

Public Document Pack



DORSET COUNCIL - WESTERN AND SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 9 JULY 2020

A recording of the meeting can be found on the committee page by using the following link:- [Link to committee page](#)

Present: Cllrs Simon Christopher (Chairman), David Gray (Vice-Chairman), Pete Barrow, Kelvin Clayton, Susan Cocking, Jean Dunseith, Nick Ireland, David Shortell, Sarah Williams and Kate Wheller

Also present: Cllr David Walsh (Portfolio Holder – Planning)

Officers present (for all or part of the meeting):

Bob Burden (Senior Planning Officer), Ann Collins (Area Manager – Western and Southern Team), Philip Crowther (Legal Business Partner - Regulatory), Colin Graham (Engineer (Development Liaison) Highways), Darren Rogers (Enforcement Manager), Guy Tetley (Engineer (Development Liaison)) and Denise Hunt (Democratic Services Officer).

128. Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Cllr Louie O'Leary.

129. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Jean Dunseith declared that she had predetermined Application No WP/17/00836/FUL - Land NW side of Wessex Roundabout, Radipole Lane, Weymouth and would not take part in the debate or vote on this application.

Cllr David Shortell declared that he had predetermined Application No WP/17/00836/FUL - Land NW side of Wessex Roundabout, Radipole Lane, Weymouth and would not take part in debate or vote on this application.

130. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 June 2020 were confirmed and signed.

131. Public Participation

Representations by the public to the Committee on individual planning applications are detailed below. There were no questions, petitions or deputations received on other items on this occasion.

132. **Planning Applications**

Members considered written reports submitted on planning applications as set out below.

133. **WD/D/20/000583 - 82 East Street, Beaminster, DT8 3DT**

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of a bungalow and erection of 5 dwellings.

Two further representations were received following publication of the report that had been included in an update sheet circulated to the committee the day before the meeting.

Members were shown site location plans showing the existing bungalow and large rear garden, properties along East Street, allotments to the south of the site; the relationship of the site to the town centre showing the site outside, but adjoining the Defined Development Boundary (DDB) and Conservation Area (CA).

The proposed site plan showed the vehicular access was via the existing access, however, the boundary walls would be removed in order to improve visibility. This access followed the rear of 64-80 East Street. The hatched areas in the site plan were as a result of comments made by the Conservation Officer to provide some glimpses towards the allotments and countryside beyond the garages in that location. Trees along the site boundary of Nos 54 and 56 were to be retained.

An aerial photograph of the site showed the existing bungalow and wider garden area of the site as well as the extensive garden area of the neighbouring property at 92 East Street. Representations had been received in relation to the impact of amenity due to overlooking from plot 1 on this property that was addressed in the report.

The proposal included land controlled by the applicant for a secondary pedestrian access onto the site (between 62 and 64 East Street) and highways required details to be submitted should permission of this application be granted.

Photographs were shown that included the access off East Street, showing the narrowness of East Street itself with many parked cars on one side of the highway; the large garden area of the application site; looking towards the side of the existing bungalow and rear of properties in East Street, including the proposed pedestrian access.

A plan was also shown that included a bin storage area at the rear of No 86; the provision of 14 car parking spaces and 2 garages; proposed rear and front elevations; ground floor & first floor plans; side elevations; cross sections of the existing, withdrawn and proposed scheme; and details of materials. The key planning points were highlighted.

A comparison with a scheme on Portland for 3 backland dwellings with a single narrow access where the planning inspector concluded the risk to be low had been outlined in the report.

A number of written representations in objection to the proposal were received from members of the public and Beaminster Town Council that were read out at the meeting and are attached to these minutes.

Cllr Rebecca Knox - Dorset Council - Beaminster, addressed the Committee, saying that in order to satisfy the greenfield status of the application site, that proposals should be for affordable housing and come with evidence of unmet housing need. However, Beaminster Town Council had outlined other significant opportunities for housing in that area and the proposal included no affordable housing.

She drew attention to the undulating elevation of the site with the houses along East Street sitting at the bottom of an incline meaning that the field would need to be dug out in order to sink the elevation of the new properties into the field. She considered that this would give rise to a flooding issue and identified flood zones 1, 2 and 3 in the immediate vicinity and that soakaways would not work in clay soil and serve as mitigation. The report did not include the view of the Environment Agency or Wessex water. She also questioned the comparison made with the application in Easton Street, Portland given the difference in the width of this street when compared to East Street and that other applications in the area had been refused on highways grounds.

The committee adjourned at 10:33am for 5 minutes and reconvened at 10.38am.

In response to comments made during public participation, the Enforcement Manager confirmed that consultation with the Environment Agency had not been a requirement of this application and that a condition included finished floor levels. The comparison with a scheme on Portland was made due to a single access with vehicles emerging between a terrace of properties which the Planning Inspector had concluded was low risk, rather than the width of the streets in either case.

Members asked about the definitive status of the site and the impact on the application and were advised that there was no lawful development certificate to state that the garden land was associated with this property, but was an open field owned by the owner of the property. In terms of the site being outside the DDB, members needed to determine whether there were significant adverse effects that outweighed the presumption in favour of development.

Further to questions it was confirmed that bins would be collected from the bin storage rather than being collected from the individual properties, meaning that the refuse lorry would need to park at the site access for a short period in order to collect the bins. It was also confirmed that a condition of the recommendation required details of the pedestrian link between 62 and 64 East Street needed

to be submitted, approved and carried out prior to occupation of the new houses.

The Highways Engineer outlined some previous applications in the area that had been allowed or refused on appeal. He stated that the development would create approximately 18-20 trips a day which was not considered to be so severe as to warrant refusal on highways grounds.

The width of the access would enable emergency vehicles to access the site and there were several similar accesses in the vicinity. The access complied with guidance in terms of the low speed approach due to the reduced vehicle speeds through this area as a result of the narrowness and parked cars in East Street.

Members remained concerned about the vehicular access and safety of exiting the site despite removal of the existing walls, fence and pillars on either side to improve visibility. The view was also expressed that removal of the walls could remove a degree of protection for the boundary properties.

Members also highlighted that sites outside the DDB were outlined in the Local Plan as exception sites used for affordable housing and that this proposal went against that policy.

The Enforcement Manager referred to the position with regards to the housing land supply and advised that the Council had granted a number of permissions on land outside the DDB.

Further comment was made that photographs viewed as part of the presentation had been pieced together to form a panoramic view, in such a way that it was difficult to gauge the size of the site.

Throughout the debate, the question of undertaking a site visit was raised on a number of occasions. The Solicitor drew attention to the practicalities of arranging a site visit having regard to social distancing rules and its impact on the length of time taken to determine the application.

Proposed by Cllr David Gray, seconded by Cllr Kate Wheller.

Decision: That the application be deferred for a site visit.

Following consideration of this application, the committee adjourned at 11:35am for a short comfort break and reconvened at 11.40am.

134. **WD/D/20/001014 - Creek Caravan Park, Fishers Place, Ringstead, Dorchester, DT2 8NG**

The Committee considered an application to vary planning conditions 1 and 2 and the removal of conditions 3 and 4 of planning permission 207358 granted on 13 December 1962 as the application wished to operate the site with 30 static caravans for a longer season in line with the operation of other sites in the area.

The Enforcement Manager presented the application for a variation of conditions on previous planning conditions in the 1960s that sought to extend the season for the occupancy of the caravans from 9 February to 10 January to include Christmas and February school half term periods each year. An anomaly caused in the original permission with regard to the stationing of 40 caravans with permission for 30 had also been addressed.

An update sheet circulated to members before the meeting included additional representations, including some in support. A further letter had also been received the previous day objecting to the extension of the season beyond the current 7month period of April-October.

Members were shown a site location plan, aerial photos showing the 30 caravans and wider context of the site as well as photos taken by a neighbour showing access to the dwellings, the coastline to the east of the site and stepped access beyond the site to the east.

The Enforcement Officer outlined the key planning points and advised that the issues raised as a result of the consultation including the impact on the character of the area and on amenity needed to be balanced against the benefit to the local economy.

A number of written representations were received that were read out by an officer at the meeting and are attached to these minutes.

Cllr Nick Ireland, the ward member for the area, highlighted that Osmington Parish Council had not been consulted and that the notice had been erected on private land. He proposed that the application be amended so that the site was closed between 15th January and 15th March each year in line with other caravan parks in the area. He highlighted that many sites were becoming residential which was against the spirit of the restrictions.

The Enforcement Manager stated that as a result of the Covid 19 pandemic, planning officers relied on applicants and agents to erect notices where they could be seen by the public. This notice had been placed on the caravan notice board and people were able to walk onto the land to see it. The neighbour immediately adjacent to the site was notified by letter, however, this was a holiday home.

The Vice-Chairman stated that ensuring that notices were accessible to the public rather than on private land and informing neighbouring Parish Councils should be investigated and this would be discussed with the Planning Portfolio Holder.

Proposed by Cllr Nick Ireland, seconded by Cllr Peter Barrow.

Decision: That the application be approved and that the description of development be altered to “Station caravans” and subject to the conditions outlined in the appendix to these minutes.

135. **WP/17/00836/FUL - Land NW Side of Wessex Roundabout, Radipole Lane, Weymouth - Appeal against non-determination**

The report was introduced by the Area Manager - Western & Southern who explained that the applicant had lodged an appeal against non-determination of this application that would now be determined by the Planning Inspectorate. The report sought an indication from members on its decision had it determined the application in February 2020. It was confirmed that no additional information had been provided by the applicant since that time.

Members were shown a plan of the application site that included the area of the reserved matters application and the access, ponds and landscaping that was the subject of this application. Both applications had been submitted separately due to the former council areas covered by Weymouth & Portland Borough Council (access) and West Dorset District Council (residential). A softworks plan showed a pavement on the south of the access with no continuation on the south into the site. This meant that people would have to cross the road to the north to continue into the site. A plan of the proposed relocated access demonstrated that it would not impact on existing parking alongside football stadium should the reserve matters application for the residential development not come to fruition. Google map views were also shown of Wessex roundabout and the existing access from different directions. The key planning issues were outlined.

The Solicitor provided advice to members in relation to pre-determination due to prior consideration of the application by the Committee in February 2020.

Cllr Nick Ireland stated that there was no access for cycles due to the narrow footpath and that the current design required anyone on foot or cycle to cross the access to continue the pavement on the northern side. He proposed that the application be refused under the NPPF and Local Plan ENV 11.

Members expressed further concerns in relation to the single access onto a busy roundabout along a school route, all of which became relevant should the residential development go ahead.

Proposed by Cllr Nick Ireland, seconded by Cllr Peter Barrow.

Decision:

That the application would have been refused for the reason outlined in the appendix to these minutes if an appeal against non-determination had not been submitted.

136. **WP/19/01016/FUL - St Nicholas Church, Buxton Road, Weymouth**

The Committee considered an application to demolish an existing church and erect 18 affordable flats with external amenity space and parking spaces.

The Senior Planning Officer made reference to a letter of objection that had been received from a neighbouring property stating the proposed building

would block their TV reception. However, this was a private matter and if the proposal went ahead was quite doubtful

Following the circulation of the update sheet prior to the meeting comments on the proposal had been received from Cllr Clare Sutton, one of the Local Members. She felt whilst it was important to protect the character of the area the ability to provide affordable housing was paramount and she was content with the application.

The Senior Planning Officer gave members a presentation on the proposal highlighting the building in situ at the present time along with the bungalow which was situated at the rear of the church. Members were also shown the height of the proposed building which was below the height of the neighbouring Victorian villas. He advised there would be 16 car spaces underground with a further 2 spaces at the front of the property in readiness for the 18 units. Each unit would be 2 bedrooms, 67 square metres in area.

The Senior Planning Officer had met with the bungalow owner and some amendments had been made to the proposal following that visit. Pop out windows with obscure glazing were highlighted in order to protect the secluded part of the garden of the bungalow.

The main planning issues were highlighted to members, these included:-

- Principle
- Residential development within defined development boundary
- 100% affordable housing,
- Contribution towards 5 year housing land supply
- Effect on conservation area
- Effect on residential amenity and;
- Highway safety.

A number of written representations objecting to the proposal were read out by the Technical Officer and are attached to these minutes.

The Senior Planning Officer made reference to comments made regarding over development of the site and noted that the amenity space would be over 200 square metres for community use.

