



Western and Southern Area Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday, 1 February 2022
Time: 10.00 am
Venue: MS Team Live Event This meeting will be held remotely as an MS Teams Live Event [see link below]

Membership: (Quorum 6)

Dave Bolwell, Kelvin Clayton, Susan Cocking, Jean Dunseith, Nick Ireland, Louie O'Leary, Paul Kimber, Bill Pipe (Vice-Chairman), David Shortell (Chairman), Sarah Williams, Kate Wheller and John Worth.

Chief Executive: Matt Prosser, County Hall, Dorchester, Dorset DT1 1XJ

For more information about this agenda please contact Denise Hunt 01305 224878 - denise.hunt@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk



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.

Members of the public are invited to view the proceedings of this meeting with the exception of any items listed in the exempt part of this agenda.

Due to the current coronavirus pandemic the Council has reviewed its approach to holding committee meetings. Members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting and listen to the debate online by using the following link:-

[Link to observe the meeting](#)

Members of the public are invited to make written representations provided that they are submitted to the Democratic Services Officer no later than 8.30am on Friday 28 January 2022. This must include your name, together with a summary of your comments and contain no more than 450 words.

If a councillor who is not on the Planning Committee wishes to address the committee, they will be allowed 3 minutes to do so and will be invited to speak before the applicant or their representative provided that they have notified the Democratic Services Officer by 8.30am on Friday 28 January 2022.

Please note that if you submit a representation to be read out on your behalf at the committee meeting, your name and written submission will be published as part of the minutes of the meeting.

Please refer to the guide to public participation at committee meetings for general information about speaking at meetings [Guidance to Public Speaking at a Planning Committee](#) and specifically the "***Covid-19 Pandemic – Addendum to the Guide to Public Speaking Protocol for Planning Committee meetings - effective from 20 July 2020***" included as part of this agenda (see agenda item 4 - Public Participation).

Using social media at virtual meetings

Anyone can use social media such as tweeting and blogging to report the meeting when it is open to the public.

AGENDA

Page No.

1 APOLOGIES

To receive any apologies for absence

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To disclose any pecuniary, other registerable or non-registerable interest as set out in the adopted Code of Conduct. In making their disclosure councillors are asked to state the agenda item, the nature of the interest and any action they propose to take as part of their declaration.

If required, further advice should be sought from the Monitoring Officer in advance of the meeting.

3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

5 - 6

To receive questions or statements on the business of the committee from town and parish councils and members of the public.

Public speaking has been suspended for virtual committee meetings during the Covid-19 crisis and public participation will be dealt with through written submissions only.

Members of the public who live, work or represent an organisation within the Dorset Council area, may submit up to two questions or a statement of up to a maximum of 450 words. All submissions must be sent electronically to denise.hunt@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk by the deadline set out below. When submitting a question please indicate who the question is for and include your name, address and contact details. Questions and statements received in line with the council's rules for public participation will be published as a supplement to the agenda.

Questions will be read out by an officer of the council and a response given by the appropriate Portfolio Holder or officer at the meeting. All questions, statements and responses will be published in full within the minutes of the meeting. **The deadline for submission of the full text of a question or statement is 8.30am on Friday 28 January 2022.**

4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

To consider the application listed below for planning permission

- a **WP/20/00756/FUL - Waterside Holiday Park, Bowleaze
Coveyay, Weymouth, DT3 6PP**

7 - 42

Extension and improvements to Waterside Holiday Park, comprising use of land for the siting of timber lodges for holiday use, outdoor recreation and play areas, associated access and parking, landscaping planting and infrastructure.

5 URGENT ITEMS

To consider any items of business which the Chairman has had prior notification and considers to be urgent pursuant to section 100B (4) b) of the Local Government Act 1972. The reason for the urgency shall be recorded in the minutes.

6 EXEMPT BUSINESS

To move the exclusion of the press and the public for the following item in view of the likely disclosure of exempt information within the meaning of paragraph 3 of schedule 12 A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

The public and the press will be asked to leave the meeting whilst the item of business is considered.

Dorset Council

Covid-19 Pandemic – Addendum to the Guide to Public Speaking Protocol for Planning Committee meetings – effective from 20 July 2020

Due to the Covid-19 pandemic the council has had to put in place measures to enable the council's decision making processes to continue whilst keeping safe members of the public, councillors and council staff in accordance with the Government's guidance on social distancing by applying new regulations for holding committee meetings from remote locations.

The following procedures will apply to planning committee meetings until further notice, replacing where appropriate the relevant sections of the Guide to Public Speaking at Planning Committees:

1. While planning committee meetings are held remotely during the Coronavirus outbreak public participation will take the form of written statements (and not public speaking) to the committee.
2. If you wish to make a written statement it must be no more than 450 words with no attached documents and be sent to the Democratic Services Team by 8.30am two working days prior to the date of the committee – i.e. for a committee meeting on a Wednesday written statements must be received by 8.30am on the Monday. The deadline date and the email contact details of the relevant democratic services officer can be found on the front page of the committee agenda. The agendas for each meeting can be found on the Dorset Council website

[Dorset Council Committee List](#)

3. During this period the council can only accept written statements via email and you should continue to bear in mind the guidance in the public speaking guide when preparing your representation.
4. The first three statements received from members of the public for and against the application (maximum six in total) will be read out together with any statement from the town and parish council, by an officer (but not the case officer), after the case officer has presented their report and before the application is debated by members of the Committee. It may be that not all of your statement will be read out if the same point has been made by another statement and already read to the Committee. This is to align with the pre-Covid-19 protocol which limited public speaking to 15 minutes per item, although the Chairman of the Committee will retain discretion over this time period as she/he sees fit. All statements received will be circulated to the Committee members before the meeting.
5. This addendum applies to members of public (whether objecting or supporting an application, town and parish councils, planning agents and applicants).
6. Councillors who are not on the Planning Committee may also address the Committee for up to 3 minutes by speaking to the Committee (rather than submitting a written statement). They need to inform Democratic Services of their wish to speak at the meeting two working days before the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

Delegated Officer Report

Application Number:	WP/20/00756/FUL
Proposal:	Extension and improvements to Waterside Holiday Park, comprising use of land for the siting of timber lodges for holiday use, outdoor recreation and play areas, associated access and parking, landscaping planting and infrastructure
Location:	WATERSIDE HOLIDAY PARK, BOWLEAZE COVEWAY, WEYMOUTH, DT3 6PP
Recommendation:	Grant, subject to conditions
Case Officer:	Emma Telford
Ward Member(s):	Cllr Ferrari and Cllr O'leary

This application is referred to committee in line with the Scheme of Delegation consultation process at the request of the Service Manager.

1.0 Summary of Recommendation:

1.1 That the committee be minded to grant planning permission subject to conditions and that the Head of Planning determine the application accordingly.

2.0 Reason for the Recommendation:

- The proposed development is not considered to result in any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity.
- The proposed development is considered acceptable in its design and general visual impact.
- There are no material considerations which would warrant refusal of this application.

3.0 Key Planning Issues:

Issue	Consideration
Principle of Development	The proposal is considered to comply with local plan policies SUS 2 and ECON 7.
Residential Amenity	The proposed development is not considered to result in any significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity.
Visual Amenity, Setting of the	On balance and subject to conditions the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on the characteristics of the area's landscape.

Heritage Coast and the AONB	
Heritage Assets	Revised scheme would not result in harm to the significance of the identified heritage assets.
Highway Safety	Highways Officer raised no objections.
Flooding and Drainage	Flood Risk Management Team raised no objections subject to conditions.
Biodiversity	Biodiversity Plan has been agreed.
Land Stability	An informative would be included to ensure the applicant is aware of the potential risk from coastal recession to the access.

4.0 Description of Site:

4.1 The application site is located on land adjacent to the existing Waterside Holiday Park. Waterside Holiday Park is accessed from Bowleaze Cove way to the south. Opposite the holiday park to the south are a number of leisure and retail developments fronting Bowleaze Cove Beach, residential properties of Bowleaze Cove way and the Riveria Hotel. Surrounding the holiday park in all other directions are open, agricultural fields.

4.2 The application site is located towards the north-east of the holiday park. The eastern boundary of the site immediately adjoins the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Heritage Coast.

5.0 Description of Proposal:

5.1 The proposed development is for the change of use of the land for the siting of timber lodges for holiday use, outdoor recreation, play areas, associated access and parking as part of the existing Waterside Holiday Park. The proposed lodges would fall under the definition of caravans.

6.0 Relevant Planning History:

WP/17/00922/FUL - Erection of 24 safari tents instead of 28 tents permitted under WP/14/00153/FUL (revised scheme to include 4no. 4 bed safari tents and provision of hot tubs to units 8-24). – Approved.

