Public Document Pack

Western and Southern Area Planning Committee

Date: Wednesday, 15 July 2026
Time: 10.00 am
Venue: Council Chamber, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ

Members (Quorum 6)
Neil Eysenck (Chair), Ryan Holloway (Vice-Chair), Belinda Bawden, Simon Christopher, Peter Dickenson, Paul Kimber, Craig Monks, David Northam, Louie O'Leary, Pete Roper, David Taylor and Kate Wheller

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

For more information about this agenda please contact Democratic & Governance Services Meeting Contact 01305 224710 Joshua.kennedy@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk

Members of the public are welcome to attend this meeting, apart from any items listed in the exempt part of this agenda. If you would like to attend this meeting and have any specific requirements please contact the Democratic Services Officer named above.

For easy access to all the council's committee agendas and minutes download the free public app called Modern.Gov for use on any iPad, Android, and Windows tablet. Once downloaded select Dorset Council.

Agenda

Item **Pages**

1. APOLOGIES

To receive any apologies for absence

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To disclose any pecuniary, other registerable or non-registrable 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. MINUTES 5 - 8

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 08 June 2026.

4. REGISTRATION FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING AND STATEMENTS

Members of the public wishing to speak to the Committee on a planning application should notify the Democratic Services Officer listed on the front of this agenda. This must be done no later than two clear working days before the meeting. Please refer to the Guide to Public Speaking at Planning Committee. Guide to Public Speaking at Planning Committee.

The deadline for notifying a request to speak is 8.30am on Monday 13 July.

5. WD/D/20/002569 - LAND EAST OF CHICKERELL AND SOUTH OF COLDHARBOUR, CHICKERELL 9 - 138

An outline application for up to 328 dwellings with full details supplied in respect of 143 dwellings (Phase A) including creation of new accesses onto School Hill and Chickerell Link Road (B3157), including details of the internal spine road, landscaping, drainage, car parking, public open space and associated works for Phase A. All other matters reserved in respect of 185 dwellings (Phases B and C) and land for a primary school, public open space including, landscaping and associated works

6. P/FUL/2025/04039 - WEYMOUTH BAY HOLIDAY PARK, PRESTON ROAD, WEYMOUTH, DT3 6BQ 139 - 196

Removal of a telecommunications mast and associated structures and installation of bases for the siting of static holiday caravans with decking and associated access, landscaping, drainage and other related infrastructure works.

7. P/FUL/2025/06223 - PAVEMENT OPPOSITE 32 THE ESPLANADE, WEYMOUTH 197 - 212

Installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphone.

8. P/ADV/2025/06228 - PAVEMENT OPPOSITE 32 THE ESPLANADE, WEYMOUTH 213 - 224

Installation of 1no. internally illuminated double sided LCD display screen.

9. P/FUL/2026/01894 - 13 THE ESPLANADE WEYMOUTH, DT4 8EB 225 - 236

Removal of existing upper floor window and enlargement of opening in order to add new french doors giving access onto a new balcony area formed upon the existing bay window roof.

10. P/LBC/2026/01893 - 13 THE ESPLANADE WEYMOUTH, DT4 8EB 237 - 244

Internal and external alteration to facilitate the removal of existing upper floor window and enlargement of opening in order to add new French doors giving access onto a new balcony area formed upon the existing bay window roof.

11. 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.

12. 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.

There is no scheduled exempt business.

This page is intentionally left blank

Dorset Council

WESTERN AND SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 8 JUNE 2026

Present: Cllrs Neil Eysenck (Chair), Ryan Holloway (Vice-Chair), Belinda Bawden, Simon Christopher, Peter Dickenson, Paul Kimber, David Northam, Louie O'Leary, Pete Roper and Kate Wheller

Apologies: Cllrs Craig Monks and David Taylor

Officers present (for all or part of the meeting):
Ann Collins (Area Manager – Western and Southern Team), Joshua Kennedy (Democratic and Governance Officer), Hannah Massey (Lawyer - Regulatory), Robert Parr (Planning Officer), Louis Wicks (Democratic Services Officer Apprentice) and Nicola Yeates (Conservation and Design Officer)

1. **Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Bawden declared an interest in application P/FUL/2026/00324, due to being a member of the Dorset Wildlife Trust, who were the applicant. They did not take part in the debate or vote for this item.

Cllr Dickenson declared an interest in application P/LBC/2026/01598 due to having sat on the Weymouth Town Council Planning Committee when this application was considered. They did not take part in the debate or vote for this item.

2. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 07 May were confirmed and signed.

3. **Registration for public speaking and statements**

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

4. **P/FUL/2026/00324 - Chesil Beach Visitor Centre, Portland Beach Road, Portland, DT4 9XE**

The Planning Officer presented the application submitted by the Dorset Wildlife Trust for the erection of a bird viewing building. It was noted that the application had been brought before the Committee as Dorset Council leases the land on which the development was proposed.

The site location was shown on a map, with the application site outlined to the north of the existing Chesil Beach Visitor Centre. A 3D view of the site was provided to illustrate the position of the proposed building in relation to the main visitor centre. Members were shown the proposed site plan, which included the bird viewing building, an access ramp into the building, steps, and an associated bin store.

Proposed elevations were displayed, showing a single sliding door providing access to the main building, which would be clad in vertical timber boarding with a grey roof. The northwest elevation indicated three large viewing windows, while the northeast elevation showed a proposed bird box to contribute towards biodiversity net gain. Street view images of the site from the car park were provided, highlighting the existing bin store and the area where the building would be located, along with views from Portland Beach Road.

The Planning Officer advised that, although the site lay outside the Defined Development Boundary, planning policies supported tourism and educational facilities in such locations. The scale and design of the proposal were considered subordinate to the main visitor centre, and the choice of materials was deemed to complement the surrounding area.

In terms of flood risk, it was noted that a condition would be included requiring an evacuation plan to be implemented in the event of flooding. The proposal was also expected to provide a small economic benefit through tourism.

The Highways Authority had raised no objections to the scheme, noting that access would be via Portland Beach Road, which was the only access route to Portland. Conditions would be imposed to ensure that the development did not cause disruption to this route during construction.

Cllr Bawden left the Council Chamber at 10:13.

In response to questions from members the Planning Officer provided the following responses:

- The building contained no additional facilities and was only intended for viewing wildlife.
- The location of the bin store was in a similar location to where it was currently located.
- The applicant would be required to submit details of the flood evacuation plan prior to starting work on the site.

It was proposed by Cllr Wheller and seconded by Cllr Kimber that the application be granted.

Decision: That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the appendix to these minutes.

5. **P/LBC/2026/01598 - 142 The Esplanade, Weymouth, DT4 7PB**

Cllr Bawden returned to the Council Chamber at 10:21.

The Conservation and Design Officer presented the application for the replacement of rear dormer casement-style windows. It was noted that the Listed Building Consent application had been brought before the Committee as the building was owned by Dorset Council.

The site location plan was shown, along with an image of the front of the building. Members were advised that the property formed part of a Grade II listed group, together with other nearby properties, and that No. 142 was situated within a prominent group of buildings in the Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area.

It was explained that there were various extensions to the rear of the property, as well as a parking area, and that the dormer window in question was located at attic level. The proposal sought to replace the existing casement-style window, which was currently a softwood unit. It was reported that the existing window was in poor condition due to wet rot deterioration and therefore required replacement. The proposed replacement window would match the existing in design, while incorporating double glazing to improve thermal performance.

It was concluded that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Listed Building, as it would not alter its external appearance. As such, there would be no adverse impact on the street scene or the wider conservation area.

Cllr Dickenson left the Council Chamber at 10:28.

In response to questions from members the Conservation and Design Officer confirmed that UPVC windows wouldn't generally be supported for Listed Buildings and that in this case the applicant had applied for a softwood replacement window with double glazing, which was considered acceptable.

It was proposed by Cllr Wheller and seconded by Cllr O'Leary that the application be granted.

Decision: That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the appendix to these minutes.

6. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

7. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

Decision List

Duration of meeting: 10.00 - 10.37 am

Chairman

.....

Application Number:	WD/D/20/002569
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/
Site address:	Land East Of Chickerell And South Of Coldharbour Chickerell
Proposal:	An outline application for up to 328 dwellings with full details supplied in respect of 143 dwellings (Phase A) including creation of new accesses onto School Hill and Chickerell Link Road (B3157), including details of the internal spine road, landscaping, drainage, car parking, public open space and associated works for Phase A. All other matters reserved in respect of 185 dwellings (Phases B and C) and land for a primary school, public open space including, landscaping and associated works
Applicant name:	Mr D Buczynskyj
Case Officer:	Penny Canning
Ward Member(s):	Cllr Clifford and Cllr Taylor

1. **Reason application is going to committee:**

1.1. The Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement has exercised their discretion to refer this application to committee.

2. **Summary of recommendation:**

2.1. To delegate authority to the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager Southern and Western Team, in consultation with the Chair of the committee, and subject to no new material planning objections being received to the amended plans the current subject of consultation to

A) grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report and the completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation under Section106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (S106 agreement) to secure the following:

- No more than 100 dwellings to be occupied prior to the completion of the central avenue;
- Provision of 35% affordable housing;
- Financial contribution of £722 per dwelling towards NHS;
- Financial contribution of £524.72 per dwelling and £357.77 per flat towards Chesil and the Fleet mitigation;
- Financial contribution of £1,736.06 per qualifying dwelling (house or flat with 2 or more bedrooms), less land value discount of £482,000, towards primary education; plus a contribution towards SEND provision of £1,487.62 per qualifying dwelling, together with the transfer of land for the school;
- Financial contribution of £22,524 towards sports pitches and training facilities;
- Financial contribution of £106,413 towards Weymouth swimming pool;
- The provision of 0.28ha of play space, which shall include two LAP's, a LEAP, and informal play, together with the transfer of the land to Chickerell Town Council and a financial contribution of £411.84 per 2 bed unit; £587.34 per 3 bed unit; and £669.24 per 4+ bed unit; less land value discount of

£98,800 towards play provision; a financial contribution of £420,000 towards maintenance, and to address the shortfall in play provision, a financial contribution of £50,000 towards enhancing the play facilities at Willowbed Hall and/or towards a skate park within the town;

- Financial contribution of £348,532.80 towards open space maintenance, together with transfer of the land to Chickerell Town Council;
- Financial Contribution of £50,000 towards improvements at Willowbed Hall;
- Financial contribution of £81,675.76 towards bus infrastructure; sustainable travel cards to be exchanged for 30 day bus ticket or cycle equipment; updating the walking and cycling maps;
- Financial contribution of £20,000 towards the upgrading of footpath S16/23;
- Financial contribution of £12,000 towards the upgrading of footpath S16/21.

Or

B) Refuse planning permission for the reasons set out at the end of the report if the S106 agreement is not completed within 6 months from the committee resolution or such extended time as agreed by the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager Southern and Western Team. The reasons for refusal for failure to secure the necessary obligations are set out in full at the end of this report.

3. Key planning issues

Issue	**Conclusion**
Principle of development	The majority of the land subject of this application is part of a wider site, allocated for development under Policy CHIC2 of the adopted Local Plan. Neighbourhood Plan policies relating to land outside of the allocation also permit the facilitation of the development. Detailed consideration is given to the detailed requirements of these policies, and it is considered that the principle of bringing forward this allocated site for development would be acceptable.
Highway impacts, safety, access and parking	The Highway Authority have considered the application and consider the proposed works to be acceptable having regard to highway safety and raise no objection subject to minor revisions which can be secured through condition. In light of the above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable having regard to the provisions set out in Local Plan Policy COM7 (Creating a safe & efficient transport network) and COM9 (Parking Provision).
Scale, design, impact on character and appearance	Having regard to the revised plans (submitted June 2026) it is considered that the resulting scheme goes some considerable way to improve the built environment. Buildings would more cohesively respond to the street, providing a more continuous building line and with less ad hoc variation in height would establish a stronger rhythm of development within streets. There continues to be concerns regarding detailed elements such as placement of chimneys, lack of detailing and use of split level materials that weaken the schemes response to local context and character. Further,

Issue	Conclusion
	owing to loose application of the parameters defining different character areas, there would be little distinct differentiation in character between areas within phase A. Other matters that challenge design quality relate to the treatment of the central avenue, treatment of parking, and concerns surrounding the western most pedestrian link. It is considered that the revised scheme, despite some misgivings surrounding character, goes some way to address officer concerns, however, given the high bar set by policy to deliver high quality developments, there are nonetheless a number of elements that let the scheme down and it is therefore questionable whether the proposal truly meets the 'high quality' expectation as set out in Local Plan Policy ENV12 and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 135. This matter needs to be weighed in the planning balance.
Impact on the living conditions of the occupants and neighbouring properties	It is not considered that the proposed development would significantly detract from the residential amenity of existing occupiers through loss of light, privacy, noise or general amenity, in accordance with Local Plan policy ENV16. The presence of significant retaining features to the rear of properties would compromise the rear garden space and outlook for future occupiers and this matter should be weighed in the balance having regard to the benefits of managing levels within plots as opposed to in the public realm. Having carefully reviewed the level of risk from ball strike from the adjoining golf course, the appropriateness and feasibility of mitigation features and their impacts, the proposed land use of those areas subject to high levels of risk, and the impacts of the development on third parties having regard to the agent of change principle, it is considered that the June 2026 revisions to the layout of the scheme ensure significant risk can be avoided by ensuring public access and housing is kept away from those areas most at risk.
Impact on landscape	Subject to conditions, including a revised landscape scheme and phasing plan, the revised (Jun 2026) submission seeks retention of existing hedgerows and provides robust east-west green infrastructure and wildlife corridors; enhances strategic links where pedestrian movement is at its greatest; and in doing so creates green focal points within the development acting as gateway locations. Green open spaces are interspersed with trees and landscape for the community to enjoy, while offering opportunity for amenity and play. It is considered that these latest revisions appropriately address the key concerns raised by the Landscape Officer. Further the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the setting of the National Landscape. As such, the scheme would be in compliance with Local Plan policies ENV1, ENV3, ENV10, and CHIC2;