There had been a number of comments about the units starting off as affordable homes and then being secured as second homes. There would be legal constraints in place to ensure these units could only be used for affordable housing.

With regards to some lack of communication with certain properties, the Senior Planning Officer noted this was possibly as those properties were not adjacent to the red line of the application site. Properties higher up the slope had made comments about possible overshadowing and overlooking but these properties were about 46 metres away so it was felt there was no issue with this.

In respect of 'the decision already had been made' comment, the Senior Planning Officer explained that the case officers made the recommendations and elected members made the decisions.

The Senior Planning Officer felt that the issue about drainage had been addressed. A report had been issued to the Flood Risk Manager who was content and had recommended appropriate conditions which had been included.

The Highways Officer made reference to comments made about the increase of vehicles and appreciated that the current building had been underused in recent years but in the past it would have been quite a busy area. He would expect there to be a lower number of vehicles with the proposed flats. Accessibility via the highway was good and there was no recorded accident history within 110 metres of the property. However, the intention was to make it even safer.

In respect of the quantity of car parking, the Officer advised there were no minimum standards only guidance. However, the proposed building was on a bus route and was near a cycle route.

Cllr Brian Heatley spoke in support of the proposal, which is also attached to the minutes.

Cllr Ireland noted that there were not many opportunities in Weymouth for affordable housing but asked for confirmation if the units would be for rent or sale. The Senior Planning office confirmed the units would be for rent and that the Housing Enabling Officer was content with the application. Cllr Ireland highlighted the access to the Rodwell Trail for cycling and was happy to propose the recommendation.

Cllr Wheller made reference to comments that the proposal was not in keeping for the area but felt that it did reflect other architecture in the area. She felt the developers had been very imaginative and considerate with the proposed building. She was very pleased to see the building was 100% affordable housing. She made reference to a pedestrian crossing on Wyke Road where problems with a new building were now being mitigated but felt it would be better to sort any potential issues beforehand.

Cllr Dunseith was generally in favour of the development but had concerns about the car parking and questioned where other cars would go as nearby streets were quite busy. She felt the entry to the flats off the road might be a bit small. The Highways Officer advised the width of the access would be 4.5 metres and that the current standard width was 5 metres. The Senior Planning Officer advised that an amended plan could be sought to increase the driveway entrance width to 5 metres.

There was a concern regarding the amenity space, with 18x2 bedroom flats there would be a number of children and it would be important for residents to have somewhere outside to go.

Cllr Cocking felt that the housing was desperately needed for the area and was happy to second the proposal, as long as condition included to state it was not for holiday home use.

Following a question whether the sub-station referenced in the presentation would be removed or incorporated, the Senior Planning Officer advised that his understanding from the applicant was there was no problem for it to be removed.

Proposed by Cllr Nick Ireland, seconded by Cllr Susan Cocking

Decision:

(A): That authority be delegated to grant to the Head of Planning, subject to completion of a S106 agreement to secure provision of 100% affordable housing, and subject to the receipt of a satisfactorily amended plan in respect of the width of the vehicular access (to be increased to 5m), and the planning conditions outlined in the appendix to these minutes.

(B) Refuse permission for the reasons set out below if the legal agreement under Section 106 of the town and country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) is not completed within 6 months of the date of the committee resolution or such extended time as is agreed by the Head of Planning.

1. Policy HOUS1 of the adopted West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan 2015 requires a minimum on-site provision of units as affordable housing and in the absence of a planning obligation to secure these affordable units the scheme would fail to meet the substantial unmet need for affordable housing in the district and the proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy HOUS1 of the adopted West Dorset Weymouth and Portland Local Plan. Furthermore the community-related benefits inherent in the scheme would not be achieved. Hence the scheme would be contrary to the objectives of paragraph 92 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

137. Urgent items

There were no urgent items.

138. Update Sheet

The update sheet is attached to these minutes.

Appendix - Decision List

Duration of meeting: 9.30 am - 3.30 pm

Chairman

.....

Western & Southern Area Planning Committee - 9 July 20

Written Submissions

WD/D/20/000583 - 82 East Street, Beaminster, DT8 3DT

Fiona Laidlaw-Smith

Objection to the above Planning Application

Briefly, I am extremely worried about my house, No. 80 East Street, Beaminster.

The corner, nearest the entrance to No. 82, was knocked a few months ago, by a lorry driving straight down East Street trying to negotiate between my house and cars parked on the other side of the road outside their houses, quite legally.

Lorries entering or exiting No. 82 will have much more difficulty, if they head to or from Whitcombe Road (B3163) along East Street.

There is no pavement between No. 80 and the houses opposite. Pedestrians sometimes have to take refuge in the doorway of No. 80, even when cars are driving up or down East Street.

Please do not pass this planning application.

John Teasdale

I have lived on East Street for almost 40 years and seen some big changes in traffic and parking. This application will only exacerbate an already very difficult situation. The current local plan has been mindful of this and identified sites well away from the old parts of town

Applications to build new houses in East Street have been resisted on one occasion for a single dwelling next to no35 with better access than no.82. Four houses were approved on the Brit but only after part demolition of a building. The access prior to demolition was better than no82.

More recently the request to build 3 houses beyond East Street but using the Street for access would only be considered by Highways with the introduction of a traffic management scheme citing safety grounds. Matthew Piles wrote to locals saying that such a scheme would require public consultation. The opening to no 82 could not be at a more dangerous location and yet no mention of the need for traffic management. So what makes a street deemed by the Authority to be unsafe without a scheme suddenly safe?

The NPPF guidelines would appear to have been taken to relax the safety requirements. This cannot be the case and anyway the 2015 view mandating the need for traffic management must have considered the situation potentially severe.

By means of a comparison section 16.26 draws the members attention to a proposal at Portland where, and I quote “arguably the access width and visibility is worse than that proposed on East Street” unquote The highway width at no 82 is 4.97 metres and the equivalent at Portland is 19.2 metres. I am not sure what the point is meant to be.

The report does not pay enough attention to the future and in particular climate change and heavy rainfall onto a surface which is largely clay. The cottages on East Street look particularly vulnerable.

Cramming extra houses into an unsuitable site when over 100 houses are earmarked elsewhere in Beaminster makes no sense to local people, especially as they are not affordable. Please listen to the Town Council.

Chris Chaney

The Highways Authority has ignored the impact of incremental traffic generated by the proposed development elsewhere on East Street, despite many representations highlighting this issue. Their assessment and submission focus ONLY on hazards in the immediate vicinity of the site access. Further, the applicant has provided NO information on expected traffic generation and vehicle movements, let alone any plan to mitigate their impact on East Street – nor has it been requested by the Authority.

East Street is one of the oldest areas of Beaminster, a narrow residential road with many houses opening directly onto the highway and very limited off-street parking for residents. Since June 2015, the Authority has accepted that traffic movements on East Street are precarious and hazardous for residents & other road users. It has consistently recommended refusal for every application for any new dwellings in the vicinity of East Street, on each occasion (four applications for 1 to 23 units) saying: “The residential development proposal will generate further traffic and pedestrian movements along East Street, a County highway with variable and limited carriageway and footway widths.

In the absence of the construction of, or programme for, a detailed improvement scheme design to provide suitable and appropriate traffic management and safety enhancements for this street, this development would be likely to cause danger and inconvenience to all highway users.” In other words, the Authority accepts that any additional traffic on East Street will have severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network which, as they helpfully point out in their submission, is a sound reason for refusal (viz. NPPF [2019], §109).

This position was also upheld by the Planning Inspector when a refusal for one of these applications was taken to appeal and subsequently dismissed – he even cited NPPF as a reason, adding that: “I acknowledge that existing development has taken place alongside Hollymoor Lane which utilises East Street for access. However, the evidence is also clear that further development requires resolution of highway and pedestrian conditions on East Street.”

It is puzzling why such a clear and well-evidenced highways safety issue has been deliberately ignored for this particular application (Officer’s Report, §17.24). Should approval be granted, not only would it be in ignorance of the severity of its impact on the safety of road users in East Street, but it would also be in direct contradiction to the Authority’s substantiated position for the past five years. It would also challenge the soundness of previous Council decisions to refuse such applications.

This application as submitted should be refused on these grounds.

Mike and Carol Tolman

We object to this development for the following reasons:

1. Members of my family have lived in our property (54 East Street) since approximately 1960 and the field behind us has always been a field/scrub land, and never used as an extended garden. This would mean a change of use which, to my knowledge, has never been authorised.
2. This development would be outside the defined development boundary and, therefore, the field should be protected from development as it is part of the wider Green Network within Beaminster, providing varied wildlife habitat.
3. The proximity of the development to our property (54 East St) will be detrimental to us as we have windows in all rooms overlooking the proposed development; we will be severely affected due to increased noise pollution, loss of privacy, loss of light, etc.
4. East Street is a narrow street which has only limited pavements; the part from 58 East St to the turning into Woodswater Lane, (which included the reposed access to the development), has no pavement and there would, therefore, be much greater risk to pedestrians, accidents, etc. Also, East Street can get very congested due to heavy lorries and tractors from local farms, waste collection lorries, delivery vehicles, etc; this development would only exacerbate the situation and cause more problems for parking, visibility, accidents, etc
5. With reference to further information that has been sourced, it is clear that the proposed site is definitely in the conservation area, and the track along the back of the site to the East is subject to the warning status of 'EA Surface Water Risk depth 0.1%'; this means that there will be a much greater potential risk of flooding to properties surrounding the proposed development site, including ours 54 East St, (which is adjacent to the site), if this development goes ahead.

We hope you thoroughly look into our above points before making your decision.

William Dixon

The statement from Highways would suggest there is no problem with the proposal, but for the residents of East Street and surrounding area who experience using the street every day, there is. This is demonstrated by the numerous objections to both this and the withdrawn proposal.

The traffic survey carried out in 2013 showed traffic speed in the vicinity of the site was not always below the prescribed limit. Is 30mph safe in an area where there are no footpaths and front doors open directly onto the narrow carriageway?

Highways have failed to examine the effect of removing the parking that currently takes place directly in front of the proposed access, which would result in increased traffic speeds. The speeding up of the frequent HGVs that serve the 3 farms on Hollymoor Lane has not been considered. Or, is the parking to remain and inhibit the access? It cannot be argued both ways.

The alterations to the access are claimed to maximise visibility splays, but this is not true and a simple drawing would demonstrate this. No sightlines or vehicle manoeuvring drawings have been submitted. The fact they are not presented, is, I would suggest, evidence that the drawings would not support the Highways case.

Traffic has increased in recent years, so too has the damage by vehicles to front doorsteps. Recently a vehicle drove over my front doorstep, shunting the food waste bin along the street. There are numerous doorsteps already damaged by vehicles. Some doorsteps have small pedestrian bridges over traditional historic stone drainage channels, these features are specifically referred to in the conservation area appraisal as a conservation asset. These too will suffer more damage, but they are given no mention in the conservation officer's report. The development will do nothing to improve matters.

The absence of any benchmark for the site levels is a real problem. Without this, it is impossible to know at what level the buildings are in relation to everything else. The levels between the building plots as shown would indicate a difference in level between them equivalent to a 4storey building! The difference between the plot levels and the Ordnance Survey levels shown on the drawings are beyond 4 storeys! Is the Officers Report 6.7 inaccurate or misleading?

Levels are fundamental to all planning applications, their effect substantial. This application makes particular show of reducing levels as a key part of the design to attempt to mitigate its negative impact on existing properties but what are they? The old stone cottages around East Street do not all have modern dpc's and dpm's and their habitability susceptible to any increase in surface water levels.

The application should be refused.

Martin Waters

It is disappointing that the apparent numerous inaccuracies, errors, omissions and unsupported assertions in the application have not been addressed during the scrutiny process e.g. The Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol Plan Certificate has been issued based on a report that stated there were no ponds within 250 metres of site, despite my two large ponds being within 5 metres!

It appears the NPPF is being used to promote the application and ignoring the numerous sections of it that is also meant to protect the character and nature of our surroundings and the community. I trust as our elected representatives you will take a more balanced view in deciding what is acceptable.

The following I suggest are unacceptable:

The proposal is to develop an area that is mostly a field and not garden outside the defined development area and will negatively impact both the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Most houses adjoining the site sit one storey lower than the ground level of the field and will have their residential amenity adversely affected by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing / loss of light, noise, fumes and existing views. The amended plan does not resolve these issues as the accuracy of the drawings is being questioned when compared to Ordinance Survey which show an ever greater difference in levels. The development will be over-bearing and again drawings appear to be misleading and missing any benchmark for the site levels.

