Public Document Pack

Dorset Council

AGENDA SUPPLEMENT

Cabinet

Date: Tuesday, 10 November 2026

Time: 6.30 pm

Venue: Council Chamber, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ

Chief Executive: Catherine Howe, Dorset Council County Hall, Dorchester, Dorset DT1 1XJ

For easy access to the Council agendas and minutes download the free public app Mod.gov for use on your iPad, Android and Windows tablet. Once downloaded select Dorset Council. **For more information about this agenda please contact Kate Critchel 01305 252234 - kate.critchel@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk**

A G E N D A

Page No.

4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION 3 - 12

Representatives of town or parish councils and members of the public who live, work, or represent an organisation within the Dorset Council area are welcome to submit either 1 question or 1 statement for each meeting. You are welcome to attend the meeting in person or via MS Teams to read out your question and to receive the response. If you submit a statement for the committee this will be circulated to all members of the committee in advance of the meeting as a supplement to the agenda and appended to the minutes for the formal record but will not be read out at the meeting. The first 8 questions and the first 8 statements received from members of the public or organisations for each meeting will be accepted on a first come first served basis in accordance with the deadline set out below. Further information read Public Participation - Dorset Council

All submissions must be emailed in full to Kate.Critchel@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk by 8.30am on Thursday 5 November 2026.

When submitting your question or statement please note that:

- You can submit 1 question or 1 statement.
- a question may include a short pre-amble to set the context.
- It must be a single question and any sub-divided questions will not be permitted.
- Each question will consist of no more than 450 words, and you will be given up to 3 minutes to present your question.
- when submitting a question please indicate who the question is for (e.g., the name of the committee or Portfolio Holder)
- Include your name, address, and contact details. Only your name will be published but we may need your other details to contact you about your question or statement in advance of the meeting.
- questions and statements received in line with the council's rules for public participation will be published as a supplement to the agenda.
- all questions, statements and responses will be published in full within the minutes of the meeting.

Public Participation
Questions

1. Question from Cllr Atkinson on behalf of Weymouth Town Council

What evidence base will cabinet depend upon for its decision on a proposed change to the PSPO to permit dogs on leads on Weymouth Central Beach from 6pm to 6am, 01 May to 30 September?

The proposed arrangement will result in increased risk to a) public health, b) the resort's reputation. c) our ability to regain its Blue Flag Status.

The proposed change ignores the majority view to Q20 in DC's PSPO survey.

1. Q20, (P67, line 4) established 55.2% of respondents (57.4% of residents) supports retaining the current restriction. Those seeking change include a minority likely to seek exclusion. 89.9% of non-dog owners supported retention of the current restriction (P67, 3 lines up).
2. About 59% of respondents were dog owners This over-representation is an example of self-selection bias that officers should correct for by standard procedures (e.g. Spix C. *et al. J. Med. Screen* **23,** 44-49). This would establish that the overwhelming percentage of respondents are against change at Central Beach.

The proposed change would pose environmental, health and reputation risks to Weymouth resort.

1. The imperative #23 of BLUE FLAG BEACH CRITERIA allows only assistance dogs on a Blue Flag beach.
2. EA has established the sources of faecal indicator organisms at Central Beach are birds, shedding by human bathers and dogs.
3. A minority of irresponsible dog owners are likely to fail to pick up dog faeces or find them for those let off the required lead in the dark.
4. It is intestinal enterococci that compromise bathing water quality at Central Beach.
5. An average sized dog releases millions of intestinal enterococci (range according to size 10^7 to 10^9/deposition) The lower end of the range is equivalent to that from about 7000 birds or c 3,000 human bathers (Wright M.E. et al., 2009, *Marine Pollution Bulletin* **58**, 1649–1656). The latter figure contrast with 99±17 (range 0-200) swimmers in the RNLI designated bathing area at noon on Central Beach this August.
6. The high tide between 6pm and 6am will flush faeces in the intertidal zone into the sea before next morning's raking. Faeces are likely to remain for some time in the bathing water in calm conditions.
7. The website of the manufacturer of our sand rake does not list faeces among efficiently collected materials (SURF RAKE Beach Cleaner | H. Barber & Sons).
8. RNLI will again close Weymouth beach if faeces are reported to it. This damages the reputation of the resort.