Issue	Conclusion
	Neighbourhood Plan policies CNP10 and CNP11, and NPPF para 135-136 and 189.
Affordable Housing	The proposed development would provide 35% affordable housing. Affordable housing is well distributed throughout the site and there appears to be no discernible difference in design, layout or parking provision. This will help create a more mixed and balanced community where different tenures are well integrated into the scheme. The proposed development is considered to comply with policies HOUS1 and HOUS2 of the adopted Local Plan.
Biodiversity	Subject to the conditions securing a dormouse bridge, tunnels for small mammals and amphibians, and final details relating to landscaping, lighting strategy, reworking highway components and a CEMP and LEMP, together with mitigation for the Chesil and the Fleet secured via a S106 agreement, it is considered that significant harm to protected species and habitat sites can be avoided, and the functioning of the Chickerell Wildlife Corridor maintained, in accordance with Local Plan policy ENV2 and Neighbourhood Plan policies CNP4 and CNP12, and para 192-195 of the NPPF. In line with the above policy, it is considered that the proposed developments would provide a net increase in biodiversity.
Flood risk and drainage	Adopting a combined approach to surface level and below ground attenuation storage to manage water across the site is justified owing to the benefits to placemaking, and the proposed scheme is considered to be acceptable on flood risk grounds, and in accordance with the provisions of Local Plan policy ENV5, and is considered to accord with the aims of para 181 and 182 of the NPPF (2024), supported by the National Planning Policy Guidance on Flood Risk.
Impact on heritage assets	Taking into account the lack of harm to the significance of identified designated heritage assets and an acceptable level of harm to non-designated heritage assets by the development, it is considered that the proposed scheme would be acceptable and would comply with the provisions of Local Plan policy ENV4 and para 212-216 of the NPPF.
Contaminated Land	The proposed works, subject to appropriate conditions, are considered to be acceptable and to comply with the provisions of Policy ENV9 of the Local Plan, and para 196 and 198 of the NPPF.
EIA	The proposal is EIA development for the purposes of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and so this application is supported by an Environmental Statement (ES). The conclusions of the ES are important material considerations and are referenced throughout this report.

4. Description of Site

4.1. The application site relates to land to the East of the Chickerell settlement. The site comprises 23.9ha of land extending north of the B3157 towards Coldharbour, directly adjacent to the built development of Chickerell. The land, on the whole, comprises agricultural land, subdivided into medium-large sized fields used mainly for grazing purposes, which span the undulating landscape, rising quite steeply in places from south to north.

4.2. At the southern extent of the site, adjacent to the B3157 (Chickerell link road) are a number of drainage ponds which receive run-off water from the B3157. North of this, the land extends across land associated with the residential property Sunny Dale. From here, a large agricultural field rises northward extending adjacent to Wessex Golf Centre to the east, and adjacent to industrial/commercial units, allotments, and residential properties to the west, before falling at a mid point where it meets the Southill watercourse running in an east west direction. At this point a number of rights of way traverse the site, generally in an east west direction, but with a north south link. These include footpath S16/23 located south of the watercourse and footpaths S16/21 and S16/22 north of the watercourse. Extending further north, the land continues to rise, taking in a number of smaller agricultural fields, subdivided by hedgerows. Adjacent to the site, the Chickerell electricity sub station sits to the east, a solar farm and Battery Storage site to the north and east, and residential properties to the west. The northern extent of the site falls adjacent to School Hill with a small part of land separating the site from Coldharbour. The site tends to be, on the whole, bound by hedgerows and trees.

4.3. The wider area comprises predominantly the settlement of Chickerell to the west together with Bennetts Water Garden; the Granby Industrial Estate lies to the south, residential properties of Coldharbour and agricultural land to the north, and with the exception of the aforementioned uses above (including the golf course, substation, and solar farm) together with Wessex Stadium, agricultural land lies to the east, providing a green wedge between Chickerell and Southill.

4.4. The application site relates to an allocated site within the Local Plan, allocated under Policy CHIC2, and forms the eastern part of a wider designation. It falls outside of the Dorset National Landscape, but traverses a locally designated Wildlife Area to the South and Land of Local Landscape Importance to the north. The site falls within flood zone 1, with parts of the site susceptible to surface water flooding. The Crookhill Brick Pit Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) is located approximately 525m to the west of the application site; the Chesil and Fleet SAC, Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar Site is approximately 1km to the south west of the application site; and the Radipole Lake SSSI is approximately 475m to the east of the application site. The site falls outside of any heritage asset, and outside of the Chickerell Conservation Area.

5. Description of Development

5.1. The application is presented in a hybrid form, with full details provided in respect of 143 dwellings (Phase A), located in the northern part of the application site, together with full details relating to the creation of new accesses onto School Hill and Chickerell Link Road (B3157) with a linking central avenue running north-south through the development. All other elements of the application are provided in outline form, with details reserved for subsequent consideration. This relates to 185 dwellings to be provided within Phase B (situated towards the south of the site) and Phase C (situated to the east of the site), and provision of a school (located in the middle portion of the site). The proposed development includes provision of open space, landscaping and associated works.

5.2. The development is “EIA development” for the purposes of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The application is

accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES). A copy of the Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary (March 2026) and the Environmental Statement are available to view on the Council's website.

6. Relevant Planning History

6.1. In 2014-2015 the applicant submitted the following Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) applications, and a broad pre-application submission in relation to the proposed development:

Application:	Site:	Type:	Date:	Decision:
WD/D/14/002716	Land East of Chickerell	EIA screening opinion	Nov 2014	Officer conclusion: EIA development.
WD/D/15/000819	Land East of Chickerell	EIA scoping opinion	Jun 2015	Officer conclusion: Scoping opinion provided.
WD/D/15/001397	Land East of Chickerell	Pre-app enquiry	Sep 2015	Officer conclusion: Advice provided on design concept, including acceptance of southern linking road extending beyond the development boundary, supported under policy SUS2; acceptance that a school should be included within the proposals to respond to the increased capacity required resulting from the development; caution offered in respect of the need to carefully consider development extending to the north. Advice provided on policy for affordable housing and housing mix; advice on highway matters including discussion over complexities and ambition to secure a connecting road from Chickerell link road and need to provide permeability. Comments provided on delivery of infrastructure/community facilities.

WD/D/18/001316	Land East of Chickerell	EIA screening opinion	Jul 2018	Officer conclusion: EIA development.

6.2. The current application was submitted to the Local Planning Authority at the end of 2020, and since then numerous amendments have been made, with various iterations of the scheme having been re-publicised over time accordingly. Recognising the importance of the site in delivering one of the Council's strategic housing allocations, and in accordance with Para 38 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Officers have endeavoured to work closely with the developer in a positive and proactive way to identify issues at an early stage and to provide advice on how issues identified could be overcome. Broad pre-application discussions had taken place to consider matters relating to the location of the school and general principles of development, and while no pre-application submission was submitted in respect of the detailed matters relating to the proposal, officers have been able to bring key consultees together alongside the developer and their specialist officers in an effort to seek solutions to issues identified. The developer also submitted the initial scheme and a further iteration to a Design Review Panel in 2021 and 2025 to further aid consideration of key issues. Where relevant, the advice provided will be referred to within the body of this report.

6.3. Significant revisions have been made to the scheme including a reduction in the application site area, such that the plans no longer include land south of Green Lane previously envisaged to provide football pitches, changing rooms and a skate park. This was not a result of Officer advice, but a consequence of the land no longer being available to the developer for development.

6.4. Amendments also include a reduction in the number of dwellings proposed, originally proposed at 502, and now proposed to be up to 328. This has resulted from the need to respond to various site constraints. The latest revisions also show amendments to the layout, landscaping, design, house types, car/cycle/pedestrian facilities, drainage strategy, open space, and location of play compared to previous iterations.

6.5. Owing to various challenges with bringing development forward on this allocated site, proposals have had to evolve to respond to issues raised over time and it has taken time to get to the latest submission. Unfortunately, issues continued to present in the latest scheme; these are discussed within the body of the report. Subsequently, a further set of revised plans have been submitted in an effort to address these, and those revised plans have been publicised (week commencing 22 June 2026). While most of the amendments are not considered to materially affect third parties, changes to the house types, and therefore quantum of 2 and 3 bed units to be provided, would have a more material affect in terms of the delivery of housing at the site. Ordinarily Officers would await the end of the publicity period before presenting a scheme to Committee. However, owing to exceptional circumstances relating to the developer's Options on the site (without a committee resolution the developer would lose their Options on the land) the scheme, and its revised plans, are brought forward with a recommendation to delegate authority to grant subject to no new material planning objections being received, in an effort to work proactively in bringing forward housing on this allocated site.

6.6. The below table indicates the iterations publicised under the current proposal and notes the timing that the plans were presented to Design South West for review:

Iteration	Description of development	Notable changes
Nov 2020	Outline application for 502 dwellings with full details supplied in respect of 277 dwellings (Phase A) including creation of new accesses onto School Hill and Chickerell Link Road	

	(B3157), details of part of the internal central avenue, landscaping, drainage, car parking, public open space, associated works and diversion of three public right of ways and with all matters reserved in respect of 255 dwellings (Phases B and C) and a primary school, public open space including field and skate park and changing facilities, landscaping, part of the internal central avenue, drainage and associated works	
Jan 2021	Plans presented to Design South West Review Panel for consideration.	
Jan 2023	Outline application for 393 dwellings with full details supplied in respect of 186 dwellings (Phase A) including creation of new accesses onto School Hill and Chickerell Link Road (B3157), details of the internal central avenue, landscaping, drainage, car parking, golf ball fencing of various heights up to 30m, public open space, associated works and diversion of three public right of ways and with all matters reserved in respect of 207 dwellings (Phases B and C) and a primary school, public open space including field and skate park and changing facilities, landscaping, drainage and associated works.	Reduction in housing numbers including housing omitted to the north (on land of local landscape importance); inclusion of central avenue in detailed element of scheme, amendments to layout incorporating cycle tracks, responding to ecological corridors and relocation of children's play area; revision to football pitch; 30m high golf net added to proposal in response to concerns.
Nov 2023	Outline application for 393 dwellings with full details supplied in respect of 186 dwellings (Phase A) including creation of new accesses onto School Hill and Chickerell Link Road (B3157), details of the internal central avenue, landscaping, drainage, car parking, golf ball fencing of various heights up to 30m, public open space, associated works and diversion of three public right of ways and with all matters reserved in respect of 207 dwellings (Phases B and C) and a primary school, public open space, landscaping, drainage and associated works	Changes to layout and house design, including parking solutions; amendments to drainage scheme; skate park, football pitch and changing facilities omitted from proposal
Nov 2024	Outline application for up to 393 dwellings with full details supplied in respect of 183 dwellings (Phase A) including creation of new accesses onto School Hill and Chickerell Link Road (B3157), including details of the internal central avenue, landscaping, drainage, car parking, public open space and associated works and diversion of three public right of ways for Phase	Further amendments to layout; 30m high golf net removed from proposal; details of retaining structures included.

	A. All other matters reserved in respect of 210 dwellings (Phases B and C) and land for primary school, public open space, landscaping and associated works	
Jan 2025	Plans presented to Design South West Review Panel for consideration.	
Mar 2026	An outline application for up to 328 dwellings with full details supplied in respect of 143 dwellings (Phase A) including creation of new accesses onto School Hill and Chickerell Link Road (B3157), including details of the internal central avenue, landscaping, drainage, car parking, public open space and associated works for Phase A. All other matters reserved in respect of 185 dwellings (Phases B and C) and land for a primary school, public open space including, landscaping and associated works	Reduction in housing numbers, amendments to layout including parking provision, location of children's play, position of drainage ponds.
June 2026	Revised plans are submitted making the following revisions: - Change to drainage strategy - Changes to open space provision and provision for play; - Amendment to house/apartment types; detailing and material treatment; position of apartments; - Amendment to boundary treatment; - Amendments to landscaping; - Amendments to parking arrangements; narrowing of courtyard entrances.	

6.7. Other relevant planning history adjacent to the application site:

Application:	**Site:**	**Proposal:**	**Date:**	**Decision:**
WD/D/16/001134	Land at 20B School Hill	Outline application to develop land for residential purposes of up to 15 dwellings	Dec 2019	Refused
WD/D/16/001443	Land at Bank and Ridge Farms	Outline application to construct 292 dwellings and associated infrastructure.	Aug 2018	Grant
WD/D/18/001922	Land at Bank and Ridge Farms	Reserved Matters application to construct 292 dwellings and associated infrastructure.	Dec 2018	Grant
WD/D/19/002561	Land North of 20B School Hill	Formation of access road.	Feb 2020	Refused

WD/D/20/002918	Land at 20B School Hill	Outline application to develop land for residential purposes of up to 15 dwellings	Nov 2021	Refused

6.8. The site comprises the eastern portion of the CHIC2 allocation, one of the Local Plan's strategic housing allocation sites. Land at Bank and Ridge Farms, referenced above, comprises the northern part of the allocation. The site also abuts the newly developed residential area adjacent to Putton Lane, which was likewise allocated in the previous Local Plan for development, and which is now complete.