I am particularly concerned with plot 1 which would have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of our garden (92) by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing and loss of light. The Officer's declared orientation of Plot 1 is not totally correct in my opinion. The gable end would be facing some of our garden, but the rear would see over the ponds, wildlife sitting areas and greenhouse where we spend most of our time! In addition to the obscure glazed bathroom window there is a bedroom window within 1.2 metres of bathroom window which will have clear line of sight into the wildlife sitting area of our garden and greenhouse. We have spent years developing this wildlife sitting area and our enjoyment, mental wellbeing and the welfare of the wildlife will be detrimentally harmed by the closeness of the new houses.

Despite the many objections should you feel inclined to give approval please make it a condition that a developer financed public consultation takes place and that an appropriate traffic management and safety enhanced scheme is approved by planning and highways, together with Beaminster Town Council. Also both rear upstairs windows of Plot 1 be obscured glass.

Please refuse the application for the good of the many.

Pat Waters

The Officer in 17.17 appears to dismiss my loss of amenity by stating I have an extensive rear garden area. I presume the inference be go and use another part other than the large area that is going to be overlooked and hence loss of privacy. So I presume he would suggest I move my greenhouse, ponds, seating areas, summerhouse and planting areas. The Officer's estimate of Plot 1's orientation in my opinion is incorrect and the bedroom window will clearly see into my sitting areas.

The Officer states each application has to be considered in its own merits but then quotes the Inspector on an appeal for 35 Easton Street but does not mention that the application was refused. In my opinion that application can't be compared to this one as there are material differences such as pavement / no pavement and the two streets are different in physical nature and by types of vehicles using them.

Highways assume that the arrangement of the access ensures slow speeds to be used when approaching the site. This is a seriously flawed theory. The majority of vehicles passing my house (92 East Street) at the start of East Street from Hollymoor Lane and in particular HGV's do so at to or exceeding the speed limit. To exit the site and see around the corner the vehicle's front end will be in the direct path of oncoming vehicles which will not have sufficient breaking distance to stop or space to avoid. This is a SEVERE safety issue.

The proposed site though only adding "4 more units" doesn't tell the true story of the danger to the inhabitants and visitors of East Street. If you survey East Street when people are at home 80% of East Street is single track due to parked cars which also overspill into Woodswater Lane and Hollymoor Lane beyond the junction of Riverside. It has been previously agreed by the experts that East Street couldn't handle any more capacity no matter how small. Also the proposed junction is potentially very dangerous as there are normally parked cars opposite. Cars leaving Woodswater Lane do so on the wrong side of the road due to parked cars. It is probably the most dangerous junction in Beaminster. In addition to occupants, visitors and deliveries people will go down the proposed new cul de sac looking for car parking spaces and if not successful will have to come back out and turn right to park in Hollymoor Lane. This could easily cause an increase of traffic movement out of the site entrance to increase by a factor of sixty times what it is now!

Please refuse the application – save lives.

Melvyn Warner

The proposed houses are to be built outside the Defined Development Area, this area was excluded from the Local Plan and its latest revision. This indicates that there is sufficient land elsewhere in Beaminster to meet the Government's requirements of the number of extra homes to be built over the coming years.

Thus, allowing these houses to be built outside a defined area may be deemed illegal. It could also set a precedence where an area outside but adjacent to the boundary of a development area could be incorporated into the neighbouring site within the area and then permission sought to develop, thus circumventing the whole of the planning process. Boundaries set legally should be respected.

An area in Hollymoor which should have been outside the development area was accidentally included within, as a result planning permission was given for a dwelling, the legal requirements having to be respected; similarly, the same applies here, the proposed houses are outside the boundary and so permission should not be given to build thus respecting the existing boundary.

The Government Inspector made comment in the Local Plan that future development in the area should be carefully considered because of the level of traffic in East Street already existing at that time. If this application is allowed, it is inevitable traffic flow will increase and so to the danger to all users of East St.

Therefore, I feel this application should be refused.

Ghislaine Warner

The level of danger to pedestrians, cyclists and others that exist in East Street at the moment will only be increased if this application is granted.

Five years ago the Highways Authority in their report on the application to build one dwelling at the end of East street in Hollymoor was that this one dwelling on its own would increase the danger to users of east Street.

It is impossible to construct a path the whole length of East Street, because the constraints of the width of the road, and the existing buildings either side. In places there is only enough for one vehicle.

The site views at the proposed entrance fall well below the Government's minimum requirements for such a junction; existing buildings would have to be demolished to achieve them.

Along with the extra traffic, and an unsatisfactory junction would only increase the danger to the public that already exists.

It is proposed that the houses are to have soakaways, rather than being connected to mains drainage. Soakaways at times fail, if this occurs and flooding of neighbouring houses occurs, who will be responsible for compensating those affected, the Council? The site lies on a clay pan and so flooding is not out of the question.

Given the above this development should not be permitted.

Rachel Bowditch

Along with other objectors I continue to object to this application, having read the Officer's Report.

PLANNING STATUS OF THE LAND

One of my objections relates to the claim in the planning application that the land is "an extended Garden" to the Bungalow. Regrettably the Officer's report does not include any information that should be in the possession of the Council to confirm this claim. From the knowledge I have the field has always been of a different planning status and is certainly not an "extended garden".

I wish to explain why I believe this claim in the application does not stand up to scrutiny of the facts. I was born on 24 March 1931. From that date I have lived at 60 East Street. I am therefore in a very good position to say what the land has been used for since that date.

History of use of the land

1. From the 1930's and until after World War 2, circa 1946 or 1947, the land was used as a scrap yard business by a Mr Green. Sometime around that time the scrap was cleared from the field.
2. Around 1950 a Mrs Maud Brinson, a local farmer who owned other land and property in the East Street area purchased the field and continued to farm it.
3. Around the mid 1960's a local builder, Mr Ron Legg, occupied the land and used it for storing building equipment and materials. At some point a planning application was put in for a house, which was refused by the planning authority.
4. Around 1970 Mr and Mrs Mist took over occupancy of the field and ran a riding stables and livery business, erecting a stable block on the land.
5. Following a fire in 1978 the stable block burnt down and the business came to an end.
6. The field has been left unused since that date, the grass only being cut once or twice a year.

Clearly the land has been used for various business activities over the time at least until 1978. Since then it has laid fallow.

Following the erection of the bungalow aerial photographs show clearly that there was a permanent fence around the garden that formed the curtilage of the bungalow. This did not extend into or enclose the field itself. Unless the Planning Department can show that a Certificate of Lawfulness for the use of land as residential land has been granted for the field, the land is not domestic land in planning terms.

Despite this specific planning objection in my letter dated 28 June 2020, this matter is glossed over in the Officers Report.

Lee and Julie Bowditch

We continue to object to this application, having read the Officer's Report. We highlight 3 issues from our letters dated 28 November 2019 and 26 June 2020

PLANNING STATUS OF THE LAND

The application states that the land on which the new houses are to built is an extended garden. In our letters of objections we stated: "Our house backs onto this field which has for many years (at least since 1931) been a field not a garden. We are not aware that a change of use from agricultural use to domestic garden has ever been authorised."

Research since 22 March 2020 indicates that the land does not benefit from being (in Planning Terms) part of the domestic garden of the bungalow. This appears to be unlawful encroachment outside the curtilage of the existing bungalow, into agricultural land – which the Local Plan states will be resisted strongly.

We can find no evidence that a Certificate of Lawfulness for the use of land as residential land has been granted for the Land. Photographic evidence provided in our submission and also with Cllr. Knox supports this. Unless the Planning Department can show that a Certificate of Lawfulness for the use of land as residential land has been granted for the Land that is the subject to the current application, the land is not domestic land in planning terms. The Officer's Report does not address this point.

The Committee may wish to question the planning officer on whether the land is truly "Extended Garden" and request written evidence of its legal status in planning terms.

DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE THE DEFINED DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARIES

The Local Plan (Policy SUS2) states "Outside defined development boundaries, development will be strictly controlled ... and be restricted to...(amongst others) Affordable Housing. No affordable Housing is proposed in the application.

The Report states that "the location is considered sustainable despite being outside the development area". The Report Para 17.1 gives little reasoning for this compared with greater detail in the Introduction to the Local Plan Para 3.1. More consideration to the good progress made with the LP Review re Beaminster's Housing sites, where Para 17.5 of the report should be given higher weight in the Committee's deliberations.

LOSS OF AMENITY AND TRAFFIC

The report dismisses the many objections regarding loss of amenity without detailed reasons. The numerous objections regarding traffic and safety to pedestrians are also dismissed without good reason.

Invitation to visit the site

Since March 23, site visits by the Committee have not been possible. Now that the Government COVID19 restrictions are eased we request, given the contentious nature of the application, Members DEFER their decision, pending a site visit which can now safely take place.

Yvonne Dobson

I trust the elected members who are charged with the responsibility of deciding this application will pay heed to the huge strength of feeling against it which has been ably expressed in the many written objections. If Local Democracy is to mean anything, then they must decline this application for the very many good reasons already given.

For the safety and well-being of the current residents of East Street, and to avoid setting a dangerous precedent of riding roughshod over the Local Development Plan, I urge members to vote this plan down.

Christine Bright - Town Clerk, Beaminster Town Council

1. Absence of 5 year land supply

In the Joint Local Plan Review of 2017, the Government's target of 775 new dwellings per year for the WDDC /Weymouth and Portland area suggested a formula of 1 new dwelling per 220 residents be used to calculate the supply of 5 year's housing. Using this calculation, and an assessment of the town's population at 3,140, Beaminster's proportionate allocation would be equivalent to 15 dwellings per annum. Since the present Local Plan was adopted, **213 dwellings** have been completed, partially built or have been approved in Beaminster.

Therefore, by these calculations, the town already has over **14 year's** land supply. However, at the present time, we need industry more than housing.

2. Outside the Defined Development Boundary

Policy SUS.2.iii of the Local Plan states that, "*development will be strictly controlled, having particular regard to the need for the protection of the countryside and environmental constraints and be restricted to*"... and lists 12 bullet points, *none of which apply to this development.*

The Planning Officer's statement in para 3.0.2 directly contradicts or ignores the principles of SUS.2.iii. If a Planning Policy is to be of value, it must be upheld.

There are no proposals for affordable housing on this site. HOUS1.i states that the level of affordable housing required should reflect the viability of development land in the local area.

3. Highways Objections

In its response to West Dorset's Draft Local Plan of 2012, Beaminster Town Council stated, "*The 'Manual for Streets' would suggest that the narrow confines of East Street with on-street parking, two way traffic, HGV traffic (including regular farm vehicles) and a major pedestrian route is totally unsuitable for increased traffic usage. The ford in Woodswater Lane would also prevent it being considered as a suitable alternative for access or egress.*"

There have been other applications for small developments using East Street as a feeder road and all have been turned down. Comments by Dorset County Council's Highways Engineer on a previous application were that *“residential development proposals would generate further traffic and pedestrian movements along East Street, a County highway with variable and limited carriageway and footway widths. In the absence of the construction of, or programme for, a detailed improvement design to provide suitable and appropriate traffic management and safety enhancements for this street, this development would be likely to cause danger and inconvenience to all highway users. Hence the application would be contrary to Policy COM7 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan 2015.”*

This was upheld in a subsequent appeal, number APP/F1230/W/16/3146827, in 2016.

WD/D/20/001014 - Creek Caravan Park, Fishers Place, Ringstead, Dorchester, DT2 8NG

Adam Armstrong

As permanent residents and lovers of Ringstead for over 30 years, we are very concerned about the proposal to alter the long-established limit of 7 months residency to as long as 11 months at the Creek Caravan Park. This decisively introduces the possibility of permanent residence at as many as thirty homes in a hitherto rare and desperately preserved site of pristine beauty...an AONB on the World Heritage Jurassic Coast!

An added concern reported to us recently has been the current distressing conflict within the site ownership: 49% of share-holders /lease-holders wish the site to remain as it is BUT 51%, comprising the Fishers' share-ownership, would like to convert caravans to chalets. Indeed long-standing lease-holders (30 years +) have been told simply that their lease may be terminated with no reason given or response to emails.