WP/19/01005/FUL - Change of use of field for stationing of Cedar Lodges (falling within the definition of a caravan) on the remaining 14 pitches instead of safari tents. – Approved.

7.0 Relevant Constraints:

Outside of a Defined Development Boundary
Setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
Setting of the Heritage Coast
Setting of World Heritage Site
Setting of Heritage Assets
South Dorset Coast SSSI
Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC
Right of Way

8.0 Consultations:

8.1 Dorset Council Waste Services – *In regard to this application the Dorset Council Waste Service have no questions or issues.*

8.2 Dorset Countryside – *The proposed works are in the vicinity of the footpath 26 Weymouth. However, I am unaware of any unrecorded paths that may be affected.*

I have no objection to the proposed development, as shown in the plans accompanying the application. However, throughout the duration of the development the full width of the public footpath must remain open and available to the public, with no materials or vehicles stored on the route.

Please note the granting of planning consent does not mean that the path will be diverted or extinguished and that a separate process is required to divert or extinguish the path. If the proposals mean a temporary closure of the route it is important this is discussed with the Senior Ranger before any works commence. It is for the applicants to assure themselves that any other necessary consents have also been obtained.

8.3 Environment Agency – *We have no objection to the proposed development subject to the following informatives being included in any planning permission granted.*

The area proposed for development of the extension to the existing holiday park does not fall within fluvial Flood Zones 2 or 3 and as such is within Flood Zone 1. We have reviewed the submitted FRA (prepared by rps Consulting Services Ltd, Version 003 dated October 2020) and Site Layout Plan (drawing number 590/01 P4) and do not have any concerns or comments to make over the proposals.

We do note however that the principal access into the site (which is as existing for the current holiday park), passes through Flood Zones 2 and 3 of the River Jordan (although there appears to be a possible alternate 'dry' access to the north via Church Road). As such it is advisable for the LPA to consult with their emergency planning

team with respect of emergency access/egress planning.

8.4 Weymouth Town Council – *Members voted by a majority to object to the application on the grounds of the impact on the countryside, traffic generation, landscaping, noise and disturbance from the development, nature conservation and planning policy.*

8.5 Flood Risk Management Team – *The following concern needs to be addressed / clarified further. At this time therefore, we recommend that a (Holding) Objection be applied to this proposal.*

- *Further information will need to be submitted in order to clarify the suitability of the existing outfall so as to provide the evidence to show that the applicant has a viable and deliverable surface water drainage scheme.*

The applicant has described that the surface water from the development will be discharged into an existing ditch which then connects into a culverted watercourse before flowing into the River Jordan. However, the applicant has stated within the surface water drainage strategy that the evidence for the culvert is ‘anecdotal’. The applicant may need to provide details from an actual survey of the ditch and culvert in order to provide evidence of its existence. Details of the watercourse/culvert location, capacity, condition and conveyance route should be provided along with verification that the applicant has the relevant ownership or permission to discharge into it.

Insufficient information has been provided regarding SW management from the development. As such, we are unable to ascertain, to our satisfaction, the appropriateness of any SW management in accordance with the Ministerial statement ‘Sustainable Drainage System’ 2014, chapter 14 of the NPPF and Planning Policy Guidance (PPG). As relevant LLFA in this matter we are unable to confirm that the applicant has met DEFRA’s technical guidance or relevant local and national policies concerning drainage.

Our (Holding) Objection may be overcome via the submission of additional details outlining a site specific SW management scheme. Accordingly, we ask to be re-consulted on the SW scheme if further information is supplied.

Our objection will be maintained until an adequate SW scheme has been approved in-principle. We may at that stage request suitable planning condition/s and informative/s to cover detailed design, future maintenance, and potential requirement for other permissions.

8.6 Highways Officer – *The Highway Authority notes the various comments about the usage and parking that occurs on Bowleaze Cove way. It also recognises that it is a bus route and that parking on the highway can be controlled by Highway Law if deemed appropriate and as such isn’t a sustainable reason for refusal.*

The Highway Authority therefore considers that the proposals do not present a material harm to the transport network or to highway safety and consequently has no objection.

8.7 Environmental Health – *Please refer to Housing for any site licence considerations.*

8.8 Dorset AONB Landscape Planning Officer – *The application proposes an extension in two areas. 31 timber lodges with green roofs and 25 timber pods with green or shingle roofs are proposed in a field adjoining the eastern boundary of the existing holiday park (Area A). Furthermore, play/fitness/recreation facilities are proposed within a portion of a field south of the existing holiday park (Area B). The application proposes the planting of a substantial amount of native plants, alongside new features such as a pond. The proposals also include areas of parking, paths and lighting to provide access to the extended areas of accommodation and recreation.*

Whilst noting that the application proposes a significant amount of planting, this does not appear to align with the AONB LCA guideline to reduce the effects of caravan parks through new planting. This is partly because the planting is attached to an extension, rather than an existing area in use. Furthermore, the guidelines clearly seek to restrict expansion in open, sensitive areas and do not encourage planting where the open character of the landscape will be affected. In this location, the extension area comprises pastoral fields that contribute to the relatively open and undeveloped character of the coastal hinterland. The arguments presented by the applicant that the application would counterbalance the landscape and visual effects through landscape enhancements are highly questionable, in my opinion.

Whilst recognising that Area A, in particular, contains a number of equine related elements that are not regarded as favourable contributors to landscape character, the argument presented by the planning statement (that the removal of these and the introduction of holiday units, extensive planting, pathways and lighting would result in net landscape gain) is not an opinion that I agree with. In my opinion the effects of equine uses, although detrimental, are relatively minor. In particular, the impact of existing uses upon elevated panoramic views is often negligible, thereby not significantly impacting upon the special qualities of the AONB (particularly the panoramic views into, out of and across the designated area and perceptions of a lack of development within the site area and wider coastal strip).

In contrast, despite adopting measures such as recessive finishes, the development would result in a clearly perceptible and transformative effect on an area of pasture, within the immediate setting of the AONB. This transformation would adversely affect views into, out of and across the AONB, as can be understood through the LVIA. For example, the following views into the AONB would be adversely affected:

- VP3, in which area A forms a relatively prominent component in the foreground of the view toward the Osmington White Horse and the South Dorset Ridgeway.
- VP4, toward Osmington Hill.
- VP9, which is a view along the coastline.

In all of these locations, holiday parks, both at Waterside and across the wider area, are significant detractors to the quality of views. Furthermore, it should be noted that the photography provided does not illustrate the substantial seasonal campsite at Eweleaze Farm in operation. The coalescence of the proposed extension at Waterside with the seasonal camping at Eweleaze is a significant cumulative issue that requires consideration. For example, from VP9, the extension area, in combination with Eweleaze and the more distant PGL site would create a near continuous swathe of visitor based development that clearly contrasts with the character of the 'exceptional undeveloped coastline' of the AONB, which is amongst the special qualities of the designated area.

Concerning views out of the AONB, whilst recognising that area A sometimes appears relatively foreshortened, there are nonetheless views that would be adversely affected, to varying degrees. I would particularly highlight VP 10 (Winslow Hill), VP11 (Chalbury Hill Fort) and VP 12 (Green Hill) as locations where the expansion would perceptibly alter the pastoral appearance of the site within the open coastal landscape and lead to undesirable cumulative effects that conflict with the AONB's landscape planning guidelines. Whilst the application documents contend that the proposal would result in net landscape gain, I do not consider that this conclusion relates to landscape character and visual amenity, as the output of the development would not resemble the established form or pattern of the underlying 'natural' landscape. Whilst there may be gains for biodiversity and habitats, these are not within my field of expertise and I would therefore advise the authority to consider the advice of an ecologist to reach an informed opinion on these.

Overall, I cannot accept the contention of the Planning Statement, at section 6.14, that: "Although the proposal would be located within a previously green field setting, it would only form visible elements for a small number of low sensitivity receptors and would appear within the context of the existing holiday park and would not appear out of place in short distance views". Clearly the surrounding landscape and visual receptors can be considered highly sensitive. Furthermore, the expansion would notably extend and exacerbate the cumulative effects of holiday parks in the area, further eroding the underlying pastoral character of the coastal hinterland. Consequently, the assertion of the planning statement, following the contention I have quoted, that the allocation would comply with Policy ENV1, appears inaccurate.

8.9 Senior Landscape Architect – *Planning permission is being sought for the expansion and diversification of the Waterside Holiday Park to provide additional holiday accommodation and recreational facilities.*

The coastal strip to its south forms part of the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site; the higher ground to its north and east lies within the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; the land to its west and south forms part of the Heritage Coast; and the proposed development site and surrounding fields are identified as land of local landscape importance within the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan.