7. Constraints

7.1. Land of Local Landscape Importance;

7.2. Wildlife Corridor and ecological network;

7.3. Landscape Character; South Dorset Ridge and Vale;

7.4. Public Rights of Way (S16/21; S16/22; S16/23, S16/24);

7.5. Risk of Surface Water Flooding: 1 in 30; 1 in 100; 1 in 1000;

7.6. Groundwater susceptibility to flooding;

7.7. Chesil Beach & the Fleet RAMSAR, Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar Site – 5km buffer

7.8. Crookhill Brick Pit Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI);

7.9. Radipole Lake SSSI;

7.10. Minerals and Waste Safeguarding Area;

7.11. Contaminated Land;

7.12. Dorset Council Land (southern drainage basins);

7.13. SGN medium and high pressure gas lines (medium pressure gas line runs through the site, high pressure gas line adjacent to the site);

7.14. Radon

8. Consultations

8.1. All consultee responses can be viewed in full on the website at www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk.

8.2. Consultees

8.3. **Chickerell Town Council** – have not raised an objection (in respect of the Mar 2026 submission) but have provided comments on the proposal raising a number of concerns.

8.4. For context, Chickerell Town Council raised no objection to the 2020 submission, raised an objection to the 2023 submission, and raised no objection to the 2024 submission.

8.5. The latest response from Chickerell Town Council makes the following comments:

8.6. The Town Council acknowledge the site is an allocated site and there is a shortfall of housing, but seek that the development is appropriate in scale, design and infrastructure provision, and that the impacts on Chickerell are carefully managed. In this regard they raise the following concerns:

- *The proposal represents another significant urban extension to the town;*
- *The scale of development risks altering the character and identity of Chickerell;*

- *The level of growth, when combined with existing and committed developments, places worrying increasing pressure on the town and its existing infrastructure.*
- *Timing and delivery of the school;*
- *Capacity of local GP surgeries and healthcare services;*
- *Pressure on community facilities and local services.*
- *Infrastructure must be delivered in step with development, not after it;*
- *Any Section 106 contributions should prioritise local needs within the parish of Chickerell.*

The Town Council acknowledged the proposed ecological buffers and biodiversity measures, but strongly request:

- *Assurance that these measures will be secured, maintained and managed long-term;*
- *Protection of existing wildlife corridors and habitats.*
- *What developer contributions will be secured for the Chickerell community*
- *All social housing should be allocated to people with a proven Chickerell connection.*

Chickerell Town Council wish to see contributions towards:

- *Community facilities*
- *Open space and recreation*
- *Healthcare provision*

8.7. Following the publicising of the revised June 2026 plans, Chickerell Town Council provide comment, seeking the early provision of the spine road; the early implementation of landscaping; and the prioritising of affordable housing to those with a local connection.

8.8. **Ward Members** – No comment has been received from ward members in relation to the 2026 submission. Comments have been made previously and are referred to below:

8.9. Cllr Dunseith (former Chickerell ward member) – in 2023 requested the application be considered by committee, and made comments relating to use of the spine road for construction traffic, raised concerns about residents parking on the spine road; made comment on footpath diversions and pedestrian entrances for the proposed school; welcomed the retention of hedges and green corridors running east-west; sought no connectivity with Mariners Way, and noted the segregated cycle/footways.

8.10. Cllr. Bell (adjacent ward member (Radipole)) – in 2024 sought that pedestrian and cycle links were carefully considered, particularly having improved safety infrastructure being installed across the B3157 and Wessex roundabout.

8.11. Cllr Holland (adjacent ward member (Chesil Bank)) – in 2024 raised concern regarding increased traffic volumes, particularly around the Glennie Way junction.

8.12. Cllr Fuhrmann (adjacent ward member (Weymouth town)) – in 2024 sought consideration be given to pedestrian and cyclists crossing the Wessex roundabout.

8.13. Cllr Brown (adjacent ward member (Radipole)) - in 2024 sought that pedestrian and cycle links were carefully considered, particularly having improved safety of school children crossing the Wessex roundabout.

~~8.14.~~ **Dorset Council Highways Authority** – Raise no objection to the June 2026 plans, subject to conditions, and comment as follows:

~~8.15.~~ The Transport Assessment is considered to be satisfactory and robust, and the residual cumulative impact of the development cannot be thought to be severe having regard to para 115-116 of the NPPF.

~~8.16.~~ Having regard to access, the Highway Authority have previously confirmed that due to junction capacity issues at Glennie Way, it would be necessary to secure by S106 a 100 house cap on development until the proposed internal link road between the Chickerell Link Road and School Hill is complete.

8.17. The southern access/junction proposed as a staggered signal-controlled crossroads is considered to be acceptable.

8.18. The principle of the priority junction proposed onto School Hill (the northern access) is accepted, noting the revised Jun 2026 plans providing further refinement of the cycle provision/connection between the site and Dunster Rise and assessment of this junction. Detailed design of the northern access should be secured by condition.

8.19. Recommendations are made seeking improvements to pedestrian and cycle provision and the submission of an active travel movement plan is recommended. A lighting strategy is also recommended in the interests of ensuring lighting is integrated into the scheme. Details of bus stops are also sought.

8.20. Regarding the provision of structures within the highway to support wildlife, such as tunnel crossings beneath the highway and/or the provision of a dormouse bridge over the highway, no details have been submitted. While they could be considered acceptable in principle, clarity on what is proposed is sought.

8.21. Redesign of the side-road crossings is recommended.

8.22. The Highway Authority confirm that the proposed development includes appropriate parking provision, and dwellings would be provided with cycle parking facilitates and have access to electrical vehicle (EV) charging provision. Recommendations are provided to improve parking provision for visitors.

8.23. The Highway Authority confirm that the submitted Travel Plan is broadly acceptable and sustainable travel vouchers towards public transport and/or cycle equipment, to the value of £150, should be included within any s106 agreement.

8.24. A Construction Traffic Management Plan, including location of plant site facilities, access and the impact of construction movements to and from the site will need to be secured by condition.

8.25. The Highway Authority have previously raised a number of queries regarding drainage and have since confirmed that the proposals would be acceptable subject to a detailed methodology for pond reconfiguration being first submitted and agreed.

8.26. Conditions are recommended regarding details where the development adjoins existing highways, re-design of side roads, and revision to footpath links.

8.27. **Dorset Council Street Lighting Team** – The Lighting Team advise, having regard to the Mar 2026 submission, that any roads or footpaths proposed for adoption would be required to be lit to British Standards. Consequently, careful consideration should be given to the position of adoptable footpaths and roads relative to ecological corridors and hedgerows.

8.28. Where footpaths are shown physically separate from estate roads, these would require an additional lighting system; minimising additional systems would be beneficial having regard to lifetime energy and carbon emissions.

8.29. The Lighting Team note that ‘some areas of the estate have arrangements for off street parking and/or tree planting that will not allow any locations for a system of street lighting to be achieved, which will conflict with the adoption of its roads as public highway’. Due to the lack of landscaping detail it is difficult to fully evaluate impacts from trees on highway lighting, consequently the highway lighting design cannot at this stage be verified, nor its impact on the landscaping scheme be fully understood.

8.30. The use of vertical traffic calming features shown will require permanent all-night street lighting in some areas and the Team also note that shared surface areas (roads without any pavements) provide no safe locations for street lighting to be installed. Safety legislation requires a minimum separation of vehicles from highway electrical apparatus which, for lighting columns, is taken as 800mm from a full height kerb. These necessary

kerbed and raised islands around each light will reduce the useable width of the highway significantly and conflict with pedestrians and vehicle movements.

8.31. **Dorset Council Urban Design Officer** – is unable to support the application, based on the Mar 2026 submission, concluding that the proposal fails to satisfactorily respond to the topography of the site and the character and appearance of the area.

8.32. Concerns are raised having regard to the lack of consistency and coherence in the way streets and spaces are formed and are framed by buildings; the lack of reference to local context in the layout and design of the site; the response to topography resulting in significant retaining structures at property boundaries, and terminating within the street scene; the significant engineered embankments and drainage basins and their impact on the quality the public open space; the lack of clear and legible connections linking people with where they want to go; the lack of surveillance of footpaths; the treatment of car parking and lack of street planting; the lack of clear character areas within the built form; and the materials and design of dwellings and boundary treatments.

8.33. Having regard to the design of the scheme, the Urban Design Officer advises that the proposed development is considered to fall contrary to Local and National Guidance on design.

8.34. **Dorset Council Landscape Officer** – is unable to support the application, based on the Mar 2026 submission, for the following reasons:

8.35. The proposals fall short of the standards required with regards the adequate provision of landscaping to successfully integrate the Development with the character of the Site and its surrounding area. In relation to CHIC2 – whilst the Scheme does provide, to some degree, a traditional street with frontage development and a bus route, connecting corridors of semi-natural green spaces along the eastern margin and biodiversity enhancements – the details/design quality of these would be significantly compromised by the extensive use of Permacrib retaining walls within rear gardens and an over-reliance on heavily engineered solutions for drainage.

8.36. **Dorset Council Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)** – Following an initial holding objection, the LLFA raise no objection to the Jun 2026 revisions, subject to conditions.

8.37. The LLFA confirm that the revised combined approach to drainage would be acceptable, noting that the tanks would discharge into open features.

8.38. Regarding the effects of flooding on third party land, the LLFA note that there are significant areas of reduced flood depths shown across the golf course, there is also a much smaller area of increased flood depth. The FRA states that the increase in flood depth is less than 30mm in 'an area of scrub that is not actively used by the golf course'. The flood modelling shows a much greater area of reduction in flooding across the golf course than the small area of increase; the area of increase is located in an undeveloped area. Based on the flood modelling the proposed surface water management scheme for the subject site would lead to a general overall and tangible reduction in flood risk to the golf course. Therefore, the LLFA consider that the requirements of the NPPF with regards to ensuring that flood risk is not increased elsewhere has been satisfied.

8.39. **Dorset Council Environmental Protection** – having regard to the Mar 2026 submission, have no adverse comment to make regarding the proposed development.

8.40. Environmental Protection have recommended a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) be conditioned to address matters relating to noise, air quality and other construction related activities that could cause disturbance. Comment has also been made having regard to operational noise resulting from the electricity sub station and its effects on the development post construction, and conclude no harm. Environmental health subsequently raised no objection to the proposal.

8.41. **Dorset Council Housing Enabling Team** – raise no objection to the Mar 2026 submission, noting a policy compliant 35% affordable housing provision, of a policy compliant tenure mix and well distributed across the site.

8.42. **Dorset Council Tree Officer** – Offered no comment on the scheme design, based on the Mar 2026 submission, but advised additional detail would be required.

8.43. **Dorset Council Design and Conservation Team** – raise no objection to the Mar 2026 submission, stating '*the proposed scheme has been assessed, in relation to perceived impacts on encompassing heritage assets, considered of special architectural/ historical significance, and their associated settings to which, on built heritage grounds, no objection is raised*'.

8.44. **Dorset Council Natural Environment Team** – raise concerns regarding the proposed development, based on the Mar 2026 submission. They note that whilst the latest iteration of the scheme is a step in the right direction, and the updated ecological documentation does address some of the concerns raised previously, the absence of detailed information about lighting is a significant issue as it means that there is significant uncertainty about the efficacy of certain key elements of ecological mitigation including the east-west ecological corridors, the Dormouse bridge, and the wildlife corridor.

8.45. More detailed comments are made having regard to protected species, with key concerns relating to the impacts on dormice and bats. These are discussed within the body of the report.

8.46. It is noted that an appropriate level of biodiversity net gain is achieved in the latest proposals.

8.47. **Dorset National Landscape Team** – raise no objections to the Mar 2026 submission, concluding that the proposal is unlikely to result in undue harm to the setting of the Dorset National Landscape.

8.48. **Dorset Fire and Rescue** – raise no objection to the Mar 2026 submission, but make a number of recommendations relating to Building Regulation matters in the interests of raising them at an early stage. The matters include giving consideration to ensuring adequate access to the site for the purpose of firefighting, ensuring the provision of suitably located fire hydrants ahead of commencement, and encouraging the use of sprinklers in both homes and schools.

8.49. Having regard to the submitted information, including swept path analysis and layout, it is considered that access by firefighting officers would not be impeded through the scheme design and that the above recommendations could be secured. These matters will be addressed in more detail at the Building Regulations stage.

8.50. **Dorset Council Environmental Mitigation Delivery Team** – raise no objection based on the Mar 2026 submission, subject to considerations around public open space with reference to 'Advice Note for Practical Design and Management of Greenspace'.

8.51. Comments raised in previous submissions have also been made regarding the provision of open space, planting, attenuation tanks, play and public rights of way.

8.52. **Dorset Council Rights of Way** – raise no objection to the Mar 2026 submission subject to informatives, the upgrading of local footways and a condition requiring a Rights of Way Management Plan that covers the lifetime of the development and details the design of access and public rights of way routes and their surfacing, widths, gradients, landscaping, and structures; any proposals for diversion and closures of public rights of way and alternative route provision; and consideration of the additional informatives.

8.53. **Crime Prevention Officer** – raised no objection to the Mar 2026 submission, but raises the following concerns:

8.54. It will be necessary to ensure that tree placement within open spaces with play are appropriately positioned to ensure good surveillance of these spaces is maintained. Given proximity of the parks to the road, boundary treatment is recommended.

8.55. Advice and recommendations are made regarding parking provision.

8.56. Advice is recommended regarding rear garden gates.

8.57. Advise is recommended regarding spaces adjacent to the school, to ensure appropriate surveillance.

8.58. Ramblers Association – raise disappointment regarding the Mar 2026 submission that the proposed footpath diversions would require walkers using footways alongside estate roads, and in some places cross the 'primary movement route'. They recommend safe crossings be secured at such junctions.

8.59. Natural England – raise no objection to the Mar 2026 submission, subject to appropriate mitigation measures, including the provision of the dormice bridge and small mammal tunnels.