Possibly the Planning Committee are unaware of this situation? It certainly throws the application into a different light.

Is this sudden desire for a time extension (and a short extension to 9 months is surely enough?) truly to enhance the current conditions or, which we greatly fear, is it a step to further far more invasive development?

Moreover, this disturbing planning permission was sought during the Covid crisis when few if any people were permitted to read the displayed application. This is surely not right?

This is a valuable site potentially of great Private profit. It also directly adjoins National Trust Land. The preservation of Ringstead - a place of such joy to all people especially from Dorset but also from as far as the US or Australia, is surely, in the Committee's opinion far more valuable?

Nicholas and Virginia Hemery

We wish to add our voice to the already existing objections, which set out admirably the reasons why this proposal is unnecessary and detrimental to the fabric of Ringstead.

Ringstead provides a rare place of sanctuary and quiet in Southern England. The current occupancy of the caravans allows for affordable holidays for families, 11 months occupancy allows for permanent dwelling for those who can afford such luxury...especially in the light of the proposed plans to place chalets on the site.

There has been, to our intimate knowledge of Ringstead, no application notice in a visible public site, and we have not heard these plans from the caravan site owners. Therefore no application can surely be granted until an application notice is placed in clear vision for the public.

There is certainly no parking for 30 cars 'to the north of the caravan site'.

There is, to repeat the major objections to this plan, insufficient infrastructure in Ringstead to accommodate this plan.

We have lived in close proximity to Ringstead village for 30+ years, and wish to see it remain as a refuge for people who seek an escape from the commercialization of other seaside destinations in Dorset, England, the UK, and indeed the world.

Tim Wallis

I am concerned that this important application has not received the appropriate time for public scrutiny. I am disappointed that the recommendation to approve this application has been made without the opposing arguments having sufficient time to be heard. The Parish council did not oppose this on 8/6/20 because they had not received any comments simply because no one knew about it. They have informed me that they now oppose it.

The application has been carefully crafted to appear that nothing will change on the site. As a result few of the statutory bodies have commented.

I do not see how any reasonable assessment can be made on such questions as the effects on infrastructure, roads and highways, residential amenities, ecosystems and the local environment, without knowing where this site is going with its further 4 months.

A quiet summer only seasonal caravan site, with lettings currently restricted to 4 out of the 30 caravans is a very different prospect to a site of 30 luxury all year round lodges being heavily marketed and let throughout the year. Surely such intense operations are best suited to less obtrusive sites, that can be properly screened, and do not dominate the local community as this no doubt will.

This is a perfectly profitable business that has served shareholders and leaseholders well for many years that now wishes to maximise its profitability at the expense of residents, infrastructure and the environment. In my opinion the economic benefits to the local community from this will be overshadowed by the damage it will cause to our small hamlet.

Sarah Wallis

A recommendation summary by the council recommending approval to the application contains an amendment to the planning statement from occupancy 9th February to 10th January the following year.

Section 73 of the Town and Country planning Act 1990 would indicate to me that in changing the conditions under which the 1962 permission was approved, it is enabling approval of future planning application.

Jane Birchett

There are some inaccuracies in the planning application in that the applicant states that the site cannot be seen from a public road, footpath, bridleway or other public land. The site is not only starkly visible from the beach but is seen along the SW coastal path when walking in an easterly direction from the Ringstead car park. It remains visible as the path rises towards White Nothe.

On the site plan from the applicant the public footpath S34/19 that crosses the site to a stile in the eastern hedge boundary is not drawn.

There has been a failure of communication as regards the application. We were only notified via an article in the Dorset Echo on 16 June. The public notification went up in the Caravan site's own notice board during 'lockdown' and was not seen by any of the Ringstead residents due to the position of the notice board on private land and in that it was placed amongst other posters. An important neighbour is the NT and they were not alerted. It seems that there is a deliberate attempt to minimise scrutiny of the proposed changes. It is also noteworthy that many caravan owners do not know of these proposals.

A misapprehension has been made that no one was concerned because there were no prior comments until after Trevor Bevan's article in the Echo. On the contrary there are many people worried about the implications of this proposal and there has been consternation at the lack of time for a fuller response.

The directors of the caravan park are less than transparent about their intentions for the caravan site. They seem to want to drop conditions that give the LPA an oversight, they want to extend the occupancy to 48 weeks of the year, 36% more time than previously and all present

caravan owners lose their leases from October 2020 and have to remove their vans. While on the face of it these are regarded as minor conditions in the proposal for residents the clearing of the site of caravans and felling trees indicates to us that this is paving the way for substantial commercialisation with scant regard to the unique nature of Ringstead.

In my estimation 48 weeks of occupancy of a caravan site directly positioned on the Dorset coast with no respite for the residents, no dormancy for the natural environment, light intrusion into dark skies as well as traffic disturbance is too long and risks changing Ringstead's rural identity as a secluded, tranquil hamlet loved by residents and walkers of the SW coast path.

We urge you to decline this proposal.

Debbie Redding (on behalf of applicant)

The Creek Caravan Site is a long established business that currently operates under an out-dated planning permission granted in 1962. Ringstead Caravan Company Ltd was established in 1978 and the site was family owned and run since the 1920's. The family and company have always supported local residents, landowners, businesses, visitors and the Council.

This application made under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act seeks to update the 1962 permission with the removal and variation of conditions, but as is a requirement of section 73, does not fundamentally change the extant permission.

The extended season requested would not allow permanent residence of the caravans. The site would continue to operate under site licence requirements and all caravans would be within the legal definition. No physical changes or building operations are proposed and therefore there will be no change to the visual impact on the surrounding area. No change is proposed to the access and parking arrangements for the site.

In reality the site may not be fully occupied during these additional months and the impact of some additional traffic and visitors would not be seriously detrimental. The longer season would cater for short breaks which are popular at these times and although other facilities at Ringstead may not be open, additional visitors would provide some economic benefit to the wider area. This is a reflection of modern patterns of tourism. Other sites in the area have increased the length of season over recent years and in some cases no seasonal limit at all is imposed.

The influx of visitors to Ringstead in the summer undoubtedly puts pressure on the area, but this application will not change the situation at peak holiday times. Existing infrastructure and services provide adequately for the area. The proposed longer season for occupation of the existing caravans would be when visitor numbers are lower and therefore would not put unacceptable pressure on services and facilities.

No objection is raised by the Parish Council, Natural England or Highways Authority. The Jurassic Coast Trust has understandable concerns regarding coastal erosion and protection, which will need to be considered in any future coastal management proposals. With no

physical change and only amendments to conditions being considered this application does not affect coastal erosion.

The variation and removal of conditions will not make any physical change to the site and will not allow permanent residence. The extended season would provide added security for the future of the business and support the local economy. This would not have a significant adverse effect on local residents and would be in accordance with planning policy. Committee members are asked to support the proposal and grant permission as recommended.

**WP/19/01016/FUL - St Nicholas Church, Buxton Road,
Weymouth DT4 9PJ**

Paul Gardner

I have no objection to the proposed development in principle however there are two points which I would ask the committee to consider.

Firstly the overall design is completely unsympathetic with the surrounding area. Surely a design that blends with the surroundings is all part of the conservation requirements in a conservation area?

Secondly the size is much too large and will dominate the area and be an eye sore if allowed as proposed.

Peter and Elizabeth Hillary

We reside directly to the rear of St Nicholas Church, our garden area is to the front and sides of our property, we have no rear garden. The proposed new build will be directly in front of our property and directly in front of our garden. The height and extent of the proposed new build will therefore create a loss of privacy, a loss of light and a serious loss of value to our property.

Kate Inkster

Further to my letter of objection already submitted when the proposal was first revealed I wish to underline my concerns.

The site is going to be overdeveloped - 18 two-bedroom units is too much for this area, look at the density of existing housing nearby.

There are no gardens or shared outdoor space or nearby parks or playgrounds which makes these units quite unsuitable for families with children.

The facade of the block of flats looks like an office block and not a residential unit. It needs to blend in with the existing houses and premises within the street line & area.

The building is too high, four storeys, it will not blend in with the height of the surrounding buildings despite clever drawings to mitigate this within the plans, it will greatly overlook and overshadow a number of houses around the perimeter of the site.

Not enough provision has been made for car parking of potential residents. It would be prudent to anticipate 2 cars per unit and also visitors. The local roads around the site cannot cope with yet more people looking to park here.

It sits near a busy pedestrian thoroughfare and on a busy road. Access into the site would be across the pavement very near to a pedestrian crossing which is again another potential danger to pedestrians.

Why can the plan not be for several modest and affordable houses (2/3 bedroomed) in a line with the road frontage providing adequate parking and small gardens?

Mark Packer

St Nicholas Church is situated in the Connaught Conservation Area - designated in 2001 as an area of architectural and historical interest because of the Victorian buildings within it.

The adjacent buildings to the church are both mentioned in the designation - the villas to the west and Elsadene to the east.

The proposed development will change a site with no housing and limited traffic to an excessively large 4 storey block of 18 flats with limited architectural merit and no attempt to integrate into the aesthetics of the adjacent buildings.

There will be a marked increase in traffic entering on to a busy A road, both during potential construction and afterwards - not just residents but visitors, delivery and taxi drivers and tradespeople. The entrance is flanked by a bus stop and a pedestrian crossing and the road is especially busy at school drop off and collection times.

Parking is limited and there will be over spill on to adjacent roads, already full of parked cars as these houses do not have garages.

The building line has been drawn as a diagonal from the Victorian Villas to The Bath Store - this is erroneous, The Bath Store should not be considered in the building line as this is for commercial use and lies on the opposite side across Verne Road. The building line should be parallel to the villas to the east.

The green space will be covered in concrete and there will be water run off down the steep slopes of Khartoum Road and Sudan Road.

It seems that the magical words 'affordable housing' are used to shoehorn development approval. These flats will not remain affordable for long. They will be sold at a premium as soon as it is feasible as they are highly desirable with their commanding views of Portland Harbour and close proximity to Castle Cove and Sandsfoot Beach. They will be second homes in next to no time.

If the council really wanted some affordable housing then they could convert a lot of existing larger properties or office blocks in the town into flats without removing green spaces.

I have no objection to development on the site, but this should be a sympathetic design, something along the lines of the old fire station site at the bottom of Boot Hill, or the 2 storey terrace houses built at Prospect Place in Chapelhay.

Properties could be built to mirror the red brick properties on the opposite side of the road. A development of say, 8 terraced houses will still be profitable - just not profitable enough - the motivation appears to be greed.

Julie Price

I would like to register my objection to the plans to redevelop St Nicholas Church, Weymouth which is situated in the Connaught Conservation Area. Whilst I understand the current pressures to build housing, the plan for 18 flats on this plot does not have any architectural merit and will simply create traffic pressures and other problems for those living in the area. The plans do not seem to fit with the architecture of the area and will inevitably increase people and traffic movements in an already busy location. Additionally, the loss of green space to be replaced by concrete and paving will be detrimental to the environment.

The plan squeezes in as many flats as possible into a small area without wider consideration of the impact to those living alongside it or to those who will be living in the new flats. Other plans for development in Weymouth (plans for less residences in a larger area) have been turned down and hence I hope that the council will, in similar fashion, turn down the planned redevelopment of St Nicholas Church.

Mr Chris Peploe

First a personal comment: Although my home is, (and was) shown to be affected by the proposed development, I was surprised and disappointed not to have heard from Dorset Council in the first place. News of the planning application came from neighbours. I had no contact from Dorset Council until I contacted them. I can only guess at the reasons for this. In any case, this has left me with very little confidence in the new unitary authority.

Regarding the development, this will affect my outlook and I will be overlooked by the proposed property. I find it hard to believe that mitigation for this is the provision of frosted glass.

The latest documentation mentions the 'Bath Store'. Are the committee aware that this shop has been closed for around six months and we can assume that it will not reopen as commercial property. Will this site become another block of flats in short time? Is this the thin end of the wedge? Has local planning come to allowing piecemeal and willy-nilly development?

I have an interest in clean and public transport in Weymouth. I work on the Granby Industrial Estate, which is the largest industrial zone in Weymouth, and (pre-coronavirus) I walked to work. This is a forty-minute walk across town. There are no bus routes from the vicinity of the proposed development to the Granby. The only way to take public transport to the Granby would be a bus into the Town centre, then another bus out again. This would be both time consuming (approximately one hour) and expensive. There are no cycle routes to the Granby - the nearest cycle route is the Rodwell Trail, which can only be reached by travelling along one or two main roads. It is unbelievable to think that residents of the proposed development will be able or willing to spend nearly two hours a day getting to work across town! They will have no option but to drive.