While it is clear that the proposed design, materials, layout, reduced density and associated planting would create a development that is markedly physically and visually different from the existing holiday park it would also be markedly different from the open pastoral landscape which surrounds it and of which it forms part.

I consider that the development would be likely to have an adverse impact on landscape and visual character and quality both in and of itself and also by significantly adding to the cumulative effect of permanent and seasonal holiday accommodation provision within the surrounding landscape.

I consider that the accommodation, vehicular and pedestrian access, parking, lighting and planting together with their residential and recreational uses would result in a marked change in landscape character that would be at odds with the current open pastoral farmland character of the site itself and the surrounding landscape to its north, east and south.

I also consider that the current submission fails to include sufficient evidence with regard to the landscape and visual impact of the proposed development and the cumulative impact with adjacent permanent and seasonal holiday accommodation. I consider that the submission should have included photomontages showing both the proposed development and the wider context of existing permanent and seasonal holiday accommodation provision.

8.10 Housing Technical Officer – *With regard for the planning permission WP/20/00756 and the current licencing conditions for a holiday site with both a tent & touring licence and static caravan licence (no 307).*

We have no comments to made concerning the extension of the site for lodges or pods. Any changes granted by planning permission in the current licence conditions will be dealt with via either a new licence or suitable amendments on the licence holders application.

8.11 Senior Conservation Officer – *There are no heritage assets on the application site and it is not within a Conservation Area. However, development on the site has the*

potential to affect the significance of designated heritage assets through impacts on their setting. The main issues to be considered therefore include:

1. the impact of the proposed development on the significance of the following designated heritage assets, including any contribution made by their setting:

- Preston Roman Villa (Scheduled Monument, 1002704);*
- Romano-Celtic Temple and Associated Remains (Scheduled Monument, 1013371);*
- Multi-Period Archaeological Landscape at Chalbury (Scheduled Monument, 1002711);*
- George III, Chalk-Cut Hill Side Figure / Osmington White Horse (Scheduled Monument, 1005574);*
- Riviera Hotel (Grade II, 1135188);*
- Sutton Poytnz Conservation Area; and*

2. if harm is identified to designated heritage assets, any public benefits of the proposals which could be sufficiently substantial to outweigh the harm caused, along with any other relevant tests etc. set out in local and national policy.

General

The existing holiday park forms one part of a cluster of similar, densely occupied parks to the S of Preston. It is clear from the various viewpoints presented in the LVIA that these are already detrimental elements not only within the landscape, but also insofar as they impact upon elements of the setting of designated heritage assets (see above) which contribute to their significance. Combined with the undulating landscape sandwiched between higher ground to the N and S in particular, these aspects present considerable challenges to the sensitive extension of the holiday park site, even if the overall objectives of the scheme might be laudable. These issues are borne out especially in the topography of Areas A and B, which occupy areas of land sloping in opposing directions (e.g. LVIA Viewpoints 6, 10 and 11). The setting impacts therefore need to be considered not only in terms of surrounding physical context, but also in visual terms, where this contributes to the significance of designated heritage assets. Given these constraints, the application could have benefited from a series of comparative verified views of the proposed development from key areas within the surrounding landscape.

The Heritage Statement (HS) identifies a number of potentially affected designated heritage assets, with which we broadly concur, although we have also considered the impacts on the George III/Osmington White Horse hillside figure for reasons which are

clear from the contribution of setting to its significance. The overall conclusion of the HS is that there is no resulting harm to any of the designated heritage assets identified in that document (HS, pp. 15-16), though again without considering the White Horse. However, the HS does identify the potential for buried archaeology (5.10, p. 16) and for harm to occur to it as a result of the development (5.12, p. 16). If comments have not been provided already, we would therefore recommend that views are sought from the County Archaeologist on this element of the scheme.

In considering impacts and taking into account the contribution of setting to their significance, we do not consider that the proposed development would result in harm to the Preston Roman Villa Scheduled Monument or the Riviera Hotel. However, we have concerns regarding impacts on the other designated heritage assets identified above, all of which are related to the spread of development within the landscape and the visibility of both areas of the site. We do acknowledge that the majority of the development is contained within Area A, with that in Area B located towards its lower reaches and, as an adventure playground, is likely to be less visually prominent.

Chalbury Hillfort and Romano-British Temple

The significance of both the Romano-British temple and the monument at Chalbury hillfort rely to no small extent on their prominence as focal points within the wider landscape, meaning that long views from and towards them were intentional and significant for understanding their purpose. Both were built to look over, and be seen from, a settled and worked landscape, but one that was far from that of today. The various viewpoints presented in the LVIA (especially 9 and 110 illustrate how modern development cannot be said to have enhanced these views, but have rather resulted in a degree of attrition. Whilst some measure of continual development is inevitable, this does not mean that further attritional impacts should be ignored or downplayed, but rather considered as part of the overall balance. In this case, the proposed development, of Area A in particular, will result in further loss of the open landscape over which these monuments preside. From Chalbury hillfort (Viewpoint 11), this will continue a sweep of development which currently extends from the Riviera Hotel and through the current holiday park and push it further towards the sea. From the temple (Viewpoint 9), the development would push the holiday park further into landscape towards Osmington Hill and beyond its somewhat nestled position (from this viewpoint at least). These impacts are compounded by the upward slope of Area A. In both these cases, we consider that less than substantial harm will result to both heritage assets arising from continued development of their hinterland and resulting detractions in visual experience. However, the nature and extent of this harm is not considered to be excessive and is difficult to quantify further without the suggested verified views, which would clarify the visual aspects of the proposed design and materials etc. The harm could potentially be fully or partly addressed by some combination of the following, subject to associated considerations:

- *removing development from Area A, or at least reducing the development by restricting it to a close margin at the W end of the field; or*
- *moving the proposed adventure playground to the W end of Area A and focussing a smaller number of new pods/lodges on the lower ground within Area B.*

George III/Osmington White Horse

From the position and material nature of the White Horse, it is clear that long views towards it from the direction of Weymouth were intended and a number of fortuitous viewpoints have emerged through the later use of paths around the more immediate landscape. One particular vantage point is from the South West Coast Path, a nationally recognised walking route, and the adjoining coastal margin, as is clearly illustrated in LVIA Viewpoint 3. From these areas the White Horse forms the dominant visual element in the landscape and is largely free of intervening development which could detract and distract from it. From these coastal areas, Area A extends right across the middle ground of the views towards the White Horse and the view would therefore be changed considerably if this area were developed. Given that the significance of the White Horse depends almost entirely on its visibility in such views, it is considered that the proposals would result in less than substantial harm to its significance. Though, again, the nature and extent of the harm could be further assessed with verified views.

Again, subject to associated considerations, the measures suggested above for avoiding/mitigating impacts on the Chalbury hillfort and Romano-British temple could result in improvements as regards impacts on the White Horse, though even development at the W end of Area A would be more visually prominent than from those monuments.

Sutton Poyntz Conservation Area

Though the setting of the Conservation Area has been detrimentally affected by the creep of settlement to its W and, to a lesser extent, between the two distinct settlements of Sutton Poyntz and Preston, within the landscape it can still be appreciated as a historic settlement. In this case, various areas which permit its remaining characteristic rural setting to be experienced and appreciated have arisen fortuitously from the use of the surrounding landscape, particularly from the W and NW (LVIA Viewpoints 11 and 12). Development on the site will result in further erosion of the rural backdrop to the Conservation Area and, for this reason, would result in less than substantial harm to its significance. However, given the extent to which setting contributes to its significance, the nature and extent of harm is considered to be less than the harm to the Scheduled Monuments above.

It is possible that the measures suggested above to address or avoid the harm to other designated heritage assets could also have similar outcomes relating to the Conservation Area, subject to all other associated considerations.

8.12 Senior Archaeologist – *No comment – I am not greatly concerned about archaeological impact here.*

8.13 Natural England – *Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.*

*European sites – Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs Special Area of Conservation
Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have likely significant effects on the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs Special Area of Conservation and has no objection to the proposed development.*

To meet the requirements of the Habitats Regulations, we advise you to record your decision that a likely significant effect can be ruled out. The following may provide a suitable justification for that decision:

- We note provision of a shadow HRA within Appendix E of the Ecological Assessment.*
- Recreational disturbance was carried through to the appropriate assessment stage of the HRA.*
- The HRA concludes that the proposals alone would result in a very small increase in visitors to the SAC and goes on to mention that a SANG is being provided as part of the development.*
- We would agree that the SANG is unlikely to intercept visitors accessing the SAC. However, we can advise the competent authority that despite the provision of SANG as part of the proposal, your authority should be able to conclude that this development will not lead to an adverse effect on integrity of the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC.*
- Whilst we welcome the SANG (which should more appropriately be called Green Infrastructure/GI in this instance), it does not act as mitigation for impacts on the SAC.*
- However, the GI does provide some recreational and landscape benefits and so should be secured.*

South Dorset Coast Site of Special Scientific Interest

Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not damage or destroy the interest features for which the site has been notified and has no objection.