8.60. Sport England – raise significant concerns to the Mar 2026 submission regarding the parts of the development falling within the golf strike zone and seek additional detail relating to the use of land falling within the ball strike trajectory, and proposed mitigation. Their key concern relates to the impact on the golf course as a result of the 'agent of change' principle. Sport England also refer to comments made by England Golf who concur with these comments and comment: '*We would like the safety aspect to be mitigated suitably, potentially wild meadow without a path would mean people wouldn't be accessing the area'.*

8.61. WPA Land Contamination Consultants – raise no objection to the Mar 2026 submission and comment as follows:

8.62. '*Contaminated land planning conditions need to be applied. WPA notes the conclusions made in Ch 13 of the Environment Statement drawing from prior site investigation and reporting. No significant contaminant linkages have been identified but a watching brief concerning potentially unidentified contamination is recommended. Further reporting concerning unexpected finds, adherence to standard protocols for alerts in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), Waste Management Pan (WMP) and generally reported demolition / materials management processes is to be expected for review prior to agreeing completion of contaminated land planning conditions'*.

8.63. SGN – raise no objection to the Mar 2026 submission.

8.64. **Office for Nuclear Regulations** – No comment in respect of the Mar 2026 submission.

8.65. **Public Health and Prevention** – has no comment to make on the Mar 2026 submission. Previous comments relating to the 2023 submission were made making comment on public open space provision and the affordable housing mix.

8.66. **Dorset Wildlife Trust** – commented in 2020 that they were unable to support, but no further comment has been received in relation to other iterations of the scheme.

8.67. **The Countryside Access Team** – raised no objection to the 2020 submission. No further comment has been received in relation to other iterations of the scheme.

8.68. **The Open Spaces Society** - raised no objection to the 2020 submission. No further comment has been received in relation to other iterations of the scheme.

8.69. **Historic England** – raised no objection to the 2020 and 2023 submissions, and made no comment in 2024. No further comment has been received in relation to the latest scheme.

8.70. **Dorset Travel** – have previously comments on the proposal seeking contributions towards bus infrastructure. No comment has been made in respect of recent submissions.

8.71. **Active Travel England** - raised no objection to the 2023 and 2024 submission. To the 2023 submission comments were made in relation to the configuration of the southern and northern access having particular regard to cycle provision; recommendations for a segregated cycle way to be incorporated along the entirety of the spine road; and recommendations regarding footway links and junctions crossings; support was given to of enhanced east-west links; and recommendations made regarding access to the school site. 2024 comments recognised some improvement has been secured. No comment has been received relating to the Mar 2026 submission.

8.72. **Environment Agency** – raised no objection in 2020 and 2024. No further comment has been received in relation to the latest iteration of the scheme.

8.73. **Wessex Water** – raised no objection and offered comment to the 2023 scheme. No further comment has been received in relation to later iterations of the scheme.

8.74. **NHS Dorset** – raised no objection to the 2020 scheme. No further comment has been received in relation to other iterations of the scheme.

8.75. **Scottish and Southern Electricity** – raised no objection in 2020 and 2024. No further comment has been received in relation to the latest iteration of the scheme.

8.76. **Scottish and Southern Thermal** – raised concerns regarding matters relating to noise in 2020. No further comment has been received in relation to other iterations of the scheme.

8.77. **Health and Safey Executive** – raised no objection to the 2020 scheme. No further comment has been received in relation to other iterations of the scheme.

8.78. **National Grid Plant Protection** – raised no objection in 2020, 2023 and 2024. No further comment has been received in relation to the Mar 2026 submission.

8.79. **Dorset Council Waste Team** – raised no objection in 2023. No further comment has been received in relation to other iterations of the scheme.

8.80. **Bournemouth Water Ltd** - raised no objection in 2023. No further comment has been received in relation to other iterations of the scheme.

8.81. **National Air Traffic Services (NATS)** - raised no objection in 2023. No further comment has been received in relation to other iterations of the scheme.

9. Representations received

9.1. The following third party comments have been submitted and broken down to relate to the various submissions. Full details of third party comments can be found on the Council's website.

9.2. Nov 2020 submission:

9.3. 34 Third party comments were received in response to the initial 2020 consultation.

9.4. The comments received raised the following concerns:

- Impact on Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Impact on the environment; loss of green open space; loss of agricultural land, and impact upon farming practice.
- Impact on local wildlife, including protected species, impact on domestic animals. Impact on habitat, including the east/west wildlife corridor running adjacent to the link road.
- Impact on traffic; traffic light issues; increased volume of traffic at both access points would be to the detriment of highway safety, with a high volume of traffic already

utilising the local highway network, particularly School Hill. Noise and air pollution due to additional traffic.

- Impact on residents
- Significant volume of housing already built within the local area over the past 5 years; cumulative impact on the community of Chickerell as a consequence of the large volume of building within the locality.
- Insufficient infrastructure; capacity of doctors and hospitals, poor phasing leaving the school until last, capacity of secondary schools and further education, capacity of sewerage network, contributions would be required to support bus service.
- The phasing of development should allow the primary school, health centre contribution, skate park and assistance with bus service to fall in phase 1.
- Insufficient employment within the area
- Impact on tourism in the area
- Anti-social behaviour
- Drainage concerns due to sloping site
- Housing in the area is not affordable, and not serving the local community
- Insufficient electric car charging points
- Impact on rights of way
- Merging of Chickerell and Weymouth
- Pedestrian access to and from school adjacent to busy car garage
- Contradiction of Inspectors report

9.5. The following non-material planning considerations were raised:

- Impact on view from existing residential properties
- Impact of construction through dust, noise and construction traffic disturbance, particularly as construction traffic will have to access the site via the existing road network as opposed to the new road

9.6. The following benefits were identified:

- Provision of a new primary school
- Based on submitted information, the impact on the environment would be acceptable
- Addressing local need for additional affordable homes
- Creation of jobs within the area
- Development respects the character of the area

9.7. Jan 2023 submission:

9.8. 17 third party comments were received in response to the Jan 2023 consultation.

9.9. The comments received raised the following concerns:

- Location of skatepark at Green Lane unacceptable given access, road crossing and car parking issues, Green Lane is partly private and already issues in Putton Lane, Farewell Crescent
- Concerns with parking at sports facilities and skate park; already skate parks in Weymouth and Portland with more planned; site proposed for skatepark has high biodiversity value and would result in loss of green space; skatepark would lead to crime, litter

- Existing transport network can't cope
- Significant existing pressure on health services in area (e.g. WR and Lanehouse Practice), with patients travelling long distances. Development fails to make provision for Chickerell Health Centre, which should be a pre-requisite for consent; more amenities needed, alongside new GP, public spaces for socialising; schools currently overcrowded
- Infrastructure issues compounded by phases A, B and C; large number of dwellings for town with poor amenities
- Boundary treatment to school playing fields should be considered, as to how would affect neighbouring properties
- Loss of open green space and wildlife habitat, and land which was designated as Land of Local Landscape Importance (LLLI). Govt commitment to protecting greenspace is at odds with this development. Harm the character and landscape of the area, as noted by Ind Govt Inspector in 2007
- Chickerell should remain independent from Weymouth
- East and West Streets in need of regeneration, parking and road navigation/pedestrian safety should be addressed in these locations
- Too large in scale and loss of village feel, cumulatively impactful alongside other development, e.g. solar farm
- Loss of farming land and tradition field patterns; loss of dog walking paths
- Lead to air and noise pollution, partly given increase in car use
- Need to ensure housing is made affordable for young and local people
- Archaeological remains need to be safeguarded
- Design of houses are visually offensive and do not fit character of the area; 3 storey houses would restrict views toward coastline
- Houses nearest to Mariners way would introduce loss of privacy to occupants of 8 Mariners Way, fenestration of proposed Denbury House raised as an issue. No hard boundary between Mariners Way and new development, needed for security; fencing appears to be in place.
- Carparking arrangement for dwellings unacceptable, shared parking leads to disputes, inability to charge EV, issues with deliveries. Carparking should be established in frontage of properties
- Drainage issues within Greys Field, path to Putton Lane. Drainage naturally occurs across site toward Chafeys Lane and natural drainage channels should be protected
- Walking along narrow Green Lane unacceptable. A pedestrian lane should be provided for walking and cycling, linking Putton Lane to Green Barn
- Hedges along roadsides need to be responsibility of property owners to maintain, wooden fences a poor substitute
- Wide verge on corner of Putton Lane and Green Lane should not be development land, was created by Dorset Council for visibility

9.10. The following benefits were identified:

- School is a welcome addition and needs to be built given Greys Field Estate was meant to have one

9.11. <u>Nov 2023 submission</u>:

9.12. 23 third party comments were received in response to the Nov 2023 consultation.

9.13. The comments received raised the following concerns:

- Loss of Land of Local Landscape Importance (LLLI), open green space and wildlife habitat, e.g. to Barn Owl, Golden Plover and Lapwing.
- Comments related to Mariners Way field: Loss of green buffer zone/field between new development and Mariners Way; revised plans show increase in housing in this location; would cause loss of habitat, loss of mature trees and hedges; issue with existing pipes and drainage; remove a vital noise and visual screen between two estates and introduce higher levels of traffic to an incompatible single lane road; ecological report identifies biodiversity value of buffer; objection to the house type and fenestration proposed for housing near Mariners Way, in particular 8 Mariners Way, resulting in loss of privacy to occupants of this property.
- School and green space should be constructed prior to housing habitation.
- Concerned with construction activity and how this would affect residents in neighbouring estate, in particular those at Mariners Way. Other similar schemes in area have resulted in noise/air pollution to residents.
- Concerns with change in provision of sporting facilities, namely skate park, with this having been previously compatible with wildlife corridor. If skate park located on other open space then DC would need to calculate developed infrastructure contributions accordingly.
- Concerns with large development which does not secure vital amenities, medical centre, road infrastructure.
- Concern with impact to private property due to loss of vista, disturbance from new sports facilities, being overlooked from new housing, and impacts of construction.

9.14. The following benefits were identified:

- Supportive of principle of development bringing much needed housing and economic development.

9.15. Nov 2024 submission

9.16. Further third party comments were received in response to the Nov 2024 consultation.

9.17. The comments received raised the following concerns:

- Overdevelopment within Chickerell, with over 1500 new builds in recent years, all on green fields with little regard to wildlife.
- Loss of Land of Local Landscape Importance (LLLI), open green space and wildlife habitat impacting wildlife (e.g. nesting birds and feeding ground for scarce birds, badger setts, hedgehogs, flora and fauna) resulting in irreversible impacts to the ecosystem; impacts on all species (not just protected species) has not been thoroughly reviewed. Impacts on people's health and wellbeing through loss of green space.
- Loss of farmland, needed for growing food.
- Comments related to Mariners Way field: Mariners Way cannot cope with traffic coming from the development if a vehicular connection were to be established, further such a connection would be illegal as there is a strip of land outside of the developers ownership; there looks to be a road crossing a buffer area where there are pipes; should revert to plan to provide small field at the end of Mariners Way as a buffer with trees and hedges; loss of vegetation, shrubs and established trees used by wildlife; a buffer at the end of Mariners Way would help with noise and disturbance this development might cause; a hard boundary wall should be installed at the end of Mariners Way; overdevelopment adjacent to Mariners Way (number of properties increased from 4 to 6, and green buffer lost); positioning of proposed properties do

not need to line up with Mariners Way properties as they are separate estates; loss of privacy to neighbouring properties, in particular No. 8 and 25 Mariners Way; revised plans, compared to those submitted Oct 2022 would see the loss of ecological corridors, green sound barriers and wildlife friendly areas to the detriment of the residents of Mariners Way.

- Concerned about impact on existing properties: loss of vista, space and continual noise from building works and any sports facilities, as well as being overlooked by numerous houses; loss of property value and impact on housing market.
- Impact on flooding through increased water run off impacting properties and land, particularly on the western side of the development; the fields currently offer some retention capacity, but building will remove this; impact on properties on lower ground and further down stream; the flood protection and water management plans inadequately address flood risk.
- Concern regarding the removal of the golf nets, and impacts upon both the golf course and risk to third parties; while the developer has sought to explore options within the golf course, those changes would have implications for the golf course site in terms of its status and memberships, causing financial ramifications; it is recommended that public access be restricted in the areas adjacent to the golf course and that trees are planted in this area.
- Concern regarding impacts from the site proposed as a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) site, making the proposed development undesirable.
- Concern regarding the impact on local road networks, including at the Wessex roundabout and the Weymouth Link Road, the cut through to Upwey, and Glennie Way; financial contributions should be secured to improve road network; insufficient parking within Chickerell. The proposed junction at School Hill will not safely accommodate the traffic movements from School Hill, Dunster Rise, Courage Way and Coldharbour and that a more comprehensive junction is considered i.e. a medium sized roundabout, which should be funded by the developer.
- Concerns regarding impact upon local infrastructure, in addition to local roads, schools, local healthcare provision including GPs and dentists, green spaces, water and sewerage networks would all be affected; local shop offers inadequate facilities for population increase; poor local public transport links (bus stops at 8pm); queries raised over the delivery of proposed infrastructure at the site.
- Insufficient job opportunities within the local area to serve the increased population.
- Historically (2007) concerns were raised by an independent Govt Examiner regarding the development of this site owing to its impact on landscape character and visual amenity.
- Replacement of skate park with housing would be detrimental; loss of skate park from the plans should be addressed through a financial contribution.
- Questions over ‘need’ in light of housing not selling quickly in the local area.

9.18. The following benefits were identified:

- Should help contribute to addressing housing need.
- Assist economic growth for this part of Dorset.
- To date Chickerell may not have received all the infrastructure improvements and protection of its environment it needs and arguably deserves.