This brings me to parking. Congestion due to cars parked in the local roads is already a problem in the area, particularly at school times. The authorities know of local problems of both traffic congestion and lack of access for emergency vehicles (this is a main route to Portland for the emergency services). There is a new housing development being undertaken along the road. This will not help the parking situation and the situation will be exacerbated if another 18 flats are built with inadequate parking.

Furthermore – Buxton road is a known road pollution blackspot – What is the reason for allowing balconies close to and facing the busy road in front of a bus stop?

Louise Peploe

We live directly behind this proposed development. We did not and have not received any direct consultation or notification.

Whilst the site does need development, the height and scale is too big for such a small site. Despite the 'sight lines' detailed on the plans; the 45-degree angles are taken from our rooftop. As a bungalow, our main living areas and bedrooms are downstairs which will mean the building will loom over us and the rear elevation will directly overlook our bedroom windows causing a loss of privacy, overshadowing, a loss of amenity together with noise pollution. We believe it will devalue our property and make it difficult to sell. This has and continues to cause us significant distress.

The Weymouth Town Council objected to a development further down Buxton Road (WP/19/01013/FUL) on the grounds of density of the development, overshadowing and loss of privacy, loss of amenity, the development not being in keeping with the character of local buildings, traffic safety, ability to exit on to the highway

Surely for the same reasons this development should also be scaled back. These same concerns are raised here and cannot be dismissed purely on the basis that the housing is to be affordable. It cannot be democratic for there to be one rule for private developments and one rule for affordable housing if the same effects apply.

Despite the Conservation Officer's comments regarding the balconies, this proposed building is completely out of keeping with the surrounding area. It is simply an attempt to fit more dwellings into the site than would normally be allowed on the basis they are to be affordable. The same planning rules should apply whether private or affordable.

On reading the Agenda, this smacks of the decision already having been made and the replies by the Consultees to the objections and Conservation Area concerns have been dismissed as 'not a problem' and overridden simply because it is deemed 'affordable'. We all know that it will not remain as affordable housing on a prime site with sea views. A development such as a row of small terraced villas similar to that on Boot Hill would be far more aesthetically pleasing and in keeping.

Developments are being shoehorned into inadequate sites and legitimate concerns of both residents and the wider community who have to live with the consequences are being overridden, the motivation being purely financial.

I would respectfully ask that this committee put a brake on speculators, reject this plan as it stands and request that they think again, re-design it in keeping with the Conservation Area and lower the density to take into account the damaging effect on neighbouring properties.

Ken Packer

I object most strongly to the application to build a large block of 18 flats on the site of Saint Nicholas church in Buxton Road Weymouth. This site is within a Conservation Area where there are strict constraints on the size and design new buildings which the developer has not adhered to.

The application also gives an artists impression of the proposed new building as one would approach from the East along Buxton Road. It would be a shock to see the extreme clash in style with the more 1880s Victorian building beyond. A modern building with a predominance of large windows against the modest sash windows of the Victorian building.

Also the Victorian buildings cover less than 30% of their site whilst the proposal for the block of flats on this site covers up to 70% of its site. This is because the development site is a half-site, because to the rear around 70 years ago a modern bungalow was built. This illustrates clearly that the proposed development is far too big for its site.

Most people have commented on the dreadful problems that will almost certainly occur with vehicle access to and from the site, especially as there is only one common Exit/access point. I agree with all comments and all the worries expressed, as this in/out point is only 2 metres from a pedestrian crossing and 6 metres from a busy bus stop. I cannot believe that the Traffic Advisor has not high-lighted a major problem here; it is after all the main A road to Portland. Of course it is very quiet just now as all schools are closed, the sailing centre also and all visitor attractions on Portland, as well as no cruise ships at Portland Port.

Kay Packer

You will have received my objections to the above Planning Application but I would like briefly, to reiterate my concerns. Please note I am NOT against development of the site nor against affordable housing but would like to see it done in a sympathetic manner, in keeping with the area.

- 1 The site is in a Conservation Area and the modern design of this application is totally out of keeping with surrounding houses. The Conservation Officer would appear to be happy with the small concessions the developer has put in place.
- 2 The density of the plan for 18 flats is a gross overdevelopment of this small site. A building half the size would be more appropriate and would not impact on the area as much. Most of the site will be concreted over.
- 3 The flats will totally overshadow two thirds of the garden at 16 Buxton Road which will be dwarfed by this huge 4 storey building.
- 4 The single entrance/exit to the flats is between a traffic controlled crossing and a bus stop on the extremely busy A354 main road to Portland and cars will have to cross a very well used pavement to access this road. I totally disagree with the Highways officer who says that 18 vehicles plus service vehicles would not cause a problem on this busy road and even busier pavement at school times.
- 5 Parking is at a premium in this area and where will any overspill from this application park? Please note there has been no provision for visitors' cars in the plan. Parking in Khartoum Road and Verne Road is already congested as most of the houses there don't have a garage.

Finally, I would like to ask that this application be turned down for all of the above reasons with a recommendation that a smaller building would be more appropriate for this site.

Debbie Moore

This proposal will change a site with no housing and limited traffic to a large 4 storey block of 18 flats which neither fits in nor compliments the adjacent buildings, both of which are mentioned in the designation of this area - the Connaught Conservation area- in 2001 as of architectural and historical interest because of the Victorian buildings within it.

Because of the number of dwellings proposed there will be a considerable increase in the amount of traffic on this busy A road. A bus stop and pedestrian crossing are next to the site, both open to increased danger with the increase in traffic. Parking is also potentially a problem as there is very limited parking available on site.

The building line has been drawn as a diagonal from the Victorian Villas to The Bath Store - but The Bath Store should not be considered in the building line as this is for commercial use and lies on the opposite side across Verne Road The building line should be parallel to the villas to the east.

There are potential drainage problems that have not been addressed. The grassed area on the site will disappear so water will instead run off down the steep slopes of Khartoum Road and Sudan Road.

The proposal is for 'affordable housing'. Realistically they will be sold at a premium as soon as it is feasible as they are highly desirable with their commanding views of Portland Harbour and close proximity to Castle Cove and Sandsfoot Beach They will be second homes in next to no time.

I am not objecting to the site being appropriately developed, rather to the unsuitability of the current proposal in terms of fitting in with building regulations as to height, the density of the housing and that the plans are not suitable for this conservation area.

Cllr Brian Heatley - Dorset Council -Rodwell and Wyke

I'm Brian Heatley, one of the local Ward Dorset Councillors.

First of all can I say thank you for taking this in Committee. It's a difficult and important case, and I know that a lot of residents from the ward I represent wanted to make their case directly to the Committee itself. I really appreciate this decision.

There is an inevitable conflict here between two very desirable objectives

- Providing much needed affordable housing
- Protecting the nature of the surrounding area.

I've looked carefully at the application, and the comments and representations made on it. In the end I have to come down to the judgement that the prospect of creating 18 new affordable dwellings is an opportunity that is too good to miss.

I say that in spite of rather disagreeing with the statement in the report that 'the siting, design and materials of the proposed building- with its contemporary approach- would enhance the character of the conservation area.' While it's true that the existing church building adds little to the area, I'm sure a different and more sensitive development could enhance the conservation area.

Indeed I feel that local residents have made many excellent points against this development, and I know that Committee members will consider them carefully when weighing this difficult balance.

But the need for affordable housing, particularly in smaller units, is especially acute in Weymouth, and this will make a real contribution; 18 units would be an important contribution to the estimated 104 such units needed in Weymouth each year.

In the end the needs of people desperately in need of this type of housing outweigh the important desire of local residents to protect the conservation area and only build in a way that thoroughly respects the look of the area as it is now.

We simply don't get opportunities like this very often, and so I support this application

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee – Update Sheet

Application Ref.	Address	Agenda ref.	Page no.
WD/D/20/000583	82 EAST STREET, BEAMINSTER, DT8 3DT	Item 5a	15-46
<p>Update(s): 2 further representations from occupiers at 54; 60&62; East St – objecting on grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application site is not a garden area hence the proposal is contrary to Policy HOUS6 – no lawful development certificate for use as a garden area. • Outside the DDB for Beaminster. • Contrary to Policy ENV3 Green Infrastructure Network as the site lies next to allotments and on the edge of the rural countryside and provides a zone that should be protected the additional Traffic that will be generated both by the vehicles owned the owners of the proposed houses and also by additional vehicles associated with deliveries, waste and recycling collections all that are likely to use the route in a south-eastern direction down East Street and hence contrary to Policy COM7 and the Highway Authority objected to a previous application WD/D/15/001713 for the construction of three dwellings on land east of 28 to 34 Hollymoor Gardens due to the impact on East Street and this decision was upheld by the Planning Inspector in the inspector’s decision dated 24 March 2016. The Decision Notice published at the time of the publication of the Planning Inspector’s decision states ...”<i>The residential development proposals will generate further traffic and pedestrian movements along East Street, a County highway with variable and limited carriageway and footway widths. In the absence of the construction of, or programme for, a detailed improvement scheme design to provide suitable and appropriate traffic management and safety enhancements for this street, this development would be likely to cause danger and inconvenience to all highway users. Hence the application would be contrary to Policy COM7 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan 2015</i>”. • Ground conditions in the area may not be sufficiently permeable for effective rainwater soakaways and further permeability testing must be required before a decision is made. The capacity of the existing public sewer is not known as Wessex Water has not replied (to date) to the consultation. The ability for rainwater management from the site if soakaways are not feasible is therefore in doubt without an input from Wessex Water. • The public sewer is already overcapacity and without improvement there is a serious risk that problems will arise if further houses are discharging into it. While the application form states that the applicant proposes to connect Foul Sewage to the existing sewer there is no confirmation by Wessex Water that such a connection is technically feasible without overloading the sewer. • The proximity of the development to 54 East St will be detrimental to us as we have windows in all rooms overlooking the proposed development; we will be severely affected due to increased noise pollution, loss of privacy, loss of light. 			

WD/D/20/001014	CREEK CARAVAN PARK, FISHERS PLACE, RINGSTEAD, DORCHESTER, DT2 8NG	Item 5b	47-60
----------------	---	---------	-------

Update(s):

22 further representations. This now includes a revised Parish Council response stating:

In relation to the application WD/D/20/001014, the initial response of Owermoigne Parish Council of 'no objection' was on the basis that there were no objections displayed on the planning website from local residents, but that it appears that the notice was not in a very visible location and due to a lack of consultation with the residents, no-one knew of the application until very recently.

Subsequently several objections have been lodged and we have reviewed and amended our comment in the light of those objections. The formal position of the parish council is as follows:

"Owermoigne Parish Council objects to the proposal to extend the period of occupation for the static caravans from the 31st October to the 31st January consequently increasing the site usage from 7 months to 11 months and to reducing the closed season to 1 month.

Reasons for this include the following:

- *An 11 month occupation is virtually a permanent residence and so this will substantially intensify the occupation and usage of the site and the local access roads and track. This will impact on the relative tranquillity of Ringstead during the autumn and winter months impacting adversely on the local residents and on the intrinsic character of the AONB and Heritage Coast and the harm arising from this is contrary to NPPF policies 170, 171, 172 and 173.*
- *Shopping facilities and services at Ringstead are limited to a seasonal kiosk with a very limited range of stock and therefore it is inevitable that intensifying occupation will increase both individual car journeys and deliveries, impacting on tranquillity for residents and on people using the nationally important south coast footpath that would be directly affected by increased traffic. The cumulative effects of additional journeys on the already struggling access road and the lack of any potential mitigation options means the proposal would be contrary to the sustainability policies contained in Section 9 of the NPPF.*
- *The proposals demonstrate no clear benefits to either the local community or the environment and the stated employment opportunities are negligible. There would however be clear disbenefits to the local community and detrimental effects on the character of the landscape, particularly on its valued tranquillity out of season, potential impacts on the sensitive adjacent habitats arising from increased site occupation and impacts on the enjoyment of the south coast path. The current 7 month season is a reasonable balance between the business interests of the caravan park and the interests of the*

local community and the need to protect the special landscape character of this unique section of the Dorset coastline."