Protected Landscapes – Dorset AONB and Purbeck Heritage Coast

The proposed development is for a site in close proximity to the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), a nationally designated landscape and the

Heritage Coast. The statutory purpose of the AONB is to conserve and enhance the area's natural beauty. You should assess the application carefully as to whether the proposed development would have a significant impact on or harm that statutory purpose. Relevant to this is the duty on public bodies to 'have regard' for that statutory purpose in carrying out their functions (S85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, 2000). The Planning Practice Guidance confirms that this duty also applies to proposals outside the designated area but impacting on its natural beauty.

Natural England notes and supports the comments made by the Dorset AONB Team on the likely implications of the proposals on the setting of the designated landscape.

In determining the application, the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) should be given careful consideration. In particular, paragraph 170, which states that planning decisions should "contribute and enhance the natural and local environment by" (amongst other things) "protecting and enhancing valued landscapes". Paragraph 172 requires that, "Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty". The requirement, set out in the NPPF, for new development to not only protect the special qualities of the AONBs, but also serve to enhance those qualities is clear. Alongside national policy you should also apply landscape policies set out in your development plan.

If the authority were minded to approve despite the comments of the AONB team, we feel the proposal should be looking to improve the landscaping and character of the entire park, not just the proposal area, for example, through planting of native trees within the existing park.

Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan Required (over 0.1ha or site with biodiversity interest)

Natural England welcome the submission of a Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (BMEP), however this is not accompanied by a Certificate of Approval from the Dorset Council Natural Environment Team (DC NET). In this case, we recommend permission is not granted until the BMEP has been approved by DC NET. Provided the implementation in full of a DC NET approved BMEP is secured through a condition as part of the grant of planning permission, Natural England agree with the opinion of the Natural Environment Team of Dorset Council that the planning authority will have met their duties under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 and Regulation 9(3) of The Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017.

Comments on the Ecological Assessment

The Ecological Assessment makes statements regarding the quality of the grassland

*being lost to the development in the absence of any survey/DAFOR data. We would therefore **request that the applicant provides a full DAFOR species list for the existing areas of grassland.** Table 5.1 attempts to demonstrate the habitat losses and gains from the development. We would ask that a standardised approach be taken when demonstrating losses and gains such as the Defra metric and look forward to seeing the results of that approach to clarify the losses and gains for the proposal.*

CEMP/LEMP

Natural England advises a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) and/or Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) should be submitted to and approved in writing by the district ecologist/biodiversity officer that identifies the steps and procedures that will be implemented to avoid or mitigate constructional impacts on species and habitats.

The approved CEMP/LEMP should be secured via an appropriately worded condition attached to any planning consent and shall be adhered to at all times, unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Comments on Amended Plans-

8.1 In response to the comments received the scheme was reduced and the proposed holiday pods removed from the scheme. The application was reconsulted on and the following further responses were made:

8.15 **Sport England** – *The proposed development does not fall within either our statutory remit or non-statutory remit, therefore Sport England has not provided a detailed response in this case.*

8.16 **Wessex Water** – *As water supplier for this area we have a responsibility to maintain regulatory levels of service for our household customers, which includes providing a minimum flow of 9 litres/minute at a pressure of 10m head (1 bar) at the customer stop tap/meter at their property boundary. The network monitoring measures we have in place record this local network meets these OFWAT service standards.*

The existing Holiday Park has a metered connection off the 4" public water main in Bowleaze Coveway. If it is the applicant's intention to apply for an increase in their flow rate, or upsizing of their water connection, then as a business customer this application would be made through their water retailer. To get a new or increased water connection for commercial purposes the applicant will need to agree terms and conditions, including the charge with Wessex Water.

When considering a request for a commercial supply we must make sure first and foremost that we can meet and maintain all existing service levels and potential demand for domestic supply purposes. Wessex Water is entitled to recover from the commercial

applicant, the reasonable costs of making the connection and any necessary network reinforcement required to accommodate the commercial demand whilst maintaining our regulatory service levels to our existing customers.

8.17 Highways – *Further to its previous response, Dorset Highways has no further observations to make.*

8.18 Weymouth Town Council – *The Council has no objection to the proposals.*

8.19 Dorset AONB Landscape Planning Officer – *My previous comments appear below and constitute an objection, which has not been overcome. Despite a reduction in the number of new holiday units proposed, the impact of encroachment of built development and the loss of pastoral character in the coastal hinterland in the immediate setting of the AONB remain significant issues that weigh heavily against the proposal.*

I have reviewed the latest comments from the Council's Senior Landscape Architect and, rather than repeat the points made, would simply like to add my support to these and confirm that the reduced proposal continues to conflict with those policies of the AONB's Management Plan highlighted previously, despite a reduction in coalescence with the nearby Eweleaze site.

I would also like to highlight that if the council were to consider approving the scheme, modifications to the red line area should be considered, so as to minimise any change in use. Were mitigation measures required, a mechanism for securing these within a blue line area could be considered. However, I would highlight that modifications to the red line area and/or the proposed wider planting and 'unofficial SANG' would not serve to overcome my concerns about the proposal.

8.20 Senior Landscape Architect – *Further to my previous comments the description has been amended to reflect the omission of the proposed 25 No. round timber holiday pods in the eastern portion of Area A of the proposed development site.*

The coastal strip to the south of the proposed development forms part of the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site; the higher ground to its north and east lies within the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; the land to its west and south forms part of the Heritage Coast; and the proposed development site and surrounding fields are identified as land of local landscape importance within the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan.

While the revised scheme and its proposed materials, layout, density and associated planting would create a development that would be markedly physically and visually different from the existing holiday park, I still consider that it would also be markedly

different from the open pastoral landscape which surrounds it and of which the site forms part.

I continue to consider that the development would be likely to have an adverse impact on landscape and visual character and quality, both in and of itself, and also by significantly adding to the cumulative effect of permanent and seasonal holiday accommodation provision within the surrounding landscape.

I continue to consider that the accommodation, vehicular and pedestrian access, parking, lighting and planting together with their residential and recreational uses would result in a marked change in landscape character that would be at odds with the current open pastoral farmland of the site itself and the surrounding landscape to its north, east and south.

Further to my previous comments, that the prior submission failed to include sufficient evidence with regard to the landscape and visual impact of the proposed development and the cumulative impact with adjacent permanent and seasonal holiday accommodation, Visually Verified Montages (VVMs) from three viewpoints to the north, south and west of the proposed development have been submitted.

I would commend the quality, accuracy and presentation of these visually verified montages and thank the applicant and their consultants for taking the time and trouble to commission, prepare and submit them. They are undoubtedly a great aid, not just to my assessment of the proposed development, but to that of other consultees, interested parties and members of the general public.

The visually verified montages from viewpoints to the north and west of the site show that the proposed green roofs and associated tree planting would be likely to mitigate and reduce the adverse landscape and visual impact of the the proposed development.

However I consider that the visually verified montages from the viewpoint to the south of the proposed development clearly demonstrate that the landscape and visual impact of the proposed development from this viewpoint would result in a significant adverse impact on landscape and visual character and quality both in and of itself and cumulatively with the permanent and seasonal holiday accommodation provision within the surrounding landscape both within the first year after completion and ten years after completion.

I would challenge and refute the assertion made in paragraph 12.5.5 of the amended Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (The Landscape Practice 590 LVIA Text Rev P3 16.03.2021) that “whilst some residual adverse landscape and visual effects have been identified, these are small in scale”.

It also clearly demonstrates that from viewpoints to the south “the sensitive layout, recessive detailing, form and materials of the proposed buildings and structures, together with the large amount of native planting” would clearly fail to adequately mitigate these adverse visual effects even after a period of ten years has elapsed.

I therefore consider that the proposed development would be likely to create a significant visual detractor within the setting of the Dorset AONB. Views from the South West Coast Path towards the Osmington White Horse, the South Dorset Escarpment and Chalk Ridgeway and the South Dorset Downs and Open Chalk Downland would be adversely affected as a result.

Furthermore, unlike the seasonal campsite at Eweleaze farm to its east, the proposed development would form a permanent feature in the landscape.

I consider that as such it would not meet the requirements of paragraphs 98, 170 and 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework February 2019 and Policies ENV1, ENV3 and ECON7 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan 2015 and I am therefore unable to support the development proposal

8.21 Senior Conservation Officer – *We support the application, subject to conditions.*

The designated heritage assets mentioned here are those to whose significance we previously identified less than substantial harm, namely Romano-Celtic Temple and Associated Remains (Scheduled Monument); Multi-Period Archaeological Landscape at Chalbury (Scheduled Monument); George III, Chalk-Cut Hill Side Figure/Osmington White Horse (Scheduled Monument); and Sutton Poytnz Conservation Area. As no harm was identified to Preston Roman Villa or the Riviera Hotel, these are not considered here.