9.19. <u>Mar 2026 submission</u>

9.20. Further third party comments have been received in response to the Mar 2026 submission.

9.21. The comments received raised the following concerns:

- Overdevelopment within Chickerell, undermining the area and undermining coordinated growth.
- Area is the last buffer between Chickerell and the more urban spaces in Weymouth; should not link Chickerell to Southill; cannot be considered in isolation to CG Fry's plans on the fields behind the police station.
- Loss of open green space and wildlife habitat; impact on rural walking routes and access to green spaces, which are proven to support physical and mental wellbeing; green spaces that would be lost are vital for carbon absorption; lost green spaces would impact the character of Chickerell, children use the fields to play in. Impacts on an important wildlife corridor and fragmentation of corridors; queries regarding the incorporation of underground wildlife corridors; failure to comply with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 - a robust Habitat Regulations Assessment is required; insufficient ecological information - lack of comprehensive protected species surveys; no clear measurable biodiversity net gain; limited detail on long-term habitat management. Measures must be put in place to protect the current boundary hedges. Particularly important at the boundary of the site with the current Grey's Field development with Lower Putton Lane and Green Lane. A hedgehog highway should be put in place, and bat boxes and swift bricks placed in some buildings.
- A hard boundary wall should be installed at the end of Mariners Way.
- Impact on flooding through increased water run off; the flood risk assessment inadequately considers run-off from Lower Putton Lane or the impacts on existing drainage systems; there will be environmental impact of building on land that floods.
- Drainage concerns including potential impacts on the Fleet Lagoon.
- Concern regarding traffic generation as a consequence of the new road proposed; impact on local roads, including Glennie Way and School Hill, with increased traffic causing further degradation of the road surface and compounding the safety issues already experienced in the area with speeding motorists and visibility limits when turning in and out of Lower Putton Lane, Lower Way and East Street.
- Concerns regarding impact upon local infrastructure, including schools and local healthcare provision, including GPs and dentists; local shop and pharmacy offers inadequate facilities for population increase; poor local public transport links; no clear infrastructure delivery plan is provided.
- Insufficient job opportunities within the local area to serve the increased population; local jobs mainly seasonal and poorly paid.
- Properties will not be affordable to local people; likely intended as second homes rather than meeting local need;
- Low quality builds of the developer will undermine the nature of Chickerell.
- Consideration should be given to exiting households in the area when planning the play/outdoor space to ensure large scale anti-social behaviour is not brought into an existing residential area.
- The proposal conflicts with the Development Plan and Neighbourhood Plan, with insufficient infrastructure proposed; there is inconsistency with the strategic direction of the emerging Dorset Council Local Plan, particularly in relation to climate, biodiversity and sustainable development.
- Dorset Council is proposing housing on the site already designated for a future skate park and football pitch.

- Insufficient provision for older children
- Housing should be directed to brownfield land.
- Hazard to life if there were to be a fire at the nearby Chickerell Solar Farm.
- The Chickerell Link Road should be used for contractor vehicles and they should be banned from using the School Hill approach.

9.22. The following benefits were identified:

- Pleased the developer has reduced the number of houses and made some attempt to reconfigure the new road form link road to the top of School Hill to make it less of a race track.
- Pleased to see the field at the end of Mariners Way is to be left unbuilt upon. Hope instead it might be a children's play park or a natural wildlife setting.

10. Duties

10.1. Section 38(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.

10.2. Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000) requires Local Planning Authorities to seek to further the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of National Landscape (formerly known as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) when making any decision which affects such land.

10.3. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that when considering whether to grant planning permission for a development which affects a listed building or its setting, there is a general duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

10.4. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

11. Relevant policies

11.1. Development plan

11.1.1. Local Plan Adopted West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland Local Plan:

11.1.2. In this case the development plan comprises:

- INT1 – Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
- ENV1 – Landscape, Seascape and Sites of Geological Interest
- ENV2 – Wildlife and Habitats
- ENV3 – Green Infrastructure Network
- ENV4 – Heritage Assets
- ENV5 – Flood Risk
- ENV8 – Agricultural Land and Farming Resilience
- ENV9 – Pollution and Contaminated Land
- ENV10 – The Landscape and Townscape Setting
- ENV11 – The Pattern of Streets and Spaces
- ENV12 – The Design and Positioning of Buildings
- ENV13 – Achieving High Levels of Environmental Performance
- ENV15 – Efficient and Appropriate Use of Land
- ENV16 – Amenity
- SUS1 – The Level of Economic and Housing Growth
- SUS2 – Distribution of Development

- HOUS1 – Affordable Housing
- HOUS3 – Open Market Housing Mix
- HOUS4 – Development of Flats, Hostels and Houses in Multiple Occupation
- COM1 – Making Sure New Development makes Suitable Provision for Community Infrastructure
- COM4 – New or Improved Local Recreational Facilities
- COM6 – The provision of Education and Training Facilities
- COM 7 – Creating a Safe and Efficient Transport Network
- COM 9 – Parking Standards in New Development
- COM10 – The provision of Utilities Service Infrastructure
- CHIC2 – Chickerell Urban Extension

11.1.3. Bournemouth, Christchurch, Poole and Dorset Minerals Sites Plan 2019

- Policy MS-8: Preventing Land-Use Conflict

11.1.4. Bournemouth, Dorset & Poole Minerals Strategy 2014

- Policy SG1 - Mineral Safeguarding Area
- Policy SG2 - Mineral Consultation Area
- Policy SG3 - Safeguarding of mineral sites and facilities

11.1.5. Bournemouth, Dorset & Poole Waste Plan 2019

- Policy 22 - Waste from new developments
- Policy 24 - Safeguarding waste facilities

11.1.6. Chickerell Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2036 (made 22/06/2021)

- CNP1 – Chickerell Local Centre and other valued community facilities
- CNP4 – Chickerell Wildlife Corridor
- CNP9 – The Fleet and Heritage Coast
- CNP10 – Locally Valued Landscape north and east of Chickerell village
- CNP11 – General Design Principles
- CBP12 – Enhancing Biodiversity

11.2. Other material planning considerations:

11.2.1. Emerging Dorset Council Local Plan:

11.2.2. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF provides that local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant plan policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan are to the policies of the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

11.2.3. The Dorset Council Local Plan Options consultation took place between January and March 2021, with further consultation between 18 Aug – 31 October 2025. Being at a very early stage of preparation, the relevant policies in the draft plan should be accorded very limited weight in decision making.

11.2.4. Local Nature Recovery Strategy

11.2.5. The Dorset Local Nature Recovery Strategy identifies local priorities for nature recovery and maps areas where action would be most beneficial. In planning

decisions it is a material consideration, helping to ensure that development supports biodiversity enhancement and aligns with Dorset's agreed priorities for nature recovery.

11.2.6. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 (as amended 2025)

11.2.7. As far as this application is concerned the following sections from the NPPF are particularly relevant:

- Section 2 Achieving sustainable development
- Section 4 Decision-making
- Section 5 Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- Section 7 Ensuring the vitality of town centres
- Section 8 Promoting healthy and safe communities
- Section 9 Promoting sustainable transport
- Section 11 Making effective use of land
- Section 12 Achieving well designed places
- Section 14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- Section 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- Section 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment
- Section 17 Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals

11.2.8. Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date then permission should be granted unless specific NPPF policies protecting areas or assets provide a strong reason for refusal and/or any adverse impacts of approval would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole, with particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places and providing affordable homes.

11.2.9. Of particular relevance, the NPPF considers the following:

- Section 4 'Decision making': Para 39 - Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available…and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.
- Section 5 'Delivering a sufficient supply of homes'. This outlines the government's objective in respect of land supply.
- Section 11 'Making effective use of land'
- Section 12 'Achieving well designed places'. This indicates that all development to be of a high quality in design, and the relationship and visual impact of it to be compatible with the surroundings. In particular, and amongst other things, Paragraphs 131 – 141 advise that:
  - The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.
  - Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.
- Section 14 'Meeting the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change'

- Section 15 ‘Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment’. Paragraphs 192-195 set out how biodiversity is to be protected and encourage net gains for biodiversity.
- Section 16 ‘Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment’- Paragraph 212 says that when considering designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. The effect of an application on the significance of non-designated heritage assets should also be taken into account (para 216).

11.2.10. National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

11.2.11. National Design Guide

11.2.12. Building for Healthy Lives

11.2.13. National Standards for SUDs

11.2.14. West Dorset Landscape Character Assessment 2009

11.2.15. WDDC Design & Sustainable Development Planning Guidelines (2009)

- Policy (a) Work in harmony with the site and its surroundings
- Policy (b) Involve the right people at the design stage
- Policy (h) Maintain and enhance local character
- Policy (j) Achieve high standards of environmental performance

11.2.16. Long Bredy, Portesham, Chickerell, Abbotsbury and Langton Herring Conservation Area Appraisal, adopted December 2007 (amended 2008).

11.2.17. Guidance Notes for Residential Developments on waste storage, collection and management (2022).

11.2.18. Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs) Manual

11.2.19. Advice Note for Practical Design and Management of Greenspace

11.2.20. Secure by Design

11.2.21. Fields in Trust Guidance

11.2.22. Housing land supply

11.2.23. Dorset Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply as required by National Policy. In addition, the strategies for meeting housing needs in the adopted local plans are not designed to deliver the housing need under the Government’s standard method and therefore, in accordance with NPPF footnote 8, the housing policies within the adopted Development Plan(s) are out of date and the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. The emerging Dorset Local Plan is not sufficiently progressed and can be afforded very limited weight in decision making.

11.2.24. This does not result in automatic approval of residential development. Paragraph 11(d) requires that permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusal, or unless the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole.

11.2.25. Housing Delivery Test (HDT)

11.2.26. The latest HDT results (2023 measurement) show that enough homes have been delivered within the local plan area to demonstrate 106% of the target.

12. Human rights

12.1. Article 6 - right to a fair trial.

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

12.3. The first protocol of Article 1 protection of property.

12.4. 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.

13. Public Sector Equalities Duty

13.1. 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.

13.2. 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 Public Sector Equalities Duty.

13.3. In this case, Chickerell has a range of facilities and infrastructure within reach of the proposed development, and the development incorporates a road suitable to accommodate a bus route, providing opportunity to enhance sustainable transport provision within the village in the future, promoting opportunities to access a wider range of facilities. Its sustainable location means there is access to services to support future occupiers, including those with protected characteristics. Existing facilities within easy reach of the development include a doctors surgery, local shop, small library, school and pre-school, and residential care homes, amongst others. The site is therefore ideally located to support future occupiers. In turn, the provision of housing could also help support existing facilities and services to ensure these remain viable. These factors could have a positive impact on rural isolation.

13.4. The provision of affordable housing as part of the development could have a positive effect on people in socio-economic deprivation.

13.5. The allocation of land towards a school would ensure that there is suitable provision for education to support young people. Provision of play spaces and contributions towards improving local sporting opportunities would also have a positive impact on younger people. Contributions towards health care would likewise support a range of people with and without protected characteristics.

13.6. Mobility Guidance provides guidance to ensure that the design of places meets the needs of disabled people, people travelling with small children or carrying luggage or heavy shopping as well as people with temporary mobility problems and older people. In line with Inclusive Mobility Guidance, footways have been designed to accommodate appropriate widths to support people using a stick, cane, wheelchair and/or pushchair. A cycle link is also proposed with acceptable widths, provided as a segregated link or where there are alternative routes as a shared path. The pedestrian and cycle routes increase ease of access through the development for both pedestrians and cyclists, and on the whole take into account desire lines. Links where possible have been made into surrounding networks to link the site with existing and proposed facilities. It is regrettable that greater permeability with the existing built form is not shown. The lack of connection with the existing built form of Chickerell would have a negative impact on those with protected characteristics, increasing the length of journey to reach existing and planned

facilities for both existing and future residents. The developer has demonstrated an effort to improve these connections, but this has not been possible due to third party land and lack of willingness by third party owners. The impacts associated with the limited connections into the existing development need to be taken into account. There are also a number of opportunities where pedestrian connectivity and footway links could be improved, and where these do not mimic desire lines, this could present a barrier or hindrance to those with protected characteristics. Tactile pavement along the central avenue and changes in materials help to delineate crossings and prioritise pedestrians and cyclists aiding movement for those with a disability. Priority crossings across side roads could nonetheless be enhanced to further aid ease of movement throughout the development, together with improvement for cyclists at the School Hill access. Where poor pedestrian and cycle links/lack of priority present, these could be addressed through seeking amendments to the scheme in line with an active travel plan.

13.7. In terms of site levels, these present a challenge for this site. Mobility Guidance at Para 4.3 states: 'Generally, pedestrian environments should be level, which means that there should be no gradient in excess of 1 in 60. Effort should be made to ensure that the route is smooth, since even small dips or gaps in paving joints might present a hazard such as to people who use a stick or a crutch. If a level route is not feasible, then gradients should not exceed 1 in 20. Limited detail has been provided to assess levels, including within the detailed element of the scheme (phase A), but level data has been provided for the roads, and the finished floor levels (FFL) of the properties, offering some indication. It is estimated, based on road levels provided, that some of the footways within the proposed development would occasionally have an incline of 1:10m, particularly within the vicinity north of the proposed school; and often an incline of less than 1:20m, with the steepest sections along central avenue 2 and in the vicinity of the school and north of the school. The latest layout does on the whole present an improvement to previous iterations having regard to responding to the gradients of the site, with roads and footpaths most frequently less than 1:20. However, where streets do exceed the recommended gradients of 1:20 as set out in Mobility Guidance these routes could present restrictions for pedestrians and cyclists and their ability to easily move throughout the scheme. When having regard to the impacts of this, account needs to be taken of the natural topography of the area and the steep sloping nature of the site as existing.

13.8. Concern was previously raised regarding the number of stepped entrances into properties, owing to site levels, with 103 dwellings previously shown as having a stepped entrance, in comparison to 58 dwellings with a level or ramped access. With regards to the latest proposal, this level of detail has not been provided, but a broad assessment can be made comparing finished floor levels (FFL) and level data for the road. On the whole, it would appear that the revised scheme presents a more level entrance to properties from the street, such that it is anticipated that the current scheme would be unlikely to present disadvantages to those persons with protected characteristics.

