wildlife habitat in relation to new development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Policy WNP03: Wildlife Habitats and Areas • Draft Policy WNP04: Wildlife Corridors • Draft Policy WNP05: Ecological Impact of Development 	Consider when drafting next version
Sutton Poyntz Policy	Weymouth Policy(s)					
BNE1: Protection and enhancement of wildlife habitat in relation to new development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Policy WNP03: Wildlife Habitats and Areas • Draft Policy WNP04: Wildlife Corridors • Draft Policy WNP05: Ecological Impact of Development 					
SP/3 Dorset Council	443. The annex of 'Sutton Poyntz Character Areas' remains relevant and should be retained.	Noted comment.				