The reduced scope of the built elements of the scheme, together with the proposals as read in the Verified Views, represent a less intrusive element in the context of their impact on the setting of designated heritage assets than previously proposed. V03 and V09 specifically address viewpoints which we identified as relevant to impact on setting of designated heritage assets and correspond to the original numbered viewpoints in the LVIA (Jul 2020), whilst V10 gives an indication of the visibility from the N. We have assumed that the 1- and 10-year views reflect the planting strategy provided in Landscape Practice drawing no. 590/04 P9.

Taking these into account, we consider that the harm to the significance of the identified heritage assets, insofar as it arose from encroachment into the landscape and its associated visual impact, has been reasonably addressed. In that regard, we do not consider that the revised scheme will result in harm to the significance of the identified designated heritage assets, subject to the conditions set out below.

1. *Details of the design and materials of proposed timber lodges are to be provided and approved in writing.*
2. *Details of any proposed new site boundary walls or fences are to be provided and approved in writing*

8.22 Flood Risk Management Team – *We withdraw our previous recommendation of a holding objection and confirm that we have no in-principle objection to the proposed development subject to conditions:*

No development shall take place until a detailed surface water management scheme for the site, based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, and including clarification of how surface water is to be managed during construction, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The surface water scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the submitted details before the development is completed.

REASON: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, and to improve habitat and amenity.

No development shall take place until details of maintenance & management of both the surface water sustainable drainage scheme and any receiving system have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details. These should include a plan for the lifetime of the development, 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.

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

8.23 Natural England – *The application falls within the scope of the Dorset Biodiversity Protocol, adopted by your authority which requires the submission of a Biodiversity Mitigation & Enhancement Plan for all developments of this nature. Natural England therefore recommends that permission is not granted until a BMEP has been produced and approved by the Dorset Council's Natural Environment Team (NET). Provided the BMEP has been approved by the DC NET and its implementation in full is made a condition of any permission, then no further consultation with Natural England is required.*

Rights of Way, Access land, Coastal access and National Trails

Paragraphs 98 and 170 of the NPPF highlights the important of public rights of way and access. Development should consider potential impacts on access land, common land,

rights of way, coastal access routes and coastal margin in the vicinity of the development and the scope to mitigate any adverse impacts. Consideration should also be given to the potential impacts on any nearby National Trails, including the England Coast Path. The National Trails website www.nationaltrail.co.uk provides information including contact details for the National Trail Officer.

LEMP

Natural England welcomes the submission of a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) which should in turn be approved in writing by the district ecologist/biodiversity officer. The LEMP identifies the steps and procedures that will be implemented to avoid or mitigate constructional impacts on species and habitats. The approved LEMP should be secured via an appropriately worded condition attached to any planning consent and shall be adhered to at all times, unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

8.24 Lead Project Officer (CIL & Planning Agreements) – *I have no comments on this one.*

8.25 Dorset CPRE – *CPRE objects very strongly to this application to develop Waterside Holiday Park with the setting of the World Heritage Jurassic Coastline. Please refer to the Jurassic Coast Partnership Plan 2020-2025 written by the Jurassic Coast Trust. The 95 mile long Jurassic Coast (covering Dorset and East Devon) became a World Heritage Site in 2001. It is England's only natural World Heritage Site and has been declared a coastline of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV). It serves great historic and scientific interest and is particularly beautiful. This development of the Waterside Holiday park will cause significant damage.*

9.0 Representations:

9.1 In response to the initial consultation 92 comments were received, 72 in objection and 20 in support. The reasons for objecting are summarised below:

Principle of development:

- Jobs created are likely to be generalised, unskilled or semi-skilled cleaning and maintenance jobs.
- The additional visitors may spend some money in Weymouth but this is an out-of-town development with its own site shop, restaurant and leisure facilities.
- Food shopping is likely to be done in one of the large supermarket chains.
- Revenue from the sale or rental of the proposed new caravans will not be to the struggling town centre local hotels or self-catering accommodation operators.
- Any economic benefit does not outweigh the loss of open countryside, increased traffic and disturbance.
- Site is outside of the defined development boundary.

- No material benefit to the Weymouth community.
- Weymouth needs accommodation within the town itself to increase local restaurant and retail use.
- The boost to the economy will in the majority be to the Waterside Holiday Group.
- Initially an application for a less dense number of lodges/pods will overtime lead to application for an increase in density.
- Holiday park already has its own convenience store, restaurant, bar and other amenities designed to encourage visitors to spend money on site.
- Over development.
- Cedar cabins and canvas tent construction will be by specialists neither of which are located in Dorset.
- May result in a precedence for a permanent housing site.
- This development could set a precedent for further expansion of the site.
- Already an overdevelopment of caravan parks in the immediate area.
- Possibility that this application to provide additional lodges will be used in favour of extending their outside performance licence.
- Largely a holiday park in name only with individuals who currently occupy them for up to 46 weeks of the year.
- Expansion of all the caravan sites should be discouraged in favour of improvement.

Highway Safety:

- Proposed development should contribute towards improved public transport in this area.
- Concerns with quantity of traffic using the narrow roadway.
- Whilst site is developed will all construction traffic proceed through the park.
- Unmetalled road was only ever intended to be for access for the farm.
- Highway safety concerns due to increased number of parked cars and car movements.
- The proposed development will increase car use and traffic using Bowleaze Coveway.
- Impossible to cross the road at some point.
- Road was not built or designed to cope with this volume of traffic.
- Heavy traffic, especially lorries is causing cracking and disturbance in neighbouring properties.
- Bowleaze Coveway was not designed to cope with the volume including the bus and delivery trucks which are too big for the road with cars parked along the sea-side edge.
- Development will encourage car use, both short-term and long-term.

- Proposal will increase commercial traffic, larger vehicles will cause issues due to the road width.
- An additional 128 vehicles making numerous journeys up and down Bowleaze Cove way is unacceptable.
- Concerned construction vehicles and eventually visitors could use 'Church Road' as an alternative access – simply a narrow country lane.
- Highway is used for loading and unloading caravans from and onto lorries as no provision has been made within the boundaries of the site for this purpose
- Road is not suitable as its one way in and out.
- Parking problems causing people to park on residential streets causing further highway safety issues.
- Bowleaze Cove way is a residential cul-de-sac and not a major road.
- Already difficult for emergency vehicles to access the Rivera Hotel, the beach, the caravan park and houses in the area.
- Already problems with caravans blocking Bowleaze Cove way when being moved preventing fast access to residential properties.
- No further developments to the site should be considered until an alternative route for access and egress is established.
- Already a number of near misses along Bowleaze Cove way.
- Heaving vehicles being brought in for this huge development can only add to the eventual collapse of the road.
- New plots are at the far end of the site with parking and therefore it is likely that some visitors will drive to the beach.
- No proposed mitigation – betterment in the form of a remote joint footpath/cycleway across the grass area could be provided to remove cyclists from the road.

Landscape Impacts:

- Rural and coastal area should not be encroached upon soon Preston will be linked to Osmington by caravan parks.
- It would be visible from the South West Coast Path, risk losing the World Heritage Site status.
- Loss of open space/ would erode important green space.
- It would change the character of the landscape from rural/agricultural to semi-urban but it actually intrudes and pushes into the green space.
- Adjacent to and in close proximity to the AONB and Heritage Coast.
- Highly visible from Jordan Hill and from the footpath between Redcliff and Preston.
- Footpath presently skirts green and tranquil horse pasture which would become playground and parking area, change the path from a quiet rural footpath to a noisy semi-urban route.

- Proposed planting mitigation will take a decade or more to have any effect.
- Topography of the site means much of it is on a sloping hill rather than flat fields and therefore is highly visible.
- Site is part of an historic landscape.
- Impinge on the green belt between Bowleaze and Osmington.
- Loss of grazing land.
- In the winter the planting cover will reduce as the vegetation dies back.
- The fact they are wooden-clad caravans will not compensate for this intrusion.
- Urban creep.
- Detrimental and degrading to the AONB – view from the AONB is part of the purpose of the AONB.
- View of White Horse will be completely ruined.
- Holiday park already dominates the area and skyline.
- Loss of open gap between Bowleaze and Osmington.
- Land is within the designated Land of Local Landscape Importance.
- Considerable size and position of the proposed development will be far more intrusive than is claimed by the LVIA.
- Proposed roads and car parking will be visible in the landscape.
- People visit Weymouth for the open countryside so shouldn't develop it as may divert people elsewhere.
- Heritage coastline is precious and finite asset to Weymouth.
- Small developments avalanche into mass construction.
- Site is in close proximity to the Conservation Area.
- High density between the three holiday sites which are already visible.
- Addition of pods, lodges and car parking will simply ruin more countryside.
- Parking for 97 cars will not be disguised from view in any way.