13.9. Parking is provided on the whole within easy access of units, either in front, or to the side, of dwellinghouses, or within a conveniently located courtyard. Where provided to the side of a property, parking is in close proximity but frequently laid out in a tandem arrangement, which can be less convenient for occupiers. There are some noteworthy exceptions where parking is not conveniently located relative to the property they serve, for example at plot 22, however, these occurrences appear to be exceptions and significant improvement has been made since the previous iteration of the scheme, with short distances on the whole between property and parking allocation and where positioned in a courtyard, rear access is often viable.

13.10. Having regard to the Public Sector Equalities Duty, rights in this regard are qualified rights, which means interference in the public interest may be justified. The impacts resulting from developing a steeply sloping site have to be weighed in the context of delivering a key allocated housing site which to some extent the impact of significant

changes in levels would be unavoidable. Bringing forward the proposed scheme would provide a wide range of benefits including the delivery of both open market and affordable housing, the delivery of a school, and delivery of public open space/play facilities. Though the proposal would not in its entirety advance equality of opportunity owing to its steeply sloping streets, limited permeability with the existing built form, and detailed elements discussed such as pedestrian and cycle facilities (for which there would be scope to secure improvements), it cannot be concluded that allowing the development would result in significant harm to those with protected characteristics such as to warrant refusal of the application. In this regard it is considered that sufficient provision has been made on site to ensure that those with protected characteristics are not unlawfully disadvantaged.

13.11. In view of this, and having regard to the legitimate and well-established planning policy aim of supporting development within this sustainable site, a refusal of permission would not be proportionate and necessary. Granting consent would be consistent with the PSED duty contained within Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

14. Planning Assessment

14.1. Principle of development

14.1.1. Development Plan

14.1.2. The majority of the land subject of this application is part of a wider site, allocated within the West Dorset Weymouth and Portland Local Plan, as a development site.

14.1.3. Policy CHIC2 sets out the key requirements for the allocated site as a whole, and states the following:

i) Land to the north and land to the east of Chickerell, as shown on the policies map, will be developed for housing and related community facilities. Small-scale employment uses may be provided within the site, appropriate to a mixed-use neighbourhood.

ii) The development will deliver highway improvements necessary for the development to go ahead.

iii) The growth will be phased to deliver a steady rate of growth over at least a 10 year period through the development of:

- *land to the north (to be developed for housing and public open space);*
- *land to the east (to be developed for housing, public open space and to include a local food store of a scale appropriate to a local centre if there is still a need for such a facility, and securing land for a new primary school).*

iv) Development should be in accordance with a masterplan for each area prepared by the developer / landowner in conjunction with the local community, Chickerell Town Council and Dorset County Council, and agreed by West Dorset District Council. In order to address sustainable development issues, the masterplan will need to be subject to a sustainability assessment, such as a BREEAM Communities Assessment, carried out by a suitably qualified assessor. The masterplan should ensure that:

- *the development will be focused around a traditional street with frontage development connecting from the Chickerell Link Road to School Hill, and from School Hill to Chickerell Hill. The street should be able to accommodate a bus route. The development should also provide improved pedestrian /cycle links to Weymouth Town Centre and surrounding area;*

- *strategic planting is carried out in advance of the site being developed, in accordance with an agreed strategic landscape phasing plan, to reduce the impact of the development on longer views particularly along the northern and eastern boundaries. This should include a connecting corridor of seminatural green space along the eastern margin of the allocation and biodiversity enhancement. A network of open green spaces, for amenity /recreation and drainage purposes, should run through the development and link to the open countryside;*
- *there is adequate on-site provision of community infrastructure;*
- *areas prone to surface water flooding are kept free of built development and due consideration given to flood risk elsewhere.*

14.1.4. The site comprises, in the main, land to the east of Chickerell as set out in the proposals map and allocated under policy CHIC2, with a small area of land at 20b School Hill not included within the scope of the application. A parcel of land to the south, formerly included and proposed for use as a sports/recreation hub, is also excluded from the application, but does not form part of the Local Plan site allocation nonetheless. An additional area extending outside of the allocation is proposed to the north and south. The Local Plan indicates that the allocated site as a whole could bring forward somewhere in the region of 820 homes, and is expected to provide essential infrastructure, including a connecting street between the Chickerell Link Road and School Hill (bypassing Chickerell Road), together with a primary school, and food store if needed; the latter two to be provided within 'CHIC2 east'. The supporting text within the Local Plan indicates that of the 820 homes, 350 could be delivered within 'CHIC2 north', and 470 homes within 'CHIC2 east'. Planning consent has been granted on land to the north for 292 dwellings.

14.1.5. The application broadly accords with the key principles set out by criteria (i) which earmarks the site for the delivery of housing, alongside other related community and employment uses. Whilst the site does not include any employment, other than the employment opportunities brought forward by the provision of a new school, compliance with policy is not dependant on employment provision, the policy simply indicates that some small scale employment may be acceptable. It is not therefore considered that the proposal conflicts with criteria (i).

14.1.6. Criteria (iii) is more specific in as much as it specifies the provision of both a food store, where there is a need for such a facility, and school within the eastern portion of the site, together with the provision of housing and open space. The application includes provision for housing, a school, and formal and informal public open space, but does not include a food-store. Consideration should therefore be given to the need for such a facility.

14.1.7. Within the heart of Chickerell is a small local centre, as defined within the neighbourhood plan, including the Post Office Stores. The neighbourhood plan identifies the stores as being particularly well used by local residents according to household questionnaires. It is clear that this is an important facility serving Chickerell, and until recent years this store was the sole food-store serving Chickerell village, with a further Post Office and Stores serving Charlestown, and a number of convenience stores serving the part of Chickerell surrounding Lanehouse road.

14.1.8. Since the Local Plan was made, in 2017 Aldi food stores opened on the edge of the Granby Industrial site. The neighbourhood plan identifies the lack of in-store bakery, fresh meat counter etc. as a deficiency, which could mean that local people might still choose to travel to supermarkets located to the east of the Chickerell/Weymouth conurbation, but recognises the store as Chickerell's first major supermarket, ideally located between Chickerell village, Charlestown and Lanehouse residential areas. In

2018, the redevelopment of a former petrol station to form a small local centre with a Co-op food store and two takeaway restaurants has also been developed.

14.1.9. In recent years Chickerell has become well served by both independent small stores as well as larger food chains, and the neighbourhood plan does not identify a need for a further food-store. The local store within Chickerell village and Aldi are both located such that they would be accessible to future occupiers of the proposed development. In this regard, it would be difficult to argue that there is a high demand for a further store within the allocation. Compliance with policy is not dependant on a store being provided, this is only required where a need can be demonstrated. In this case, it is not considered that there would be an overriding need; therefore the proposal is not considered to conflict with this part of the policy.

14.1.10. Criteria (iii) anticipates that the development should be phased over at least a 10 year period. In this regard, implementation and construction of the development to the North of Chickerell has commenced, and while this application is for 328 dwellings on land to the east, full details are only being sought on phase A for 143 dwellings with detailed matters being reserved for phases B and C.

14.1.11. Regarding criteria (ii) (highway improvements), the submitted scheme shows new junctions with School Hill and Chickerell Link road, with a new estate central avenue between the two.

14.1.12. Criteria (iv) (masterplan), requires any application to be accompanied by a formerly agreed masterplan to ensure that a number of principles are met, as set out in the policy. The masterplan submitted was not formerly agreed as per the requirements of the policy, and does not include the portion of land at 20b School Hill, falling within separate ownership. The developer has however engaged with the Council, and shown engagement with the community prior to the submission of an application. Prior to the submission of amended plans, the developer has also engaged with the South West Design Review Panel and engaged in a number of Design Workshops with the Council ahead of submitting the latest masterplan. Further consideration will be given to the acceptability of the masterplan in the remainder of the report, but having regard to the principles set out in Policy CHIC2, the scheme includes a linking route suitable for a bus route, together with pedestrian and cycle links, the scheme is accompanied by a strategic landscape scheme, and includes connecting ecological corridors and a network of open space. The scheme is accompanied by a Drainage Strategy and makes provision for community infrastructure including a local play area and school. Depending on the acceptability of these features, the proposed development largely complies with part (iv) of the policy.

14.1.13. Not only is it important to ensure that masterplans are prepared in conjunction with the council and community to ensure that they respond positively to the needs of the local area, a further benefit of seeking a masterplan for each area is to avoid the development coming forward in a piecemeal manner, and in turn to secure a cohesive development. In this regard, it is regrettable that the masterplan does not incorporate land at 20b School Hill. The omission of land at 20b School Hill has resulted in key infrastructure having to be diverted outside of the allocated site, and without careful consideration at the detailed matters stage, has the potential to present a fragmented scheme. This matter nevertheless has to be weighed against the resulting harm of delaying a key allocated site coming forward. The land at 20b School Hill is a relatively small parcel of land in the wider scheme, and with careful consideration at the detailed matters stage, it is still possible to secure a cohesive development overall.

14.1.14. In light of the above, the principle of development within the allocated site area is established, subject to detailed consideration of the scheme. The proposed development however extends beyond the northern boundary of the allocated site

and outside of the defined development boundary into open countryside where Local Plan Policy SUS2 seeks to strictly control development. This area of land is also designated under Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Policy CNP10 as Land of Local Landscape Importance (LLLI), in recognition that the land comprises a locally valued landscape. Further to this, the southern extent of the site, the area linking the allocated site with the Chickerell Link Road, extends into a Wildlife Corridor, safeguarded by NP Policy CNP4.

14.1.15. Having regard to the above, policy SUS2 sets out a number of uses that may be permitted outside a defined development boundary, and this includes:

14.1.16. *'specific allocations in a development plan document and associated landscape and infrastructure requirements'.*

14.1.17. Since Policy CHIC2 requires the CHIC2 development to provide road connections to School Lane and Chickerell Link Road, the proposed road junctions and associated highway links that are outside the DDB can be considered to be compliant with this exception. The remaining area to the north, in the main, has been retained as public open space in recognition of its sensitive positioning and land designations. Nevertheless, the submitted plans do show a small amount of housing creeping onto land to the north of CHIC2, outside the DDB. This part of the proposal, be it limited, would be contrary to Policy SUS2.

14.1.18. With respect to the LLLI, which crosses the northern and eastern edges of this application, Policy CNP10 states:

14.1.19. *'The area on and below the ridgeline running east-west from Chickerell Hill (north of Courage Way) to Coldharbour (junction with Harbour Hill), as shown on Map 5 as Land of Local Landscape Importance, is a locally valued landscape that should be protected for the following qualities:*

- *long views to the Dorset AONB to the north;*
- *rural setting for Chickerell and Radipole villages and wider rural backdrop to north-west Weymouth;*
- *green wedge between Chickerell and Southill / Radipole; and*
- *part of the north-south wildlife corridor from Radipole Lake SSSI. .*

14.1.20. *Opportunities to enhance the landscape features, biodiversity and informal recreational use of this area will be supported. The impact of any development required for the successful delivery of the new road connecting the Chickerell Link Road with School Hill, should not result in significant damage to the landscape and wildlife corridors that cannot be successfully mitigated'.*

14.1.21. With respect to the Wildlife Corridor, which crosses the southern portion of this application, Policy CNP4 states:

14.1.22. *'The undeveloped Chickerell Wildlife E-W Corridor forms an important network of multifunctional green space capable of delivering a wide range of environmental benefits. Development that would significantly detract from this function will be resisted. The impact of any development required for the delivery of the new road connecting the Chickerell Link Road with School Hill (LP policy CHIC2) should not result in any significant adverse consequences which cannot be successfully mitigated'.*

14.1.23. Both Policies CNP4 and CNP10 recognise the need to deliver the new road as part of the CHIC2 development and state the need to avoid or mitigate significant harm to the Wildlife Corridor and LLLI, inferring some acceptance of infrastructure extending into these protected areas, subject to the harm.

14.1.24. As part of the examination of the Chickerell Town Neighbourhood Plan, the examiner gave careful consideration to whether the proposals in the draft neighbourhood plan would conflict with policies in the adopted local plan, and in

particular, on the successful delivery of development brought forward under the provisions of policy CHIC2.

14.1.25. The examiner was made aware of the current application, and the examiner's attention was brought to three historic masterplans for the areas dating from 2010, 2012 and 2015. To the south these all showed access being taken from Chickerell Link Road. To the north the access arrangements from School Hill varied, but they all showed housing extending further north than the CHIC2 allocation, similar to the current application.

14.1.26. Chickerell Town Council's response to the examiner (23 November 2020) also noted the planning application in question. With respect to any conflict between it and the proposed east-west Wildlife Corridor, the Town Council stated:

14.1.27. *"…CTC is satisfied that the Natural England has been involved in discussions regarding the potential mitigation for both wildlife corridors. …The policy [CNP4] is not intended to frustrate the delivery of this much needed link (which would otherwise increase traffic issues on local roads), but to ensure that its design would ensure it has minimum impact…"*

14.1.28. With respect to any conflict with the LLLI, the Town Council stated:

14.1.29. *"The policy (CNP10) has been drafted in a manner that was meant to provide some leeway if such an encroachment is shown to not impact on that landscape's qualities (i.e. the long views to the Dorset AONB to the north; the rural setting for Chickerell and Radipole villages and wider rural backdrop to north-west Weymouth; the green wedge between Chickerell and Southill / Radipole; and the north-south wildlife corridor from Radipole Lake SSSI). Whilst further study of the planning application is needed, it is considered that the policy should reinforce the need to consider whether suitable landscaping, reduced building heights and minimising light spillage for the qualities for which the LLLI is valued will be sufficient so as to ensure that this valued landscape would not be unduly compromised by such an encroachment".*

14.1.30. The above correspondence between Chickerell Town Council and the neighbourhood plan examiner, suggests that Chickerell Town Council are confident that their designations are not intended to frustrate development coming forward, but rather to ensure that negative impacts are minimised and mitigated through careful design.