9. Faeces left on the dry sand allow accumulation of the persistent eggs of *Toxocara canis*. Dogs should be excluded from sand where children play (Toxocariasis - NHS) as at our beach in the summer.

2. Question from Linda Stevenson

At its committee meeting on 28 October, Weymouth Town Council resolved to object to the continuation of dog access on Weymouth Beach between 6.00 pm and 6.00 am during the summer restriction period, and my question is

what evidence Weymouth Town Council has provided to Dorset Council to demonstrate that responsible dog owners using the beach during these permitted hours cause harm, nuisance, safety concerns or environmental impacts sufficient to justify removing this access, particularly when the current arrangement enables people of all abilities, including disabled residents and assistance-dog users, to access the beach at quieter times, provides level access to the waterline, reduces reliance on the Esplanade which is often occupied by cyclists during permitted cycling hours, summer events, attractions and fairground rides, and allows those who may find busy environments challenging to enjoy Weymouth Beach safely and responsibly, while supporting Dorset Council's commitments to accessibility, inclusion and equality under the Equality Act 2010.

Personal Statement

My name is Linda Stevenson, and I am a resident of Weymouth who relies on an assistance dog to manage a clinically diagnosed mental-health condition.
This condition developed following ten years of full-time work supporting older people with complex mental-health needs, much of it undertaken during periods of severe staffing shortages and high emotional pressure.

I have been raising concerns about dog control signage and assistance-dog access in Weymouth since 2016. During that time I have attended meetings of both Weymouth Town Council and Dorset Council and have contacted councillors elected to represent me in Radipole.

Today I want to explain why this issue matters, not just as a matter of policy, but as a matter of daily life.

My assistance dog is essential to my independence, wellbeing and ability to participate safely in the community. However, many Public Spaces Protection Order signs simply state "No Dogs" and fail to make clear that assistance dogs are exempt.

For many people that may seem a small omission. For me, it is not.
When I approach a beach, promenade or public space displaying a sign that says "No Dogs", my anxiety immediately increases. I hesitate. I question whether I am welcome. I worry about being challenged.
Unfortunately, those concerns are often justified. I have been stopped, questioned and challenged by members of the public because the signage suggests that all dogs are

prohibited. Each time this happens I am placed in the difficult position of having to explain my disability or justify my presence.

The emotional impact of those encounters is significant. They leave me feeling vulnerable, embarrassed and unwelcome in my own community.

As a result, there are places I sometimes avoid altogether, despite having a legal right to access them with my assistance dog.

This is not simply about signs. It is about whether disabled residents can move through public spaces with confidence and dignity.

The Equality Act 2010 provides protections for disabled people and recognises the important role assistance dogs play in enabling access. Yet those protections are undermined when signage fails to communicate clearly that assistance dogs are permitted.

A simple addition of the words:
"Except Assistance Dogs"
would remove confusion, reduce confrontation, improve public understanding and help ensure disabled residents can access public spaces without unnecessary barriers.
I am therefore asking Cabinet to support the inclusion of clear assistance-dog exemptions on all relevant PSPO signage and to ensure equality considerations are fully reflected in future signage reviews.

This is a small change with a significant impact on the daily lives of disabled people.
I respectfully ask Dorset Council to take this opportunity to make its signage clear, lawful and inclusive.

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet Meeting 11th November 2026, Item 8 – Parking Review and Strategy

Portland Town Council Submission

Portland Town Council would like to raise concerns over the proposed introduction of parking tariffs for the following Portland car parks, as detailed in **Appendix 1D**:

- Masonic
- Lord Clyde
- Hambro
- Fortuneswell

As stated in the report, these car parks are used, primarily, for residents parking. All four of these car parks are in the Underhill area of Portland, where the old streets are very narrow with old terraced house and very few with off-road parking, where displacement of vehicles could be extremely problematical..

Residents struggle on a daily basis to find parking spaces near their homes, or even in nearby streets. If these charges are introduced, with an implication of a maximum of a 10 hour stay, residents could be faced with an impossible situation and be unable to find a parking space, due to the very limited on-street parking options.

Since the Cabinet Papers were published on 4th November, many of our residents have expressed concern over these proposals and are very unhappy at the thought of losing the only parking areas that they have, as they

Due to the unique nature of this area of Portland, the Council requests that these car parks are removed from the consideration to introduce parking charges and short time restrictions.