Biodiversity:

- It will disturb the wildlife.
- Excessive extension to what is already a massive caravan park area.
- Disturb natural habitats for a variety of bird and mammal life.
- Proposed site is home to a lot of wildlife including deer, foxes, badgers, rabbits, bats, swallows.
- Incorrect dates ascribed to species in the environmental report.
- Concerns regarding bats in the stable building.
- Wildlife policy emphasises the value of corridors to allow movement this scheme closes off that last corridor.
- Landscaping of the additional fields to the south seems like unnecessary destruction of wildlife habitat for little economic gain.

- Site is in close proximity to the SSSI.
- Pressure on the fragile ecosystems of the Jurassic Coast.
- Potential of impact on the River Jordan.
- Increased traffic on footpaths will destroy fragile habitats.

Neighbouring Amenity:

- Increase in noise-nuisance, loud car radios, speeding cars, anti-social behaviour, pollution and litter.
- Increase the population of an already large and busy site by roughly 10% with correspondingly increased traffic and demands on the infrastructure, notably the water supply.
- Further pressure on the water supply which is already insufficient at peak times.
- Evening entertainment and large number in the area creates noise.
- Light pollution.
- Additional waste and sewerage.
- Visitors do not consider the residents in the area.
- Increased congestion and air-pollution on Bowleaze Coveway.
- Construction noise and disturbance.
- Does not identify section 106 contributions to alleviate the low water pressure.
- Additional strain on already stretched services.
- Loss of green lung for people.
- Holiday park places significant pressure on Bowleaze Coveway and local amenities.

Flooding & Coastal Erosion:

- Flooding and coastal erosion and their impact upon future access at the bottom of the Coveway road need to be further investigated.
- Fragile cliffs that continuously collapse cannot sustain even more footfall from this site.
- Encourage additional visitors to an area which is already prone to erosion through overuse.
- Previous geological surveys have shown that coastal erosion is a serious threat to the integrity of the road.
- Increased flood effect as run off is inevitably increased.
- Currently an underground waterway trying to come through the lowest part of the road by the beachside complex which will eventually become a sink hole.

Climate Implications:

- Each static caravan needs to be provided with an electric charging point.

- Large consumption of water and power, more sewage, more CO2 emissions.
- There is nothing Eco about these huts or pods they are static caravans made out of wood.
- Cabins and canvas roundhouses are usually provided with log burners and outdoor barbeques creating a non-friendly environment condition and increasing pollutants.

9.2 The reasons for support are summarised below:

- We need as much foot flow through Weymouth as well as investment in securing jobs for local people and contractors.
- Encourage more people to visit Weymouth and the surrounding countryside.
- Need support for the local economy now more than ever.
- A project that provided local contractors with employment to fulfil the application and in the long term with permanent, good quality jobs.
- Proposed development will benefit the entire community.
- An ecologically, environmental and visually sympathetic expansion.
- Boost active tourism.
- Holiday park brings employment and holiday makers to the town.
- Redevelopment of the site.
- Vast majority of our local money comes from visitors staying in hotels and holiday parks.
- So much green space to walk and visit, the areas surrounding Waterside should be used for increasing the visiting population.
- Proposed location has been used as a stable block and paddock, dumped tyres and rusting horse boxes.
- More sensitive part of site proposed for smaller roundhouses which blend more sympathetically.
- Less visible part of the site is proposed for the cedar lodges.
- Cedar cladding is a vast improvement versus traditional metal or plastic exteriors.
- The landscaping once matured would further reduce the visual impact.
- When the park is shut there are still highway issues.
- Holiday parks employ gas engineers, electrical engineers, joiners, skilled drivers, degree educated people.
- Unemployment being at its highest level in many years I think it's great it would involve the creation of jobs.
- Local trades will benefit from the proposed development.
- Expansion of site as opposed to the creation of a new camp – rather than seeing more individual parking starting up.
- Improving the quality of the accommodation as they are spacious and set well apart.
- The site is outside of the AONB.

- Highways problems is a peak period problem resulting from attractions in the area rather than people accessing the holiday park.
- Given the hit that Dorset tourism has had this year anything to attract more visitors to the area is a good thing.
- Bring work to the area both in the building stage and when completed.
- Increased active tourism for Weymouth and the surrounding area.
- Wooden clad structures will not only blend in but add character.
- Holiday park is kept very clean the proposed site is quite untidy and in need of being used – dumped garden waste and unsightly stables.
- Would be a real asset to the area.
- Waterside have landscaped the park and implemented lots of eco friendly projects over the park.
- Proper grounds management of the proposed site will be better for wildlife with more trees being planted.
- Existing bus service that transports visitors from the holiday park directly into town.
- Site is ideal for re-development and can be transformed into something special.
-

9.3 In response to the comments received the scheme was amended, it was reduced in size with the removal of the pods. The application was re-consulted on and a further 43 comments were received, 11 in objection and 32 in support of the proposed scheme. The additional reasons for objection are summarised below:

- Ecological benefits to the site should be carried out without increasing the number of properties.
- Swallows nesting and barn owls in the stable to be demolished.
- Small developments will eventually result in large and unintended impacts.
- Creeping development has been seen through the years in a number of caravan parks.
- Red outline indicating the extent of the site should be limited to the land proposed for caravans.
- Any planning permission should be very specific that the detailed layout and type of accommodation proposed may not be varied without express planning consent.
- Already an over provision of caravan parks along this area of coastline.
- Removal of pods from the scheme does not change the fact that 31 lodges will be sited on the proposed area with the associated visual impact.
- Loss of natural habitat and a replacement of a 'man made' habitat will not replace the existing natural habitat and wildlife there now.

9.4 The additional reasons in support are summarised below:

- The reduction in chalets will mean that it is virtually invisible from the inland side of Waterside with the current hedges and trees.
- The proposed planting will greatly reduce the visibility from the seaward side as well
- Adds further improvements to allay environmental concerns.
- In order to rejuvenate the local economy Weymouth needs innovative new, high end accommodation.
- Inclusion of nature walk will be an asset; this is not only good for the environment but can be an educational experience for all.
- Nature walk will encourage plants and wildlife to grow and thrive naturally within a controlled area.
- Other reasons why many people are travelling to the Bowleaze area not just to go to Waterside.
- Unquantified knock on effect indirectly that will enhance employment, training, education in the area.
- For the size of the area there is a relatively low number of units.
- Sympathetic approach to the use of this green space.
- Provision of bird boxes, bat boxes, and beehives.
- New high-end accommodation sector to Weymouth.
- Electric charging points at the holiday homes.
- Development is well spaced out.

10.0 Relevant Policies:

s38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the determination of planning applications must be in accordance with the development plan unless material circumstances indicate otherwise.

West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan

INT 1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

ENV 1 – Landscape, Seascape and Sites of Geological Interest

ENV 2 – Wildlife and Habitats

ENV 4 – Heritage Assets

ENV 5 – Flood Risk

ENV 7 – Coastal Erosion and Land Instability

ENV 10 – The Landscape and Townscape Setting

ENV 11 – The Pattern of Streets and Spaces

ENV 13 – Achieving High Levels of Environmental Performance

ENV 16 – Amenity

SUS 1 – The Level of Economic and Housing Growth

SUS 2 – Distribution of Development
ECON 6 – Built Tourist Accommodation
ECON 7 – Caravan and Camping Sites
COM 7 – Creating a Safe and Efficient Transport Network
COM 9 – Parking Standards in New Development
COM 10 – The Provision of Utilities Service Infrastructure

Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan - In preparation – limited weight applied to decision making.

Other Material Considerations

Weymouth & Portland Urban Design (2002)
Landscape Character Assessment (Weymouth & Portland)
Dorset AONB Landscape Character Assessment
Dorset AONB Management Plan 2019-2024

11.0 Human Rights:

Article 6 - Right to a fair trial.

Article 8 - Right to respect for private and family life and home.

The first protocol of Article 1 Protection of property.

This Recommendation is based on adopted Development Plan policies, the application of which does not prejudice the Human Rights of the applicant or any third party.

12.0 Public Sector Equalities Duty:

As set out in the Equalities Act 2010, all public bodies, in discharging their functions must have “due regard” to this duty. There are 3 main aims:-

- Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics
- Taking steps to meet the needs of people with certain protected characteristics where these are different from the needs of other people
- Encouraging people with certain protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where participation is disproportionately low.

