

Western & Southern Area Planning Committee

5 November 2020

Written Submissions

Application to divert footpaths 24, 160, 161 and 162 and bridleway 24, Weymouth

Ian Beech

I would like to express the feelings and thoughts of myself and others,

Footpath 162 is nearly the same, no objection

Footpath 160 - I think the footpaths either side are adequate and not too different from the original footpath, no objection

Footpath 161 is the major concern, being moved and using the estates roadway footpaths, running alongside the highest point of the water holding area at less than a metre distance.

One apparent reason the original had to be moved was it would be too close if left in place and possibly dangerous.

It would be at least the same distance away and at a much lower level and thereby safer if left alone, it would only mean affecting 2 houses which are on the original route of the footpath and no impact on the local wildlife and also leaving a safe undisturbed corridor for movement of them and the existing reptiles and a safe not crossing roads or using pavements for the public and dogs. Otherwise they would be using the estates roadways and pavement as this is the so called relocation of footpath 161.

Why do the developers not use the existing route G,H,I,J leading to K.

They can't surely say it's too late. This could have been thought of by them rather than people like me looking at it. Or blame the council they made us have it in the corner!!

It would be a safe route to the countryside and only affect two properties or even at worst as it's now built use the pavement from U , P to Q and onto existing 161 joining at Q1. It worries us that they have already built some of the new footpaths and put tarmac on them before any consultation or

decision is made and seems like we will do what we want as it's going to happen!!

This would leave residents happier from disturbance and confrontation over dogs and mess on frontage, reduce accident risk and reduce the intrusion on the wildlife. There have been sightings of reptiles back in this area and reported to the council, now in the hands of Enforcement Officer Mr Neil Dackham!

It seems there is no respect for residents, Dorset Council planning or the locals.

Some work has already gone ahead on footpaths with no regard to planning, more like we are doing what we want not Dorset planning

Gregg Allison, Persimmon Homes

Please accept this email as a deputation, submitted on behalf of Persimmon Homes, in respect of the above item.

Firstly, I would like to extend my gratitude to the Council's Democratic Services Team, and Members, for putting in the arrangements for this meeting to take place. I would also like to take this opportunity to commend the Public Rights of Way Consultant, and your Officers, for the positive and proactive way in which they have dealt with this sensitive application.

It is, of course, regrettable that we find ourselves in this position. Throughout the planning process Persimmon Homes has taken all steps to deal with Rights of Way crossing this site in accordance with the proper procedures and legislation. The Rights of Way were fully taken into account in the layout of the site and due regard has been had for the relevant legislation in the process of diverting them through the site.

It is acknowledged however, that the Council has no other option but to submit the application to the Secretary of State given the extant objections.

With regard to the merits of the application, the assessment of the Officers in the committee report is accurate and robust in light of the material considerations. The recommendation to support the diversion is, therefore, welcomed and I trust you will share this view.

By way of clarification, I would like to confirm that a QC Opinion has been sought as to the question whether the diversion can be made under the TCPA. The conclusion is that "*...it is plain beyond doubt that the development is not substantially complete.*" This, I hope deals with this query and gives confidence that the current approach is correct.

Turning now to the completion of the scheme which, I suspect, will be of interest to Members. Please be assured that allowances have been made in the build program to deal with this eventuality and the 26 dwellings that are affected by the diversion are not to be constructed until such time as the diversion has obtained the necessary approvals. As a result of the uncertain timescales involved, however, I am not in a position to confirm when or how the site will be completed, but all evidence suggests there likely will now be a delay between the construction periods.

In conclusion, I hope that these brief comments are helpful in determining the application. I look forward to receiving confirmation of the submission to the Secretary of State and, thereafter, being in a position to be able to complete the development and provide the much needed housing in the District

WP/20/00136/FUL - 375 Dorchester Road, Weymouth

Tim Sutton

This application would involve the demolition of a former lodge to Corfe Hill House. The lodge is the smaller section of the current building fronting on to the former drive to Corfe Hill House.

Each time I pass the lodge I feel saddened by the proposed loss of this important asset to the local street scene.

It provides an important historical timeline from these rather different times.

The former lodge is an elegant building that with the attendant gate piers and walling provide variety and visual interest to the local area.

The loss of the trees surrounding the building prior to this application I find regrettable.

The density of any proposed development to this site should be in accordance with neighbouring Dorchester Road properties.