[redacted]

Jane Miles
Town Clerk
Portland Town Council
5th November 2026

Formal statement concerning Policy 3 and the protection of Shillingstone's historic character

I wish to place on the public record my continuing objection to the changes made to Policy 3 within the Shillingstone Neighbourhood Plan Review.

The original Neighbourhood Plan was approved by local referendum in 2017. Its policies concerning traditional design, local character and the historic environment formed an important part of the planning framework approved by the community.

The revised Policy 3 introduces express flexibility allowing departures from traditional vernacular design where higher environmental standards are advanced as justification, subject to the policy's other requirements.

Although presented as part of a wider policy update, this modification changes the terms upon which future development proposals may be assessed, including proposals affecting Shillingstone's Conservation Area.

My concern is not that the statutory Conservation Area designation or its boundaries have been altered. It is that the revised planning policy may afford greater discretion to accept designs that depart from the village's traditional architectural character.

Of particular concern is that I have seen no evidence establishing that Shillingstone residents requested this specific policy change or expressly endorsed the introduction of this additional flexibility.

The Parish Council has advanced the modification, Dorset Council has supported it, and the Independent Examiner has concluded that the modified Plan meets the relevant statutory requirements without the need for a further referendum.

I recognise those conclusions. However, I consider it important to distinguish between compliance with the statutory examination process and evidence that the community itself specifically sought or supported this modification.

The original Neighbourhood Plan received direct public endorsement through a referendum. The current modification to Policy 3 has not been subjected to an equivalent vote.

While I recognise that a further referendum has been found unnecessary under the applicable procedures, that conclusion should not subsequently be represented as evidence that residents expressly approved this particular change.

Matters I wish to have formally recorded

For the avoidance of doubt, I request that the following matters be preserved within the Council's records relating to the Neighbourhood Plan Review:

1. I formally objected to the proposed modification of Policy 3 during the Regulation 16 consultation.

2. I remain concerned that the revised wording may weaken the practical protection afforded to Shillingstone's traditional architectural character and historic environment, particularly within the Conservation Area.
3. I have not been provided with evidence demonstrating that Shillingstone residents requested or specifically endorsed the introduction of flexibility permitting departures from traditional vernacular design.
4. I consider it important that the origin of this modification, the reasons for introducing it, and the evidence of public support relied upon are accurately documented.
5. I do not consider that the conclusion that a further referendum is unnecessary should be confused with a positive expression of community consent to this particular policy change.

I do not claim to speak on behalf of every resident of Shillingstone, nor do I suggest that the Parish Council was necessarily acting outside its statutory powers in proposing the modification.

My concern is one of **democratic accountability, transparency and the preservation of an accurate historical record**.

The Parish Council has chosen to advance a modification which may materially influence how future development is assessed within the village. I consider it important that the responsibility for proposing that change, and the extent of demonstrated community support for it, remain clearly identifiable.

Importance of preserving this objection

Should future planning applications rely upon the revised wording of Policy 3 to justify development that departs from Shillingstone's traditional architectural character, I wish there to be no ambiguity that concerns about the consequences of this modification were formally raised before its adoption.

My purpose is not to predetermine any future planning decision.

Rather, it is to ensure that my objection, and the distinction between a Parish Council-sponsored policy change and demonstrated community support for that change, remain part of the public historical record.

Request concerning the Cabinet decision

I therefore respectfully request that:

1. This statement be accepted, if procedurally possible, as a late public representation for Cabinet's consideration of Item 13 on 10 November 2026.
2. The statement be circulated to Cabinet members before their decision.
3. The statement be included in the published meeting record, where the Council's procedures permit.
4. If inclusion in the meeting record is not possible, the statement be retained with the Council's formal records relating to the Shillingstone Neighbourhood Plan Review, with its receipt and location confirmed in writing.

5. Dorset Council identify, or provide a reference to, any consultation evidence establishing that residents specifically requested or expressly supported the modification to Policy 3.

I appreciate that the Independent Examiner has completed his assessment and that Dorset Council considers itself under a statutory duty to make the revised Plan.

Nevertheless, I believe it is entirely proper for an affected resident to ensure that his opposition to a substantive policy modification is accurately documented before that modification takes effect.

The essential point I wish to preserve is that the modification to Policy 3 was advanced through the Parish Council's review process, but I have seen no evidence establishing that the particular change was initiated or expressly endorsed by the residents whose village it will affect.

This page is intentionally left blank