Whilst there is no absolute requirement to fully remove any disadvantage the Duty is to have “regard to” and remove OR minimise disadvantage and in considering the merits of this planning application the planning authority has taken into consideration the

requirements of the PSED. The proposed development includes holiday lodges with parking adjacent to the units and the accommodation would be provided across one floor.

13.0 Financial Benefits:

- Visitors staying in the lodges will spend in the local economy
- Additional employment on-site due to increased numbers of accommodation

14.0 Climate Implications:

14.1 The additional lodges would result in more traffic movements and servicing vehicles and activity increasing emissions. However, this increase is supported by existing facilities on the site and the relationship of the site in close proximity to Weymouth and its facilities. This impact is also considered to be outweighed by the benefit of the additional holiday units and the potential for spending by users in the local shops and facilities.

15.0 Planning Assessment:

Principle of Development

15.1 The proposal involves the extension of Waterside Holiday Park for the siting of timber lodges for holiday use and outdoor recreation. The application site is located outside of a defined development boundary. Local plan policy SUS2, sets out that within defined development boundaries residential, employment and other development to meet the needs of the local area will normally be permitted. Outside defined development boundaries, development will be strictly controlled and will be restricted to a small number of uses. One of which is tourism related development which is this proposal is considered to fall under.

15.2 The proposed lodges would comprise caravans under the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960, as amended. Therefore, the proposal will be considered against local plan policy ECON 7.

i) New caravan and camping sites should be well located in relation to existing facilities or make appropriate provision for facilities on site. Farm diversification projects (for agricultural and other land-based rural businesses) for new caravan and camping sites will be supported, provided they are in keeping with the rural character and the development makes an on going contribution to the business that is diversifying.

ii) Proposals for the expansion, intensification or reorganisation of existing sites must clearly demonstrate that development forms part of a long term management plan to improve the quality and appearance of the accommodation and site.

iii) All development (including the change of use from touring to static units) must not, individually or cumulatively, have a significant adverse impact on the distinctive characteristics of the areas landscape, heritage or built environment. Proposals in the Heritage Coast are unlikely to be supported.

iv) Development proposals must include an appropriate landscape scheme and provision for its ongoing maintenance.

15.3 Whilst the proposal is not seeking a new caravan site it is looking to extend the existing caravan site and would be located in close proximity to the range of services and facilities available within Waterside Holiday Park and in close proximity to the site. In relation to criteria ii) the supporting information sets out that the *development would provide additional revenue to enable the park operator to invest in, maintain and improve the quality of facilities available in the existing park to help improve the overall quality and appearance of the overall site.* The submitted details show locations for reinforcing existing planting belts, as well as new tree planting which would be secured by condition. The impact of the development on the distinctive characteristics of the areas landscape and heritage will be considered in the following sections of the report.

15.4 Previous permissions on the site have included a seasonal occupancy condition to ensure the units are not occupied all year round. However, this is not considered necessary in the case of this application, a condition would be placed on the units to be holiday accommodation only which would prevent anyone using the units as their sole residency. The proposed lodges/caravans would be located on the site all year round, so reducing the time they can be occupied would not change the visual impact of the units. The proposed expansion of the holiday park and being able to use the units all year round would also provide support to the local economy including additional spending in local shops, restaurants and visitor attractions.

Residential Amenity

15.5 The proposal involves the extension of Waterside Holiday Park for the siting of timber lodges for holiday use and outdoor recreation. The proposed lodges would be located to the north-east of the existing Waterside Holiday Park units and would be located away from any existing neighbouring residential dwellings and therefore would not have a significant adverse impact through overlooking or overshadowing. Third party concerns have been raised in relation to increased visitors resulting in noise, pollution, increased traffic, pressure on the water supply and other local amenities. However, the proposal is not considered to result in significant adverse impacts as it would involve an extension to the existing holiday park. Wessex Water were consulted in response to the concerns raised regarding water pressure who set out that the network monitoring measures they have in place record this local network meets the service standards and if the applicants intention is to apply for an increase in their flow

rate, or upsizing of their water connection then as a business customer they would have to make an application through their water retailer. Wessex Water set out that when considering a request for a commercial supply they must make sure first and foremost that they can meet and maintain all existing service levels and potential demand for domestic supply purposes. Concerns were also raised regarding light emitted from the scheme, the supporting information sets out that lighting would be restricted to low level bollard lights with a cowelled and downward facing light source. A condition would be placed on any approval granted for the submission of a lighting scheme to ensure this as well as for visual amenity and biodiversity reasons. Given all of the above the proposal is considered to comply with local plan policy ENV 16.

Visual Amenity and the Setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Heritage Coast

15.6 The proposal involves the extension of Waterside Holiday Park for the siting of timber lodges for holiday use and outdoor recreation. The coastal strip to its south forms part of the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site, the higher ground to its north and east lies within the Dorset Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the land to its west and south forms part of the Heritage Coast and the proposed development site and surrounding fields are identified as land of local landscape importance with the Local Plan.

15.7 The original submitted scheme included the proposed lodges and additional pods within the area now labelled as Nature/Wildlife Area. Concerns were raised by the Senior Landscape Architect that the proposal would have be likely to have an adverse impact on landscape and visual character and quality and also by significantly adding to the cumulative effect of permanent and seasonal holiday accommodation provision within the surrounding landscape. It was also considered that the information submitted was not sufficient to fully the consider the landscape and visual impact of the proposal. The Dorset AONB Landscape Planning Officer echoed these views and concluded that the expansion would notably extend and exacerbate the cumulative effects of holiday parks in the area, further eroding the underlying pastoral character of the coastal hinterland.

15.8 The proposal was amended in response the comments and the proposed pods removed from the scheme with that area just forming a Nature/Wildlife area. Visually Verified Montages (VVMs) from three viewpoints to the north, south and west of the development were also submitted. The timber style lodges/caravans would have a scattered, widely spaced angular rather than a rectilinear layout and would be located adjacent to the existing units of Waterside Holiday Park. The scheme would also include an attenuation basin in the south west corner and the parking for the lodges would be distributed throughout. A limited amount of existing vegetation would be removed along and adjacent to the eastern boundary of the existing holiday park. In response to the

amendments the Senior Landscape Architect and Dorset AONB Landscape Planning Officer was reconsulted on the application.

15.9 The Senior Landscape Architect considered that the viewpoints to the north and west of the site show that the proposed green roofs and associated tree planting would be likely to mitigate and reduce the adverse landscape and visual impact of the proposed development. However, it was considered that the viewpoint to the south of the proposed development demonstrates that the landscape and visual impact of the proposed development from this viewpoint would result in a significant adverse impact on landscape and visual character and quality both in itself and cumulatively with the permanent and seasonal holiday accommodation provision within the surrounding landscape. Unlike the seasonal campsite at Eweleaze Farm to its east, the proposal would form a permanent feature in the landscape. The Dorset AONB Landscape Planning Officer supported the comments of the Senior Landscape Architect and confirmed that the reduced proposal continues to conflict with the policies of the AONB's Management Plan.

15.10 The Senior Landscape Architect set out concerns from just one viewpoint to the south. The reduction in the built form of the proposal means that the open gap between Waterside Holiday Park and Eweleaze Farm Campsite when in season is retained. It also means a gap is retained from this viewpoint up to the White Horse. A condition would be placed on any approval granted to ensure no caravans/lodges or tents are placed on this part of the site and it is retained as a Nature/Wildlife area both for biodiversity interests but also to retain this open gap. The proposed layout of the units scattered and not linear with gaps in between the units, which would also be controlled by a condition restricting the number of caravans/lodges stationed on the site, the proposed planting (would be controlled by condition) and the muted colour of the units (which again would be controlled by condition) is considered to result in a scheme which is less prominent in the landscape. The proposal when viewed from the south would also be in relation to the units of Haven Seaview Holiday Park to the north and to which your attention is drawn in that viewpoint. This impact also needs to be balanced against the benefits of the scheme including the economic benefits through the increase in overnight accommodation offer at an already established holiday park. It will contribute to increased local expenditure as a result of an increase in the number of holidaymakers in the area. The supporting information also sets out that the proposal should enable the creation of some additional full-time jobs.

15.11 On balance and subject to conditions the proposal is considered acceptable and would not have a significant adverse impact on the characteristics of the areas landscape.

Heritage Assets

15.12 The proposed development originally included the use of the land for the siting of lodges and pods for holiday use, outdoor recreation and associated access and parking. The proposed development is located within the setting of a number of heritage assets, the Sutton Poytnz conservation area, the grade II listed Riveria Hotel and the scheduled monuments Romano-Celtic Temple and associated remains, Multi-Period Archaeological Landscape at Chalbury, George III, Chalk-Cut Hill Side Figure/Osmington White Horse. The Senior Conservation Officer was consulted on the application and concluded that the proposed development would not result in harm to the Preston Roman Villa scheduled monument or the Riveria Hotel however concerns were raised regarding the impacts on the other designated heritage assets identified above all of which are related to the spread of development within the landscape and visibility of the site. The Conservation Officer concluded that the proposals would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets through impacts on their setting but set out that this could be overcome if amendments were made to the scheme. Concerns were also raised regarding archaeological potential of the site, the Senior Archaeologist was consulted and raised no comments.