Other representations object on grounds of:

- This is a peaceful stretch of coastline with little infrastructure to support the opening of the caravan site 11 months of the year. This will likely lead to people taking up permanent residency with resulting strain on the existing permanent residents and the surrounding environment. Also erosion of the landscape, a need for additional public services and damage to the already fragile access road.
- Ringstead bay is a small spot on the Dorset coast of no little beauty. I understand it is a desirable tourist location but I believe any extension to the caravanning season or expansion of the current caravan park would be disastrous for the local area.
- In brief, the current extremely limited facilities available would not be able to deal with any more tourists and their cars. If this application were to go ahead, further development would be necessary and I am sure forthcoming. All such developments would be detrimental to the region for many reasons.
- Ignoring potential future problems for the moment, and focussing on the immediate impact of extending the season and expanding the site, the proposed changes would increase the caravan's sites negative imprint on the area in a number of ways: it would be more visible for walkers on the coastal path, becoming a larger blight on the spectacular views presented than it already is; more cars coming and going in the area would firstly not fit in the limited car park and secondly cause much damage to the very poor roads in and around Fishers place, not least of all the treacherously potted road leading to the site itself; erosion of this delicate area of coastline would increase, endangering natural life as well that of the property of local residents and businesses. This final point is perhaps the most important. The erosion of our beautiful English coast cannot be stopped entirely but we must do our utmost to ensure we do not hasten it.
- To focus on future development, an expansion of the kind proposed would necessitate public toilets being built, roads being developed and extended, and perhaps even an increase in local businesses - shops, cafes, etc. All of these would contribute to the already commonplace and heinous overdevelopment of many areas along the Dorset coast, without making a significant positive impact on employment in the area (it is too small a spot for that).
- The only beneficiary of this proposal that I can see would be the owner of the caravan site. Considering the amount of negatives mentioned not only by myself but also by the other concerned members of the public, this benefit to the few is far outweighed by the detrimental impact on the many and on this place of striking natural beauty.

- Would represent over-development of a sensitive site, with detriment and injustice to the existing residents, and to regular and visiting recreational users of the South West coast path and this area of natural beauty.
- The application has been made at a time of limited scrutiny out of season and in quarantine, and appears designed to edge closer to applying for permanent residence chalets as seen elsewhere.
- I noted that the application also claims that the site is not visible, which is not true, the bin stores, toilet block and most of the caravans are entirely visible from the coastal path, as there is limited screening despite the earlier planning requirement. The caravans are also visible from the beach and from viewpoints along the coast path in both directions.
- Ringstead Bay is a small community of 20 houses, only five of which are currently occupied permanently, and 30 caravans on this site. The caravan site therefore represents more than half of the accommodation available in the settlement. Its impact is limited under Planning law because of the recognised need to preserve the character of the settlement as small, peaceful community with a summer visitor role.
- The proposed extension of occupation from 7 months of the year to 11 months would nearly double the number of dwellings occupied for almost the whole year, changing the fundamental nature of the area, and doubling the population virtually throughout the year.
- There is no public transport. There are said to be 30 spaces for cars at the site, mainly along the coast path, and these are fully occupied in the season. The access is a narrow dirt track which in wet weather, frost and snow becomes hazardous and damaged. The additional traffic if this application were allowed would be to the detriment of local residents who live on the track, and users of the South West coast path which passes along this track.
- There is no shop apart from the beach cafe which is open only between April and October. During the summer, holidaymakers using the caravans frequently have supermarket deliveries, adding to the traffic on the track. Refuse collection throughout the year would add further wear and tear to the already poor surface. Doubling the occupancy would further impact the water and sewage infrastructure.
- The cliff and beach have long been subject to erosion, with the groyne below the site being essential to prevent the whole site being washed away. Every year more erosion happens, with the low cliffs to the east being particularly badly affected as a result of the sea's action on that side of the groyne, and also by people climbing and scrambling onto the cliff sides.
- The front of the site is a low, slumped area of soft clay which is at high risk of complete erosion like the similar areas to both east and west, from visitor action as well as natural causes. Further east the clay cliffs which slip in wet

weather are then damaged by visitors searching for fossils, an activity which would be very likely to increase with additional visitor footfall in the wetter winter months.

- The site itself is only in small part within the Special Area of Nature Conservation, and there is no plan at this point to physically encroach further, so the relevant authorities cannot technically object to the proposal. However, the doubling of human use and encroachment on this sensitive environment is very likely to impact upon the fragile geology and the plant and animal life. The current closure period allows rest and recuperation for the natural inhabitants; the proposal would impact directly on the nesting season of creatures inhabiting the hedgerows and the undercliff, and on the successful growth of the rich plant, butterfly and insect life in the area.
- The proposal to abandon the requirement for the land to be maintained in 'tidy order' off season, and the original requirement for a screen of trees on the site further indicate a lack of concern for the protection and enhancement of the valuable natural resources of this coastline, and should not be permitted.
- The proposal of an extended season is claimed to meet visitor demand for UK holidays, employment outside the current season, and operational efficiency. There is minimal local economy in Ringstead Bay, the seasonal shop being the only business, and as this is closed through the winter months it would gain no benefit. The extended opening would presumably extend the one caretaker job on the site itself. Accommodation out of season is already plentiful in B&B and hotels in the larger villages and towns nearby. This proposal offers no genuine economic benefit to the community, the only benefit being to the company which owns the site whose rental income would increase.
- It is the small, seasonal nature of this place which gives its charm and natural setting.
- It will have a negative impact on the picturesque setting of Ringstead, obscuring views and expanding into land on the Heritage coast. The existing infrastructure, facilities and roads do not have capacity and any expansion will further devalue the unique character of the place due to Covid, Lockdown and people working from home, the Application, which was put in 4 weeks into lockdown, did not follow the correct procedures.
- This proposal would further damage the single track lane through Upton Ringstead which is often in gridlock because of the unreasonable number of visitors to Ringstead Beach. Adding longer residency would be disastrous to the small community of Upton with a permanent residency of less than 30. No consideration has been given to us and no notice of this application given. I would particularly appeal to the Highways Department, Country Access Team and Environmental Health to reconsider the impact on our small hamlet. There have been many instances when Emergency vehicles would have been denied access.

- It would inevitably change the whole character of the village, by increasing the number of long-term residents by a very substantial number. I am not surprised that this has caused great distress to the existing residents - and also to many summer visitors to the village who appreciate its unspoilt character.
- A campsite occupied for 11 months of the year - as opposed to the current 7 months - would have a destructive impact on the existing community and on the local environment. It would mean a substantial increase in traffic on narrow country lanes and impose a significant extra burden on water supplies, refuse collection and sewage disposal arrangements.
- Ringstead is located in an Area of Outstanding National Beauty on the Jurassic Coast and the South West coastal path passes along the lane currently leading to the caravan site. The site is already prominent, visible from both the coast path and from the beach and from higher ground further along the coast. Making the site into a permanent residential area would be aesthetically harmful as well as inevitably damaging to the fragile local environment for the currently flourishing variety of plant and animal life, including deer, rabbits and a wide range of birds.
- As there is no public transport to Ringstead, the proposed development would result in an increase in cars and vans using the gravel lane from the private road into Ringstead to the caravan site. Both the road and the lane are already potholed by the current burden of traffic, largely of day-trip summer visitors. A significant increase in traffic would be a year-around nuisance to the current residents as well as a hazard to walkers on the busy coast path. There is also some concern about the prospect of substantial increased demand on water supplies and sewage facilities.
- Whilst we applaud the decision to update and modernise the caravan site replacing the outdated units we do have concerns over the extension of the permitted usage to eleven months each year.
- To encourage up to thirty extra 'households' during the inclement winter months would put untold pressure on the already challenged roads, both council and privately owned, and potentially change the nature of Ringstead.
- The winter period of rest and recovery benefits the ecology of the area and is also enjoyed by the residents. If this is compromised it will change things on this idyllic unspoilt area of the Jurassic coast forever.
- In order to understand why the directors of the Ringstead Caravan Co. Ltd. are seeking an extension from 7 to 11 months of the year, a meeting between some residents and directors of the Company was arranged. It failed to discover their future intentions. They acknowledged that the site was to be cleared at the end of the season with the ending of leases held by the caravan owners and that there was a possibility that the site would be sold. This is a quiet, long established, successful business whose future is unclear. Econ7 (ii and iii) states that Proposals involving a reorganisation or intensification of

existing sites must clearly demonstrate that the development forms part of a long term management plan.

- This small, exposed site is unsuitable for short let holiday accommodation in the winter months. It has no onsite facilities, shops, entertainment, or any of the indoor activities found on the larger sites and required by visitors. Local plan 4.5.19 encourages extending the season to these sites.
- The access from the A353 runs for 2 miles along roads and unmade track half of which is privately owned. There are frequent awkward bends and many places where two cars are unable to pass. The final unmade section is on the SW coast path. During the winter months the ice and snow drifting on the steep privately maintained summit can make it impassable for days. This access to the site presents many road safety issues. Parking by the site can sometimes be a problem with larger vans and trailers extending over the SW coastal path, 30 spaces for parking is optimistic. Other infrastructure such as the sewerage system and electricity supply may also become compromised if the site's operations intensify.
- The site is a CCMA at high and immediate risk of erosion and flooding. Land instability and slippage is common along this part of the coast. The increase in extreme weather events, both wind and wave, during the winter months make this cliff top site particularly vulnerable. As a Section 73 application this is seen as a new application for planning permission under the 2017 Environment Impact Assessment Regulations, and should have been accompanied by a screening. The NPPF looks to reduce risk from coastal change by avoiding inappropriate development.
- Disagree that extending the season "would reflect the current operation of other sites in the area"; research shows 8 months is normal on even the larger more suitable sites such as Haven Seaview and Durdle Door. Ringstead does not benefit materially from the caravan site and the site's benefit to the local economy is unknown.
- The extension of the site's season from 7 to 11 months of the year will change it from providing summer holiday accommodation to what is in effect an all year round residential park, with all the attendant difficulties of policing. It would create a precedent that could creep to the neighbouring site and the property beyond, The Creek, which is also owned by some of the directors of the Ringstead Caravan Co.Ltd.
- The anticipated increase in traffic, noise, pollution, and disturbance will affect our quality of life as usually experienced in the winter months.
- Ringstead plays an important role in providing access to the beach for tourists and local people during the summer months. The local plan acknowledges the pressures of tourism on local communities and the need to retain the sense of remoteness and tranquility in rural areas. This is achieved here during the winter months when, as the only 2 business here, the car park shop and

caravan site close and our hamlet is returned to its residents and the walkers along the coastal path. The changes being proposed will bring year round commercialisation to Ringstead, change its unique character and could swell our winter population tenfold or more.

- Oppose the removal of condition 3 - It states the times when the caravans should be unoccupied during the year thereby ensuring it does not become a residential site. Ringstead is an area where open market housing is normally refused.
- The reasons given for both condition 2 and 3 are to reserve to the LPA control over the long term use of the site, I would not wish this to change.
- Oppose the removal of condition 4 - The need for the planting of trees for screening of the site is ongoing on this exposed site and should remain.
- Ringstead is a unique coastal hamlet having an influx of visitors in the summer months because of its beach and timeless ambience. It is fondly known as 'the locals' beach'. Residents accept and welcome this seasonal intrusion despite suffering the consequences of increased rubbish, noise and disturbance. The winter months, however, should be a time when the locality has respite from thousands of tourists and regains its identity as a small Dorset rural community.
- There is no public transport to Ringstead, the nearest bus stop is over two miles away. Access is by car. The caravan site is off an unmade stretch of the SW coast path which is rutted, potholed and hazardous in Winter. Residents frequently become stuck in the hamlet because of snow and ice. Further disturbance for residents as noisy cars crunch down the path in all hours with head light intrusion in the winter months is unacceptable.
- From November to late March the caravan site is likely to be lit for safety reasons thus increasing light pollution in a dark sky. This is detrimental to the nocturnal wildlife that inhabits this area. Residents also enjoy the dark and the chance to see night skies particularly towards the north and east. A peaceful, less disturbed winter season is necessary for the continuation of the bio-diversity of the area which is rich in wildlife and plants.
- The intentions of the caravan site owners to invite new lodges or caravans to be placed on vacated plots and thus the likelihood of an increased population of tourists occupying such dwellings for 11 months of the year raises alarm that Ringstead's population could reach a stage where caravan dwellers easily outnumber the residents and become the *raison d'être* for Ringstead as it morphs from a unique Dorset hamlet to a tourist park. Indeed to allow 11 months is to invite nigh on permanent residency with opportunists circumnavigating the regulations for yearlong residence.
- Ringstead in many ways during the Winter months is as unspoilt as in 1962. I cite part of condition 1 in the original 1962 application 207350 where it refers to

a 'coastal locality' of ' high scenic and landscape value' I urge rejection of the present proposal which will have an enduring impact on Ringstead and change its unique character to the detriment of all.