Serious consideration should be given concerning this application and the long term detrimental effect it would have on the local area.

Laura Ashworth (Agent)

The original application was submitted in February 2020 and we have worked since this time closely with the various case officers and Dorset County Highways to assure them our proposals are sustainable, enhance the current site, provide much needed low cost dwellings for local people and mitigate for any perceived harm on the landscape and biodiversity.

We note the following to help with your decision:

- The location is considered to be sustainable and the proposal is acceptable in its design and general visual impact.
- The development will assist in the lack of five year housing supply and accords with Policy SUS2 as the site is within the Weymouth DDB. The density is similar to adjacent developments and is in keeping with character of the area.
- As this site falls below the NPPF thresholds, an affordable housing contribution is not required. The dwellings will however be low cost.
- Following the submission of a BMEP and its subsequent approval by NET it is considered that the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on biodiversity. No protected species were found on site and mitigation/improvement measures are proposed. A landscape condition is included to ensure some soft planting and 5 fruit trees as mitigation for trees lost prior to the submission of the application.
- The development would have no undue impact on the wider landscape being in an urban area and would not impact on the LLLI or green infrastructure network.
- There would not be any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity.
- The development would not harmfully impact upon local highway safety. A detailed specific highways pre application was held prior to this application which helped inform the design for the scheme and site layout. All concerns were addressed through the supporting information prepared by iTransport. There is no objection from Highways Officers.
- The proposal would not affect any conservation area or designated heritage assets.
- We note the Weymouth Civic Society believe the existing building to be heritage asset, and should be retained. We would reiterate that it is not

listed, locally listed, a designated asset, nor in a conservation area. On balance we consider that the harm of its demolition is outweighed by the benefits. We note recent case law where the Inspector confirmed that there was no protection for informal heritage assets. It has no features of merit and has modern interventions which do not warrant its retention. The building suffers subsidence and two thirds of the building is of c.1970 in construction. As a fallback the building could be demolished without formal planning permission.

- In conclusion there are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application and has officer support.

WD/D/20/001700/OBL - Land to North and West of Cockroad Lane, Beaminster

Beaminster Town Council

Beaminster Town Council (BTC) is very disappointed that the long held classification of this parcel of land, initially recorded as WA1 and now incorporated into the new identity of BEAM 1, as a site for advancing employment growth in the town, is being ignored.

The S52 agreement of 10 March 1989 recognised the need for employment land and the extant

WDDC Local Plan acknowledged this need by including 'live-work' business accommodation in its policies. Beaminster has since grown significantly. The continuing influx of the newly retired has done nothing to redress the demographic balance that is necessary to maintain a thriving, living, working town.

BTC believes that it has allowed a fair proportion of new homes that is acceptable for a small town but accommodating 300 houses without improved infrastructure or employment opportunities is unsustainable. While we accept the demand for housing is real and growing, it would be irresponsible to ignore the need for an holistic assessment that encompasses Beaminster as a whole.

The Planning Officer claims that the circumstances around BEAM 1 have changed. However, the requirement for employment land, alongside existing businesses, still exists and the investment by Clipper Teas to consolidate its activities to the south of Broadwindsor Road released a hectare of business land that should be translated into BEAM1.

We strongly object to new proposals from the 'emerging local plan strategy' being a reason to remove the employment requirement explicitly referred to for the BEAM1 site. The policies in the existing Local Plan, adopted 2015, still apply. The Town Council has already objected to the creation BEAM4, south of Broadwindsor Road, for employment.

References to screening the site from the Wessex Ridgeway footpath are a spurious distraction since the town is criss-crossed with footpaths. The Senior Economic Regeneration Officer referred to "exceptional" costs for "drainage and utility connections". BTC would reasonably argue that they would be no different from the same utilities required for any residential development.

BTC accepts that there is an appetite for new ways of working, such as 'business hubs' would benefit the aspirations of young working families. 'Working-from-home' may become the 'new normal' and creative youngsters require space for start-ups which could be accommodated in smaller workshop or studio units (*cf. Poundbury*), which would blend with domestic dwellings if given an imaginative setting and built to low carbon standards.

Sustainability would be enhanced by reducing car use and energising the local economy within a desirable work environment. BTC does not wish to see its long-held aspiration for advancing employment opportunities set back again by empty promises.