15.13 In response to the comments received the scheme was reduced with the removal of the proposed pods from the end of the extended site and the car park in Area B. The Conservation Officer was re-consulted and considered that the scheme as revised would not result in harm to the significance of the designated assets through impacts on their setting. The reduced scope of the built elements of the scheme represent a less intrusive element in the context of their impact on the setting of designated heritage assets than previously proposed. The Senior Conservation Officer concluded that the harm to the significance of the identified heritage assets, insofar as it arose from encroachment into the landscape and its associated visual impact, has been responsibly addressed. It is therefore considered that the revised scheme would not result in harm to the significance of the identified heritage assets subject to conditions for materials of the proposed lodges and details of boundary treatments to be agreed which would be placed on any approval granted.

Highway Safety

15.14 A large number of third party concerns were raised regarding the impact of the proposal on highway safety. In particular due to the increased vehicle numbers resulting from the proposed lodges and the existing road conditions of Bowleaze Coveway. The proposed development would be accessed through the existing holiday park and via the existing access off Bowleaze Coveway. The proposed development includes access roads to the lodges and parking associated with each proposed lodge. Highways were consulted on the application and noted the various comments about the usage and parking that occurs on Bowleaze Coveway. It also recognises that it is a bus route and that parking on the highway can be controlled by Highway Law if deemed appropriate and as such isn't a sustainable reason for refusal. Highways considered that the

proposal would not present a material harm to the transport network or to highway safety and consequently raised no objection. NPPF para 112 sets out that applications for development should be designed to enable charging of plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations. A condition would be placed on any approval granted for a scheme for car charging to be submitted within the Waterside Holiday Park site.

Flooding and Drainage

15.15 The application site is located within flood zone 1, although the access to the site from Bowleaze Cove way is within flood zones 2 and 3 as a result of the River Jordan flowing under the existing holiday park access. The proposal includes an attenuation pond to hold surface water runoff. The Flood Risk Management Team were consulted on the proposal and recommended a holding objection until further information was submitted. In response to the comments received additional drainage details were received and the Flood Risk Management Team withdrew their holding objection and recommended conditions for a detailed surface water management scheme and details of maintenance and management which would be placed on any approval granted.

Biodiversity

15.16 The application includes an extension to the existing holiday park, comprising use of land for the siting of holiday lodges and outdoor recreation. A number of third party concerns have been raised regarding the impact of the proposal on biodiversity in particular the loss of natural habitats for a variety of birds and mammals. An Ecological Assessment and Biodiversity Plan (BP) were submitted as part of the application. The Biodiversity Plan includes both mitigation and net gain measures. The net gain measures include the creation of a reptile receptor site, bird boxes, swallow nest boxes and the provision of further hedgerows. The proposed scheme also includes a nature/wildlife area to the east of the proposed lodges and an ecological mitigation area to the south west. A condition would be placed on any approval granted to ensure lodges are not located on these parts of the site. The BP also includes the provision of a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) which has been provided as part of the application. The BP has been agreed by the Natural Environment Team and a certificate of approval has been issued. A condition would be added to any planning approval for the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted BP and LEMP.

15.17 Third party concerns were also raised regarding the location of the site in relation to the SSSI. Natural England were consulted on the application and considered that the proposed development would not damage or destroy the interest features for which the site has been notified and has no objection. Natural also considered that the proposed development is unlikely to result in a significant effect upon the Isle of Portland to

Studland Cliffs SAC. Therefore, there is no requirement for the Council to undertake an Appropriate Assessment in this instance.

Land Stability

15.18 Third party concerns have been raised regarding land instability and coastal erosion at the application site. Flood & Coastal Erosion Risk Management were consulted on the proposal and considered that the proposed development itself would not be impacted by land instability issues or coastal erosion within the next 100 years. However, the access would continue to be from Bowleaze Cove way which is fronted by Furzy cliff where the relevant Coastal Risk Planning Guidance (CRPG) suggests that there is a 5% chance that a small part of Bowleaze Cove way could be affected by coastal recession. The proposed development is for holiday accommodation and not residential accommodation. It is also considered that in the future an alternative route could potentially be formalised from the north end to the site. The Flood & Coastal Erosion Risk Management officer considered that the applicant should be made aware of the potential risk from coastal recession and an informative would be placed on any approval granted.

16.0 Conclusion:

16.1 The proposal involves the extension of Waterside Holiday Park for the siting of timber lodges for holiday use and outdoor recreation. The proposal is considered to comply with local plan policies SUS2 and ECON7.

16.2 The proposal is also considered acceptable in relation to residential amenity, setting of heritage assets, highway safety, flooding and drainage, biodiversity and lands stability. The proposal will impact on the visual amenity, setting of the Heritage Coast and the AONB however the economic benefits of the scheme are considered to outweigh any limited impacts identified.

17.0 Recommendation:

That the committee be minded to grant planning permission subject to conditions and that the Head of Planning determine the application accordingly.

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

Site Location - drawing number 590/SL01 P4

Site Layout Plan – drawing number 590/01 P5

Site Layout - Area A Holiday Park - drawing number 590/02 P7

Site Layout - Area B Recreation Ground - drawing number 590/03 P6

Planting and Mitigation Proposals - drawing number 590/04 P9

Existing Site Enhancement Strategy - 590/05 P6

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. (i) The lodges/caravans shall be occupied for holiday purposes only and

(ii) The lodges/caravans shall not be occupied as a person's sole, or main place of residence;

(iii) the owners/operators must maintain an up-to-date register of the names of all owners/occupiers of the lodges/caravans on the site, and of their main home addresses, and must make this information available at all reasonable hours at the request of a duly authorised officer of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that approved holiday accommodation is not used for unauthorised permanent residential occupation.

4. No external lighting shall be erected on the units hereby approved or within the application site without a lighting scheme having first been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development must be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and biodiversity mitigation.

5. No more than 31 lodges/caravans shall be positioned on the site as shown on the Site Layout Plan, drawing number 590/01 P5.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure adequate spacing between units.

6. No caravans/lodges or tents shall be sited in the field labelled Nature/Wildlife Area as shown on the Site Layout Plan, drawing number 590/01 P5.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

7. No caravans/lodges shall be stationed on the site until details of external materials for the caravans/lodges, including the colour of the materials have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the caravans/lodges shall be maintained in accordance with the agreed details in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

8. The landscaping shall be implemented in accordance with the details provided in the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, dated March 2021 and the plans 590/04 P9, 590/03 P6 and 590/02 P7 in the first planting season November-March following the occupation of the caravans/lodges or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Maintenance and replacement of trees and shrubs shall be carried out as necessary for a period of not less than 5 years from the completion of the landscaping scheme and any trees or plants which die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased within that 5 years shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory landscaping of the site and enhance the biodiversity, visual amenity and character of the area.

9. No individual caravan/lodge shall be occupied until a landscaping and tree planting scheme for the existing site in accordance with the plan titled Existing Site Enhancement Strategy, drawing number 590/05 P6 shall have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full during the planting season November-March following first occupation of the caravan/lodges. The scheme shall include provision for the maintenance and replacement as necessary of the trees and shrubs for a period of not less than 5 years.

Reason: To ensure a landscaping enhancement of the wider site.

10. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no fences, walls or gates or other means of enclosure permitted by Class A of Schedule 2, Part 2 of the 2015 Order shall be erected anywhere on the site or its boundaries.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

11. No individual caravan/lodge shall be occupied until that caravan/lodge has been provided with one charger for plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles in a safe, accessible and convenient location.

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

12. No development shall take place until a detailed surface water management scheme for the site, based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the

development, and including clarification of how surface water is to be managed during construction, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The surface water scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the submitted details before the development is completed.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, and to improve habitat and amenity.

13. No development shall take place until details of maintenance & management of both the surface water sustainable drainage scheme and any receiving system have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details. These should include a plan for the lifetime of the development, 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.

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

14. The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the measures of the Biodiversity Plan, signed by Katy Thomas and dated 29/03/2021 and agreed by the Natural Environment Team on 20/07/2021, unless a subsequent variation is agreed in writing with the Council.

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity mitigation and enhancement.

15. The development shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, dated March 2021, unless a subsequent variation is agreed in writing with the Council.

Reason: In the interests of biodiversity mitigation and enhancement.