- In refusing an appeal to planning in 1961, it was recognised that any intensification in the number of caravans on the site would be "detrimental to character of this beautiful and secluded locality": thus limited to 30 caravans. Conditions 3 and 4 were reserved to the Local Planning Authority to give them control over the long term use of the site, because the site was recognised as being 'in a coastal area of high scenic and landscape value'. Condition 4 was imposed 'to safeguard the amenities of the locality'.
- In what I presume is the licence under which the site is presently operating of 1979, no mention is made of the need for screening with trees as it is one of the conditions on the 1962 permission. This requirement is lost under the new proposal. In such a heavily protected area where further new development would not be allowed, the reasons for imposing these conditions remain as valid today as they did in 1962.
- There are other buildings on the site which do not appear in the 1962 permission. The residential chalet started life as a small site office with no residential element. Accommodation for the site manager was off-site in what is now Gulley Cottage. This chalet is to be the subject of a further application to confirm its status; what is its current planning status? I could find no local site of comparable size operating for 11 months per year. Many of the larger sites with on-site facilities and good links to public transport operate for 7-9 months; a closed season allows the site to regenerate.
- In the absence of any indication of the intentions of the applicant in requesting 11 month occupancy, one has to make assumptions. While the applicants' assertion is that it will not change the nature of the development, the removal or relaxing of any of the conditions opens up the likelihood that detrimental change will occur. Ringstead is a less than ideal site as a winter holiday destination; marine activities can be severely restricted and water logged ground can be a problem and snow and ice can cause the road to become impassable.
- Historically, Ringstead has suffered from erosion of the cliffs and beach. This erosion is ongoing to the east and west of this site where there are no hard sea defences. The hard sea defences around the site were provided with public money and are subject to ongoing maintenance.
- The Local Plan recognises that any development requiring increased coastal defences would be harmful to the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site. In a time when climate change is expected to increase incidences of extreme weather, any development should be directed away from areas subject to coastal erosion or land, such as would be required to provide concrete bases on which to station caravans or lodges which could be detrimental on such a geologically fragile site.

- In respect of the contribution to the local economy, with an 11 month occupancy, privately owned caravans/lodges would in effect become second homes but without the attendant council tax obligations, so contributing little to the this aspect of the economy.
- The present trend for converting from static caravans to fully residential is also of concern in the request for 11 month occupancy. Ringstead has always been a popular place to visit in summer, especially by local people. It supports a large summer population, some resident, some walkers on the South West coast path, and day visitors. But in winter it slows down. There are still day visitors, but the resident population of 5 houses by the shore and 4 further in land enjoy a more tranquil environment with dark skies at night, less noise disturbance and less traffic, giving the place a more isolated feel.
- The caravan site has been a part of Ringstead summers for many years, offering affordable holidays, however existing caravan owners have been given notice on their pitch leases, many after 20 years and more. The applicant is operating a successful business under its present conditions and the proposed change to those conditions should be resisted to prevent detriment to the natural environment, tranquillity of the location, and impact on local residents.
- A public footpath Right of Way S34/19 runs through the site; this does not appear on the applicant's plan.
- I would also like to draw Committee Members' attention to the consultation process: of the 8 permanently occupied houses, the 7 who have no direct involvement with the site were unaware of the proposal until an article appeared in the Echo on 16 June, there was no planning notice in the Echo. There was one notice on the site notice board, but during the pandemic people were staying at home and this was insufficient Public notice to properly inform residents during this period, and therefore reduced the time available for comments.
- The proposed increase will impact the precious coastline that is 1 of 46 Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty in England, Wales and Ireland that are protected for our future generations. It is well known that the cliffs surrounding the Jurassic Coastline are not stabile, therefore I fear an increase in tourist numbers over the months of winter will de-stabile the cliffs further.
- The change from a summer season site to all year-round occupation will change the character of Ringstead and will dwarf the resident population.
- Access to and from the site during the winter months can be treacherous making this an unsuitable site for all year-round occupation.

- The lighting required for winter use will impact on the environment and habitat of the wildlife, particularly Barn and Little Owls.
- If the caravan site is given this extension it will affect the character and uniqueness of this heritage coastal location. Ringstead has always been a busy summer location for tourists and locals alike. In the winter months Ringstead's appeal to many is through the lack of tourism this extension to all year-round tourist use will have a significant affect on the small resident population. The winter months allow respite for the environment and the residents of this small hamlet.
- Application document - Under 4. Description of proposal. This proposal was started on 1/1/1962 and finished 1/4/61. Under 6. Site visit. The site is clearly visible from the Beach and SW Coastal path. Under 8. Ownership Certificate. I do not believe the applicant is the sole owner.
- We are regular out of season visitors to Ringstead Bay and the surrounding area, the primary attraction being the peace and solitude to be gained once the holidaymakers have gone home. We are therefore somewhat dismayed to learn that the caravan park at Ringstead has applied for such a large extension to its season with the inevitable consequence of the loss tranquillity at what must be considered to be one of the jewels of W. Dorset.
- We fully accept that the tourist industry is in great difficulty at the moment but we strongly urge you therefore to consider the long term implications of this application and thus reject it.
- The wildness and fragile environmental beauty of Ringstead on the Heritage Coast would be severely affected by almost year-round occupation of the caravan site, and the increased pressure this would put on the very limited infrastructure. Ringstead is a small residential community and the poor quality and very steep access road is completely unsuitable to winter tourism, with no access by public transport.
- There are very few local amenities on or off site, meaning this application isn't a viable option. Ringstead bay is of outstanding natural beauty, and the winter months offer a rare opportunity to experience and enjoy this solitude, which could be destroyed by this application to extend the use of the caravan site.
- I object strongly that permission is granted that would allow the site to open 11 months, with all the extra footfall, the extra cars, in a time of the year when access can be a problem with the weather and gives no benefit to the local residents, the walkers, the fragile Environment or the coastal areas.
- I am also very concerned that because there was no Site visit, parts of the actual Application have not been checked and there are significant errors in fact. Ownership of roads and tracks, parking north of the site, National trust Boundaries, route of South West Coast Route are some of the errors, plus there are others that have been mentioned in the Objections.

- It would seriously damage the peace and tranquillity of Dorset's heritage coast during the winter months. This is a time when there are fewer tourists, therefore the shop is not open during the winter months, meaning the proposal will have no positive impact on the immediate local economy. The West Dorset Weymouth and Portland local plan greatly emphasises the need for preserving areas of peace and tranquillity and Ringstead during the winter months is one of these places. The proposal will increase strain on footpaths, and road access which in the winter months is difficult coming down a steep slope. Further to this, more than doubling the number of residents there during the winter months will have a big detrimental effect on light pollution at night. During the winter months storms batter the coast, which poses a serious health and safety risk for caravans near the front. To summarise this proposal will have a major negative effect on the heritage coast in this area, and further weaken Dorset councils' position to preserve it.
- The 1962 planning consent does not refer to the chalet then known as Elizabeth Chalet and now known as Coast Path Cottage, which is used as a residential dwelling. The current application refers to 'confirming the planning status' of this building, which implies that the owners are aware that this building is being used for residential purposes without appropriate permission.
- It should also be noted that the consultation notice which had been displayed on the site notice board was removed last week before the end of the consultation period, and before the end of the lockdown, when the leaseholders returned.

An 11 signatory petition has also been submitted objecting to the application on grounds of

- Commercialisation of Ringstead and that the non-occupancy period currently in force adds to the peaceful environment of this hamlet set in an AONB/World Heritage Jurassic coast area and
- requests from site owners to clear the site by the end of 2020 season.

6 further representations in support stating:

- Do not expect the number of cars driving along Fisher's Place to increase hugely as a result of an extended open season.
- Over the last 42 years the caravan site has never been at full occupancy outside of 3 weeks during the height of the summer. There is no reason to expect this to change, especially in the colder months of the year.
- Caravan owners come as day visitors in the winter months to spend a few hours in their caravans and enjoy the peace and quiet of Ringstead out of season. What this extension would offer them is an opportunity to stay over and enjoy those quiet times that other holiday home owners (houses) at Ringstead currently are fortunate enough to enjoy.

- Improvements in caravan design and insulation has meant that over the last 20 years many caravan parks around the county have now applied for and received planning permission to extend their season for their owners. However even modern caravans are still caravans (as I used to say to our visitors they are really just tin cans - you can hear every rain drop and feel every gust of wind against the sides) so in the colder, wetter months of the year they still won't offer the same experience as a summer holiday in a caravan or a winter holiday in a house. It just isn't comfortable or convenient.
- It would be lovely for some of them to experience a Christmas or New Year at Ringstead if they want to, and to experience the camaraderie that exists here in the winter months amongst residents and holidaymakers alike. Would welcome the idea that there might be a few more people around for security reasons alone.
- Just because our owners are not lucky enough to own a bricks and mortar holiday home here at Ringstead doesn't mean they feel any less strongly about preserving the uniqueness and beauty that is Ringstead and I think if they are allowed to stay over out of season they will add to, rather than detract from, the quality of life here.
- I think it would be really great if the caravan site was open longer as more of us would get a chance to visit and stay over.
- We would support the Caravan site extending the season so we can enjoy the bay in peace, whilst also not spending an arm and leg. It would be encouraging to know there is a holiday waiting for us towards the end of the year. I think the season being extended would appeal to people in our situation who can't afford the prices during the summer anymore. Anyone who knows Ringstead understands that by holidaying there in winter time they will likely be spending a lot of time indoors, except for the occasional walk, so I doubt it would greatly affect the locals enjoyment of their home. Life is going to be different from now on, it can't stay the same and people need to support local businesses and the environment by holidaying locally and responsibly.
- Ringstead is a small community and the infrastructure of the roads and local amenities do not make this a viable option. The rest of the tourist facilities based around the caravan are ALL seasonal. The bay is outstanding beauty and needs the months in between summer visitors to recuperate. It is certainly not designed or ready to be used all year around.
- I've been coming to Ringstead for many years because I love the peace and quiet. The natural beauty is amazing and I feel privileged every time I visit. Recently having got a dog, I now enjoy the numerous walks the area has to offer, not just the lovely beach. I've found the people to be welcoming and have been visiting almost daily over the last few weeks.
- I've also been lucky enough to have stayed in some of the holiday cottages in the area over the years. However this year they all were booked up so quickly

once holidays were allowed again, even into next year, so there is nothing left in my price range. Covid-19 has also reduced my income, meaning I can't afford to stay during the peak holiday season anymore.

- If the caravan site was open longer then I would very much welcome the opportunity to holiday out of season. It would be cheaper for me, there would be less competition for dates and I can have a peaceful stay in a place I love without having to travel there each day.
- Most people who come to Ringstead appreciate its unique beauty, and want to take care of it, myself included.
- I think it's a fantastic idea, and I'm writing to voice my support. I have been visiting the area for several years, as my partner's grandmother lives nearby. I've come to love and enjoy the Dorset Coast, and in particular, Ringstead beach and the adjacent caravan site. My favourite time to visit the area is during the off-season. Smaller crowds and more affordable off-season prices is extremely appealing. Especially at this time – having suffered an income reduction due to Covid-19, and generally hoping to avoid crowds, offseason visits are ideal.
- Also, the opportunity to enjoy Ringstead without having to make daily visits when the caravan site is closed (as is the current situation) would be a huge improvement to our experience.
- I care about preservation and protection of the area as much as anyone. I doubt that extending the season would alter the nature and appeal of the caravan site. If anything, it might provide more resources and reason to better preserve it for future generations
- **Ringstead Protection Society Committee** state - We understand that current residential occupancy- ie. .overnight sleeping- in the autumn up to the end of October is not great at the present time. It seems unlikely it will continue at the same level during the extra months which are amongst the coldest of the year. Caravans in winter on a site exposed to gales are not the most enticing places to stay. It might well be different if the site had modern, well insulated chalets, equipped modern energy efficient heating and modern bathrooms. If an application to build those was made, the Society would be concerned. Owners are entitled now to visit their caravans for the day at any time of the year and a successful application will not change that. We do not however believe that many people will be wanting to stay there in the additional months if permitted, other than perhaps for half term or over Christmas.
- It does not believe there will be a major increase in traffic if the application is successful and certainly not of a size that would justify refusing the application.
- For the above reasons, the Society does not propose to lend its support to the objectors.