14.1.31. In response to the above policy constraints on land to the north, the agent has sought to retain much of the land as open space, seeking to respond to the undeveloped character of the site and respect its value as Land of Local Landscape Importance. Very few dwellings extend into the southern extent of the designated land, beyond the development boundary, and these are provided at a lower density to much of the rest of the site.

14.1.32. Where the units extend beyond the development boundary, there is clearly a policy conflict, and consideration will need to be given in the remainder of the report in terms of the impacts of development on the designated land. In terms of the principle of development, clearly land east of Chickerell is considered to be a sustainable location for new housing, hence the allocation of the remainder of the site within the Local Plan. The site is located on the edge of Chickerell and has good access to the main village via existing footways. Chickerell is regarded as one of the larger settlements within the District with a wide choice of facilities including a shop, village hall, library, chemist, hairdressers, Church, primary school, two public houses and a regular bus service. The site itself is not isolated being adjacent to the existing built-up area of the village, therefore making access to the facilities identified above possible by foot. The development would make a positive contribution to the local economy during construction and would support existing businesses within Chickerell, which are accessible from the site, and would contribute to the vitality

and viability of the village and its facilities. In order to be considered sustainable development, the environmental impacts of the proposal also need to be considered alongside the economic and social aspects of sustainability. These are considered in more detail in the remainder of the report.

14.1.33. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

14.1.34. In the context of the NPPF, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision making, this means approving development proposals that accord with up-to-date development plans, without delay. The Council has published its five year housing land supply figures, which confirms that the Council are unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply (the deliverable housing land supply (DHLS) being 2.53 years).

14.1.35. In light of this, the policies for the delivery of housing are consequently considered out of date and as the Neighbourhood Plan does not include housing allocations and is more than 5 years old, in accordance with para 14 of the NPPF, it does not prevent the tilted balance from applying. As such, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies, as set out at para 11 of the NPPF.

14.1.36. Notwithstanding this, it is relevant that work on the West Dorset Weymouth and Portland Local Plan in 2018, and now the Dorset Council Local Plan, which has culminated in the publication of the Options Consultation in Jan 2021, shows policies SUS2 and CHIC2 renamed DEV7 and CHIC1 respectively, but retained with only minor differences, indicating that the Council continue to consider the policies to be up-to-date. A further Options Consultation in Aug 2025, continues to identify the allocated site East of Chickerell as an opportunity site for housing. The Council's published DHLS includes a contribution of 280 dwellings from the Chickerell Urban Extension East site.

14.1.37. Nonetheless, having regard to the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as per para 11(d) of the NPPF, the overarching aim of Para 11 is to support sustainable development. As such it is important to consider what would constitute sustainable development. Para 8 of the NPPF states that '*achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways'*. These objectives relate to economic, social and environmental considerations. In this case, the proposed development would during its construction have a positive economic impact, and owing to the site's location on the edge of an existing settlement future occupiers could contribute to the viability and prosperity of the town. Having regard to the social dimension of sustainable development the proposal has the potential to reduce the current shortfall in housing, contribute to the provision of affordable housing, and is sited on the edge of a town where occupants would contribute to the vitality of the area. Furthermore, given its location on the edge of an existing settlement, facilities are in reach of future residents and reliance on the car is reduced. In terms of environmental impacts, the site is well located where opportunities for active travel are possible reducing the reliance on the car. Further consideration is given within the report to the environmental impacts of the development. Subject to these impacts, having regard to para 11, the proposed scheme could subsequently be considered to comprise sustainable development. As such, the tilted balance as set out in para 11 of the NPPF is considered to apply. For decision making this means granting planning permission unless that would conflict with specific policies of the framework which indicate that development should be restricted (as set out at para 11(d)(i) of the NPPF), or where doing so would lead to significant and demonstrable harm that outweighs the benefits of the scheme (as set out at para 11(d)(ii) of the NPPF).

14.1.38. When considering impacts of the development, it is important to note that as per para 12 of the NPPF, *"the presumption in favour of sustainable development does*

not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision-making". As such policies within the adopted Local Plan unrelated to housing provision, including its environmental policies, can still be given weight in the decision making process.

14.1.39. Policy SG1 (Minerals Safeguarding Area)

14.1.40. Policy SG1 - Mineral Safeguarding Area sets out that the Mineral Planning Authority will resist proposals for non-mineral development within the Mineral Safeguarding Area, as shown on the Policies Map, unless it can be demonstrated that the sterilisation of proven mineral resources will not occur as a result of the development, and that the development would not pose a serious hindrance to future mineral development in the vicinity. Where this cannot be demonstrated, and where there is a clear and demonstrable need for the non-minerals development, prior extraction will be sought where practicable and where it would not leave the site incapable of non-mineral use.

14.1.41. The impact on the delivery of housing and the demand/supply of the material forms a material planning consideration. In this case, the minerals safeguarding area relates to the northern portion of the site (all land north of the watercourse), and the area is safeguarded for building stone. However, having regard to the relatively low levels of demand for this stone together with the unreasonable delay that would occur to the delivery of the development as a consequence of prior extraction of the building stone, and then backfilling/compacting the void in advance of the proposed built development, it is not considered that it would be reasonable to resist the development for this reason alone, with the benefits of the proposal outweighing the impacts relating to the sterilising of the minerals below the site.

14.2. Public Benefits

14.2.1. The proposals would provide a number of financial and non-financial benefits, including public benefits. These are summarised in the table below:

What	Amount / value	Weight to be attributed
Material Planning Considerations		
Affordable housing	35% on site provision equating to approx. 115 affordable dwellings	This should be attributed **substantial** weight in the planning balance in light of no demonstrable 5 year housing land supply.
Open Market Housing	Approx. 213 open market dwellings	This should be attributed **substantial** weight in the planning balance in light of no demonstrable 5 year housing land supply.
Quantum of green space	In excess of 5.3ha of green space	This should be attributed **significant** weight in the planning balance.
Play Areas	The proposed development will bring forward 0.28ha of play space, which shall include two LAP's, a LEAP and informal	This should be attributed **significant** weight in the planning balance.

	play space. To address the shortfall in provision, a financial contribution will be secured towards enhancing facilities at Willowbed Hall and/or provide a skate park within the town.	
Contribution to health care	£722 per dwelling, equating to £236,816, in accordance with the Developer Contributions for NHS Infrastructure report.	**Neutral** weight is given as this contribution addresses the impacts of the development.
Education contribution	Land to be provided for an 2FE primary school, together with a contribution of £1,736.06 per qualifying dwelling (less land value discount of £482,000), plus a contribution towards SEND provision of £1,487.62 per qualifying dwelling, in accordance with DfE 2023 Guidance.	The provision of land for a 2FE primary school is a benefit that should be given **substantial** weight in the planning balance.
Promotion of a bus link and cycling	Provision of a route suitable for a bus, together with £81,675.76 towards bus infrastructure and travel cards This includes: • A total of 4 bus stopes (provided both sides of the road in two locations); • A shelter at the stops closest to the school, and a pole at the phase A stops. These will be fitted with real time technology. • A Sustainable Travel Voucher up to the value of £139 per dwelling, either to be used towards 2 adult bus cards per dwelling or towards cycle equipment. • Updating Walking and Cycling map.	This should be given **significant** weight in the planning balance, in the interests of supporting active travel
Chesil & the Fleet Mitigation	£524.72 per dwelling; £357.77 per flat, in accordance with the Interim Strategy.	**Neutral** weight is given as this contribution addresses the impacts of the development.

Upgrading of footpath links	£7,400 towards the upgrading of footpath S16/23, and £3,900 towards the upgrading of footpath S16/21	This should be given **significant** weight in the planning balance in the interests of increasing pedestrian links both with the existing settlement and wider area, improving connections with Weymouth Town Centre.
Sporting facilities	Contributions of £106,413 towards the upgrading of Weymouth swimming pool, and £22,524 towards upgrading sports pitches and training facilities.	While this contribution addresses the impacts of the development, it facilitates improved facilities within the area which is considered a benefit to which **significant** weight should be given.
Non-Material Planning Considerations		
CIL Contributions	Zero rated	No weight
New Homes Bonus		No weight
Council Tax		No weight

14.3. Environmental Implications

14.3.1. The proposed development would give rise to additional CO2 emissions through the construction process, from both the transportation and delivery of materials, site construction workers and the operation of machinery on site, as well as from the activities of future residents post construction.

14.3.2. In order to reduce the environmental impacts of the development the houses would be designed to Part L standards of the Building Regulations requiring high levels of insulation, energy efficient heating systems, natural ventilation and all white goods offered with an energy rating of A+.

14.3.3. In response to the Net Zero, Energy Efficiency and Future Homes Standards, and the Government's 2050 Net Zero targets the submission recognises that homes proposed as part of this scheme will be required to meet these arrangements and will be built with additional thermal energy to the fabric of the building including the roof, walls, floors and windows. Homes will also have increased air tightness and System 3 ventilation.

14.3.4. The Future Homes Standard seeks all new build homes to be future proofed with low carbon heating and world leading levels of efficiency. It will incorporate additional energy saving elements including, for example, replacing gas boilers with electric heating via air source heat pumps, provision of solar panels, advanced glazing and increased building fabric efficiencies. Persimmon is currently developing its Future Home Standard specification to incorporate these elements. With the exception of those properties fronting the central avenue, the majority of the properties would be south facing, or have a south facing roof slope, suitable to support any future solar energy provision.

14.3.5. In line with new Building Regulations Part S, and para 117(e) of the NPPF, all homes with on plot parking will be served with an EV charge point. Under the current scheme no charging points are proposed to be available for public use. Whilst this is regrettable, the challenges associated with adopting EV charging points within the public highway are complex, and until policy is in place to support such provision, it is challenging for developers to provide them in such locations. Nevertheless, the majority of units would have direct access to EV charging points.

14.3.6. Each dwellinghouse would have access to a garden, accessible by a garden gate, and for those without a garage would be provided with a bike storage shed to support cycling as a sustainable means of travel. This is also true for the apartments, which would be provided with bike storage facilities in an accessible location for occupiers. The site itself is well located to facilities such that it is considered a sustainable location for housing and the scheme itself incorporates pedestrian and cycle links together with a route suitable for a bus, promoting use of sustainable modes of transport. Contributions to support the uptake of any future bus service is also to be secured through S106.

14.3.7. The above considerations are supported by Local Plan Policy COM11, ENV13 and Neighbourhood Plan CNP11.

14.3.8. Having regard to the Sustainability Statement and Checklist for Planning Applications Interim Guidance Note Consultation document (April 2023), given the above energy considerations, it is considered that the application broadly complies with the key objectives through reducing energy consumption and carbon emissions through its design and construction.

14.4. Environmental Statement

14.4.1. The submitted Environmental Statement (ES) comprises a series of reports, appendices and figures which shall be referred to where relevant to support considerations relating to the impacts of the proposal on the environment. It is considered that the ES adequately address' the environmental impacts of the development on the site.

14.5. Highways - access, movement and links, parking provision, and highway safety

14.5.1. Local Plan Policy COM7 and COM9 seek to ensure appropriate parking provision, safe efficient routes and priority to pedestrians. This is supported by para 109-117 of the NPPF which seeks schemes to prioritise pedestrian movement. Inclusive Mobility Guidance provides guidance to ensure that the design of places meets the needs of all abilities.

14.5.2. <u>Highways: Impact on local road network</u>

14.5.3. Critical to the successful delivery of the development is the establishment of an access point and connecting road off Chickerell Link Road and School Hill. Not only is this a policy requirement (LP policy CHIC2), but due to capacity issues at the Glennie Way junction, its establishment at an early stage is pivotal in order to avoid significant impacts resulting from the development on the free flow of traffic within the settlement. As a result, full details are provided for the linking road, and it would be necessary to secure its delivery ahead of more than 100 dwellings being occupied on the site to avoid a negative knock on effect at the Glennie Way junction. This is proposed to be secured through a S106 legal agreement, in line with the advice of the Highway Authority.

14.5.4. Chapter 9 (Transport) of the ES considers highway related impacts resulting from the proposal and incorporates an updated Transport Assessment following updated traffic surveys on critical road links and junctions. The assessment has used baseline traffic conditions and, allowing for committed development, has compared the predicted traffic flows when the development is completed. The junction capacity

modelling demonstrates that the highway network would operate within operational capacity in all forecast traffic scenarios. The ES concludes that any residual negative effects resulting from the proposed development would be negligible whilst there would be positive effects on pedestrians and cyclists through new infrastructure which forms part of the proposed development. Overall, the proposed development is not predicted to result in a significant increase in vehicular trips over the morning and evening peak periods. The Highway Authority considers that the submitted Transport Assessment is satisfactory and robust and that the residual cumulative impact of the development cannot be thought to be "severe" when consideration is given to paragraphs 115 and 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

14.5.5. Highways: Access to the development site

14.5.6. It has not been possible to secure an access onto School Hill from within the allocated site as a result of landownership issues forcing the linking road to extend outside of the allocated area on land to the north, designated as Land of Local Landscape Importance (LLLI). Though it would have been preferable to secure this important link with School Hill without extending outside of the site allocation, the policies safeguarding this land do not exclude the necessary infrastructure required to support the CHIC2 development, and its connection with School Hill would rather sensibly sit adjacent, in a staggered position, to the School Hill access into the newly developed land forming the northern part of the CHIC2 allocation (Dunster Rise). This junction would be in the form of a simple priority junction. Further consideration is given in the remainder of the report in terms of the landscape impacts associated with this solution, and the policy implications are explored in more detail above. From a highways and master-planning perspective, the sighting of the access onto School Hill is certainly not illogical and would provide the important link required to ensure the development of the allocation as a whole is deliverable. It would also provide a vehicular access into the remaining undeveloped part of the allocated site at land at 20B School Hill. The Highway Authority have been consulted and raise no objection in respect of the location of the access. In terms of its detailed design, additional information has been sought in the form of swept path analysis, and amendment has been sought to provide for cyclists heading from the west (Dunster Rise) east into the site. The Highway Authority are content that these matters could be addressed by way of a condition.