Finally the applicant has responded direct to a number of the objections by stating that :

- The timing of the application is because we want to regularise the site planning regulations, which are very old and incorrect as part of the improvements to the company and the site we are making.
- Ringstead Caravan Company has not applied for permanent residence in its planning application and has never indicated it would ever want to do so.
- As a company we have always complied with our site licence and planning and never allowed anyone to use the caravan as their sole and permanent residence and will continue to do so. The caravan site has been there since the 1930s older than a vast majority of the houses in Ringstead. A season extension will not change the view, as the caravans stay there 365 days a year.
- The Ringstead Caravan Park plays a major role in addressing some of the issues of concern to residents with regard to littering by daily visitors to Ringstead. See the section on waste.
- No additional development is required or has been made in the planning application. All pitches have their own utilities and do not require any additional public services.
- No public transport is currently needed when it is open now. The season extension will have even less need for public transport, I have no data on deliveries and neither do I imagine the complainants. The caravan site is used for many delivery drivers and services such as domestic refuse collection of the residents to turn around as it is the only place big enough to do so. We have never objected to this and are always keen to help the community.
- The caravan site pays £1040 to use the road far more than any other property in the village. It also voluntarily repairs the road asking no contributions from any other residence or holiday accommodation business. As far as we are aware no one else does this in Ringstead.
- There is no expansion of the numbers of people using the caravan site. As previously mentioned we are by far the single biggest contribution towards the upkeep and repairs of the road.
- The caravan site collects waste and recycling for two houses the council can not reach further up the track.
- We also collect a huge amount of waste from beach visitors (nothing to do with us) and provide the only dog waste bin in the village at our own expense.

- In our closed season we do not have bins and so there is a build up of waste left by day visitors who do not take their waste home with them. Hopefully with an extended season we can help reduce this.
- The caravan site has its only toilets and drainage facilities and will have no additional strain on any public facilities.
- The caravan site actually hosts the drainage and pumping facilities for the village on our land and is maintained at our expense. The Caravan site was central to the decision to fund the groin as it increased the number of people who would benefit from the project in the cost benefit analysis, thus enabling the project to go ahead.
- Council engineers think the rate of erosion has been significantly delayed by the presence of the groin which is of benefit to all the residents and visitors to Ringstead.
- We are not increasing the number of vans or overall numbers of visitors to the site so this objection is irrelevant.
- It is in our site licence and we will continue to do all of this work as required in the site licence. As well employing local trades persons and being able to offer all year work to cleaners and other contractors we promote local events, tourist attractions and businesses to our holiday makers. An extension would help the all year round economy of local business.

WP/19/01016/FUL	St Nicholas Church, Buxton Road, Weymouth	Item 5d	79 - 97
------------------------	--	----------------	----------------

Update(s):

A letter of objection from Mr Hillary:

Following our earlier objection we now believe the proposed building will block TV signals to our property

A letter of support from Cllr Sutton:

Dear Sir/Madam

I am unable to attend for this item on Thursday but please find below my submission for the committee's consideration. With many thanks, Cllr Clare Sutton, Rodwell & Wyke.

.....
Having carefully considered this application and the comments submitted, I fully understand why some residents in the vicinity within my ward are opposed, or would wish the building to be just 2 storeys. I agree that it is important to protect the

character of our neighbourhoods, especially within a conservation area. However, I am also aware of how the lack of affordable housing blights the lives and life opportunities of many individuals, couples and families both in my ward and across Weymouth as a whole, where around 104 new smaller housing units, as proposed in this application, are needed per year. I cannot therefore in good conscience object to this application, or propose that the number of units be reduced by 33%. These potential homes are just too precious to their future occupants.

On the aesthetics, these always come down to personal taste, but I quite like the design. Yes, 2 storeys would fit in better with the locality, but this, for me, is outweighed by those much needed 6 homes. I therefore support the application as it stands.

This page is intentionally left blank

APPLICATION NUMBER: WD/D/20/000583

APPLICATION SITE: 82 East Street, Beaminster, DT8 3DT

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 5 dwellings.

DECISION: Deferred for committee site visit.

□

APPLICATION NUMBER: WD/D/20/001014

APPLICATION SITE: Creek Caravan Park, Fishers Place, Ringstead, Dorchester, DT2 8NG

PROPOSAL: Station 40 caravans - Variation of conditions 1 and 2 and removal of conditions 3 and 4 of planning permission 207358 (extending the season).

DECISION: Approve and that the description of development be altered to “Station caravans” and subject to the following conditions:

1 Not more than 30 caravans shall be stationed on the site at any one time.

Reason: To define the permission.

2 The caravans on the site shall only be occupied during the period 15th March in any year to 15th January in the following year.

Reason: To define the permission and to prevent an unrestricted and permanent residential occupation all year round.

Reason for Decision

- The proposal to amend the planning conditions of the original planning permission is considered to be acceptable with no adverse visual impact as regards impact on the AONB and coastal landscape.
- The proposal to amend the planning conditions of the original planning permission is considered to be acceptable with no significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity.
- The proposal to amend the planning conditions of the original planning permission is considered to be acceptable with no significant harm to highway safety.
- There are no other material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.

APPLICATION NUMBER: WP/17/00836/FUL

APPLICATION SITE: Land NW side of Wessex Roundabout, Radipole Lane, Weymouth.

PROPOSAL: Construction of new vehicular and pedestrian access, surface water management ponds, open space and landscaping associated with the adjacent Wessex Grounds Residential Development.

DECISION: The committee resolved that they would have refused the application, should they still have had the ability to do so, for the following reason:

The development does not make adequate provision for pedestrians and cyclists with narrow pavements and no pavement to the south of the vehicular access, beyond the entrance to the site, meaning that pedestrians and cyclists would have to cross the access road to continue on a pavement into the site. Hence the proposal is contrary to Policy ENV11 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2015) and Paragraphs 91a and 110a of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

APPLICATION NUMBER: WP/19/01016/FUL

APPLICATION SITE: St Nicholas Church, Buxton Road, Weymouth DT4 9PJ

PROPOSAL: Demolition of the existing church and erection of 18 affordable flats with associated external amenity space and parking spaces.

DECISION:

Delegate authority to grant to Head of Planning subject to completion of a S106 agreement to secure provision of 100% affordable housing and subject to the receipt of a satisfactorily amended plan in respect of the width of the vehicular access (to be increased to 5m), and subject to planning conditions.

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

Site location plan 39 received 20/12/19

Proposed block plan 38 received 20/12/19

Proposed plan/ground floor plan 30F received 16/6/20

Proposed site plan/first floor plan 7 amenity 31F received 16/6/20

Proposed floor plans & street scene 32H received 16/6/20

Proposed floor plans/extended site section 33D received 18/6/20

Proposed elevations 34D received 16/6/20

Railing details 41A received 24/4/20

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

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

REASON: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning act 1990 (as amended).

3. No development shall take place above damp proof course level until samples of all facing and roofing materials, (and details of the design and materials of the new road frontage wall section) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the development shall be completed in accordance with those details thereafter.

REASON: To ensure the external appearance of the completed development in the conservation area is sympathetic to the locality.

4. The windows shall be of powder coated aluminium in a colour which shall first have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The windows including frames shall be retained in the agreed colour thereafter. The railing details applicable to the south elevation shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on plan 41A and retained as such thereafter.

REASON: To ensure the external appearance of the completed development in the conservation area is sympathetic to the locality.

5. Prior to the commencement of any development a detailed surface water sustainable drainage scheme for the site, based on an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development including details of the maintenance and management of the surface water sustainable drainage scheme and any receiving system and shall be designed to include a plan for the lifetime of the development for its maintenance and management, the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime, and a timetable for implementation shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the submitted details and timetable for implementation. The scheme shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to ensure the future maintenance of the surface water drainage system.

6. The finished floor levels shall be in accordance with the levels details shown on plan 33C.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity.

7. No development above dampproof course level shall be carried out until a hard and soft landscaping scheme shall first have been submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented and completed during the planting season November-March inclusive, immediately following commencement of the development, or as may be agreed otherwise in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include provision for the maintenance or replacement as necessary of the trees and shrubs for a period of not less than 5 years from completion of the development and the soft landscaping shall be maintained and replaced as necessary in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity.

8. No flat shall be first occupied until all the following glazing measures shall have been installed: The "pop-out" windows on the east elevation shall have obscure glazing facing east (with transparent glazing facing south), and the two pop-out windows in the north elevation to bedroom 2 of both flats 15 and 19 shall have obscure glazing on the north (with transparent glazing to the east and west sides). There shall be no pedestrian access to the external top floor hatched areas as shown on plan 33D. The third floor east elevation balcony and the screening to the external stair and landing on the north elevation shall be obscure glazed. All obscure glazing shall be to Code 3 standard. Thereafter, all the foregoing measures shall be permanently retained.

REASON: In the interests of residential amenity.

9. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the measures contained in the agreed Biodiversity Mitigation Plan (BMP) dated 31/3/20. All works within the BMP shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed timescale unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The completed works shall be retained thereafter.

REASON: To ensure nature conservation interests are fully addressed.

10. No development above damp-proof course level shall be carried out until a detailed scheme to enable the charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations within the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted details shall include a timetable for the implementation of the scheme. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with such details and timetable as have been approved by the local planning authority.

REASON: To ensure that adequate provision is made to enable occupiers of and visitors to the development to be able to charge their plug-in and ultra-low emission vehicles.

11. No flat shall be first occupied until details of the means of enclosure to the boundaries, including materials and height, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter the means of enclosure as are agreed shall be erected prior to first occupation of any flat and permanently retained thereafter.

REASON: In the interests of privacy and visual amenity.

12. Before the development is occupied or utilised the first 10 metres of the vehicle access, measured from the rear edge of the highway (excluding the vehicle crossing – see the Informative Note below), must be laid out and constructed to a specification submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that a suitably surfaced and constructed access to the site is provided that prevents loose material being dragged and/or deposited onto the adjacent carriageway causing a safety hazard.

13. Before the development hereby approved is occupied or utilised the parking and turning on the submitted plans must have been constructed. Thereafter these areas must be permanently maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

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

14. Before the development hereby approved is occupied or utilised provision must be made to ensure that no surface water drains directly from the site onto the adjacent public highway in accordance with details which shall have, prior to development above damp proof course level, been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the approved drainage works shall be retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

REASON: To ensure that the site is properly drained and that surface water does not flow onto the highway.

INFORMATIVE NOTE: Dorset Highways

The vehicle crossing serving this proposal (that is, the area of highway land between the nearside carriageway edge and the site's road boundary) must be constructed to the specification of the County Highway Authority in order to comply with Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980. The applicant should contact Dorset Highways by telephone at Dorset Direct (01305 221000), by email at dorsetdirect@dorsetcc.gov.uk, or in writing at Dorset Highways, Dorset County Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ, before the commencement of any works on or adjacent to the public highway. (

B) Refuse permission for the reasons set out below if the legal agreement under Section 106 of the town and country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) is not completed within 6 months of the date of the committee resolution or such extended time as is agreed by the Head of Planning.

1. Policy HOUS1 of the adopted West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan 2015 requires a minimum on-site provision of units as affordable housing and in the absence of a planning obligation to secure these affordable units the scheme would fail to meet the substantial unmet need for affordable housing in the district and the proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy HOUS1 of the adopted West Dorset Weymouth and Portland Local Plan. Furthermore the community-related benefits inherent in the scheme would not be achieved. Hence the scheme would be contrary to the objectives of paragraph 92 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Reason for the recommendation:

- Contribution towards 5 year housing land supply.
- Para 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that permission should be granted for sustainable development unless specific policies in the NPPF indicate otherwise.
- The location is considered to be sustainable and the proposal is acceptable in its design and general visual impact.
- There is not considered to be any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity.

- There are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.