14.5.7. The southern access, which would form the primary access to the site, would adjoin the Chickerell link road (Hampshire Road) in the form of a signalled junction, with a dedicated right turn lane for cars approaching from the east. This would encapsulate upgrades to the existing signal controlled junction onto Hampshire Road, to form a staggered signal controlled crossroads with an additional arm serving the new development. Following advice from Dorset Highways and the Sustainable Transport Team, the junction has been designed as a single phased crossing giving priority to pedestrians and cyclists travelling in a north south direction. The Highways Authority have reviewed the details and consider the junction design to be acceptable in planning terms.

14.5.8. Highways: Movement and connectivity - Central Avenue

14.5.9. Connecting the two accesses is a central avenue shown extending the length of the development north to south. This would extend through the southern wildlife corridor, designated under NP policy CNP4 and the LLLI to the north, designated by NP policy CNP10. As discussed above, these policies specifically note that the development of the connecting link road should not result in any significant adverse impacts which cannot be successfully mitigated, but do not in principle restrict the delivery of the access' and connecting route. The policy basis is considered in more

detail above, with more detailed consideration of the landscape and ecological impacts considered later in the report.

14.5.10. The central avenue would be designed to have a width of 6.7m to cater for a bus route (though the true width shown on the plans seems to fluctuate between approx. 6.7m and 7.3m) and separated by a 2m verge to offer separation between traffic and pedestrians/cyclists, a 3m segregated cycle route and 2m segregated footpath would extend along its length, with the exception of its most northern portion. The surfacing of the roads and pavements would on the whole reflect a typical black bituminous material. Block paved raised tables and, in some places, narrowing to approx. 5.4m at junctions and crossing points are designed to slow traffic down while offering priority to pedestrians and interest at key intersections.

14.5.11. The Highway Authority note that the design of the side road crossings requires further refinement to reflect best practice and advice contained within LTN 1/20 ensuring priority is given to pedestrians and cyclists crossing the side roads. The Highway Authority advise that this could be achieved by adopting Copenhagen style crossings or dropped kerb access (as opposed to raised tables) and that the precise design of these highway features could be secured at condition stage to ensure compliance with best practice. They also note that their placement does not always respond to desire lines, and this should also be reviewed at condition stage.

14.5.12. <u>Highways: Movement and Connectivity - Pedestrians</u>

14.5.13. A particular challenge has been finding opportunities to improve the connectivity of the development with the rest of Chickerell, specifically ensuring future occupiers can access key facilities within the heart of Chickerell, and in turn, ensuring connectivity between existing residents and the proposed development, including the proposed school. Inhibiting this, is a series of ransom strips along the development's boundaries. Consequently, the only vehicular access between the development and Chickerell is via the School Hill access to the north of the site. Pedestrian links have been included where rights of way and/or boundaries allow, and the developer has agreed a commuted sum to support the upgrading of existing rights of way leading into the site both from the east and west. Otherwise, opportunities are unfortunately limited to the detriment of the wider allocation. That said, the development is not devoid of pedestrian links into Chickerell, and the development has been designed to maximise any future opportunities to improve links should the restrictions be overcome in the future, presenting opportunities to create a far more permeable and inclusive development. Seeking connectivity between urban extensions with existing settlements is not an uncommon challenge, and owing to the connecting routes shown, the application cannot be considered to be segregated such that this would be reason to refuse permission on this allocated site.

14.5.14. Aiding connectivity has been the presence of several footpaths which traverse the site. This includes footpaths S16/21 comprising a narrow footway leading into the site from School Hill. Despite being constrained by housing either side and poor surfacing, this is an important link in terms of offering pedestrian access to the heart of Chickerell and its facilities, including the East Street bus stop, playing field, and village centre beyond; and vice versa, from the existing built form, to the school and facilities of the development. The developer has agreed to contribute to the upgrading of this footpath, including its resurfacing where it extends between east Street and the development site, which is considered essential to assist permeability. This path links with footpath S16/22, linking Lower Putton Lane, and provides access across the site to land to the east, extending north of the electrical transmitting station. Footpath S16/23 extends from Lower Putton Lane to the East, south of the electrical transmitting station and north of the golf centre. This also provides an important link towards Southill and beyond. In recognition of the need to

improve links with the rest of Weymouth, a commitment set out in LP policy CHIC2, the developer has agreed to the upgrading of this footpath also, between the development site and its intersection with the unnamed road to the east (providing access to the electricity substation). Further consideration is given within para 14.8.46 of the report to the effects of the development on public rights of way, including rights of way traversing the site and their proposed diversion.

14.5.15. Highways: Movement and Connectivity - Cycle Provision

14.5.16. The linking central avenue has been designed to deliver pedestrian and cycle links, improving access to Granby Industrial Estate, wider Chickerell, and Weymouth town centre. In this regard the proposed cycle route would connect to the established Wessex Route cycleway which connects with the Granby Industrial Estate and provides connectivity between Chickerell and Weymouth town centre via National cycle route 26, which also extends to Dorchester. In close proximity is also the Marsh cycleway connected via the Putton Lane marked cycle route which provides connectivity to Charlestown, including Budmouth Academy, Weymouth Swimming Pool and Weymouth town centre. While minor improvements are recommended to the detailed design it is considered that the development would successfully connect to the existing cycle network and provide good connectivity.

14.5.17. Within the development site, the cycle route is provided in the form of a 3m segregated cycle route, set behind a verge and running adjacent to the central avenue for most of its length. At its most northern part the cycle route extends in the form of a 3m shared cycle/pedestrian route that deviates from the road, with the central avenue offering an alternative cycle option for those preferring to cycle on the road. Attempts to incorporate priority crossings for cyclists at junction crossings dictated by a change in surfacing/colour and levels (provided as a raised table) has been made. The Highway Authority advise that these junctions, as well as the provision for cyclists at the site's northern junction with School Hill, would require amendment to better cater for cyclists, but this could be dealt with by condition, with the principle accepted. Revised plans (submitted Jun 2026) seek to address matters relating to the northern access and the Highway Authority have confirmed that the revised cycle provision at the School Hill junction would, subject to detail, be acceptable.

14.5.18. It is considered that the provision of the north-south cycle route complies with the principles of Local Transport Note (LTN) 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design guidance, with segregated provision for cyclists provided in the main (in line with best practice), and where there is shared provision, an alternative route available to offer a choice of routes while maintaining suitable connectivity. Regard has been had to recommended widths as set out in the guidance, together with design principles, and consideration has been given to the population size, likely desire lines, and likely range of users when considering cycle provision within the development. In this regard the north-south cycle link provides good overall connectivity and a safe route to school.

14.5.19. A misgiving with the proposal (Mar 2026) is the lack of a dedicated east-west cycle route linking the development with Putton Lane. Officers are advised that this is due to difficulty with steep levels in this part of the site and the link being 'pinched' between two basins. This is nonetheless a missed opportunity to provide important cycle links between the development and its facilities, namely the school and children's play, and the rest of Chickerell and its facilities. While the Highway Authority have raised no objection having regard to this point, the lack of cycle connectivity east-west weighs against the proposal. However, since raising these concerns, revised plans together with a revised drainage strategy have been submitted (Jun 2026). These plans show the repurposing of the open area east of Lower Putton Lane, and the removal of the basins. Consequently, there is greater

opportunity to incorporate an east-west cycle route, and while the plans have not been updated to include this, the developer is agreeable to providing a cycle route in this location and it is considered that this should form a condition of the consent.

14.5.20. In light of the above, and subject to conditions relating to final design of cycle provision, junction design to ensure priority to pedestrians and cyclists, and the incorporation of an east-west cycle route linking with Lower Putton Lane, the development is considered to be well served by pedestrian and cycle routes and would present a permeable and accessible environment. To enhance use of the site by pedestrians and cyclists, in line with para 111(d) and 117(a) of the NPPF, developer contributions would facilitate updating the interactive Weymouth & Portland Walking and Cycling Map to include the new development so that it can be utilised as part of the active travel plan for the area. Further, each household would be eligible for a sustainable travel voucher that could either be put towards bus tickets or cycle equipment in the interests of supportive active travel at the site.

14.5.21. In addition, each dwellinghouse would have access to a garden and, for those without a garage, would be provided with a bike storage shed to support cycling as a sustainable means of travel. Bike storage is also provided in an accessible location for occupiers of the apartments, in line with para 111(d) of the NPPF. The Design and Access Statement indicates further cycle parking at the two areas identified for play. These facilities are not indicated on the submitted plans, but could form a condition of any consent.

14.5.22. <u>Highways - Movement and Connectivity - Public Transport</u>

14.5.23. Having regard to bus provision, Chickerell is currently served by the No.8 bus route, which runs to the West of the development, and would be accessible to future occupiers via Putton Lane and/or a connecting pedestrian route, proposed to be upgraded as part of the development. The no.8 bus route provides connectivity between Chickerell and Weymouth Town Centre by public transport.

14.5.24. The linking central avenue has been designed to address the policy requirement to be suitable to serve a bus route (with a minimum width of 6.7m) with the provision of 4 bus stops (2 serving northbound buses and 2 serving southbound busses) within the development. No details have been provided to confirm the precise placement of these stops or the design of the stops, despite previous requests for this information. It is expected that two would be provided with a bus shelter, and the other two would be served by a pole; both would have real time technology. The provision of this infrastructure would be secured via a S106 legal agreement, and further detail in respect of their placement and design would be required prior to installation, which could form a condition of the consent.

14.5.25. Following consultation, detailed consideration has been given to the need for a contribution towards First Bus, to enable the introduction of an additional bus into the service to support the extension of the No.8 bus route to include the new development. Having regard to the sum requested by First bus as part of the first round of consultations, of approximately £600,000, consideration has been given to whether such a contribution would be necessary to make the development acceptable, would be directly related to the development, and would be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development, bearing in mind that policy CHIC2 seeks only to provide a route which is suitable for a bus, and the particular bus operative is not a matter to be determined by the planning system.

14.5.26. Consideration has been given to the harm, and the significance of that harm in the context of a climate emergency, in the event that a bus route is not established within the development. The greatest harm would be to the future occupiers of those units positioned furthest away from an existing bus stop on the outer periphery of the proposed development, where units fall outside of the recommended walking

distance to the existing bus route running along Glennie Way/Putton Lane. The harm is noteworthy owing to both the impact on accessibility, but also the environmental implications.

14.5.27. To better assess the impact, the harm has to be considered in the context of the wider scheme, which, in line with para 109 (e) and 117 (d) of the NPPF focusses on making provision to support walking and cycling. Para 117 (a) seeks schemes to prioritise pedestrian and cycle movement, ahead of seeking to facilitate public transport, with layouts designed, so far as possible, to maximise the catchment area for bus and other transport services. In this regard the proposal as submitted, subject to revisions to ensure routes respond to desire lines, does give priority to pedestrians over other sustainable transport modes, with cycle movement also supported in the scheme. It is regrettable that as a consequence of ransom strips the pedestrian links are not as extensive as hoped and an east-west cycle route has not been secured, but otherwise, the rest of the development would be connected by footways and cycleways to support walking and cycling. In turn, the layout maximises the catchment area for buses by having a portion of the houses within 400 metres of the existing bus route and by ensuring the development is designed to accommodate a bus in the future, with facilities, including bus stops and shelters to support its use as a bus route, agreed to be provided. The proposed development in turn satisfies the requirement of Policy CHIC2 by providing a road suitable for a bus route, facilitating the provision of a bus, if not now, in the future.

14.5.28. The impact of a proportion of the development being outside of the recommended walking distance to a bus stop, when weighed against the other provisions within the scheme to encourage walking, cycling and electric car charging is not considered to be significant to warrant refusal of the application. Owing to the site's location on the edge of an existing settlement with facilities, and the above provisions within the scheme, the development would comprise sustainable development. The provision of a route suitable to accommodate a bus route through the development is considered satisfactory in this case to meet the policy requirements, making provision for a bus route now, or in the future.

14.5.29. In light of the above, the requested contribution by First Bus to cover the purchasing of an additional bus is not considered to meet the NPPF tests. However, in line with para 117 (e) of the NPPF, which seeks appropriate facilities to encourage public transport use, it is considered reasonable that a scheme be developed to support the establishment of a bus route, as advocated by local policy. In this regard, the developer is agreeable to funding a sustainable travel voucher which could be put towards funding a 30 day bus card scheme for future occupiers to encourage the establishment and use of any future bus service. This has been agreed in line with advice by Dorset Travel and the Highways Authority, including the Sustainable Transport Team and is included within the submitted Travel Plan.

14.5.30. The Highways Authority consider the submitted Travel Plan to be acceptable. This includes more detailed monitoring of the Travel Plan.

14.5.31. <u>Highways: Movement and Connectivity - Internal layout</u>

14.5.32. The layout of the wider development site is influenced by a wide range of factors, including the provision of the central avenue, consideration of rights of way, and establishment of key connections and desire lines. Highway related matters, ecological buffers/corridors, landscape and urban design factors, and topography have all played a part in shaping the development. More detailed consideration of non-highway related matters will be given in the remainder of the report.

14.5.33. Focussing on the highway related matters, and turning to the detailed layout of phase A, housing is shown accessed off the central avenue via secondary roads, and in some cases smaller tertiary roads. These three street typologies are identified

within the Design Statement as the ‘central avenue’, ‘traditional streets’, and ‘garden edge drives’. The central avenue is described at para 14.5.8 (above). Formal tree planting is shown incorporated within the road verges either side. The secondary roads, referred to as ‘traditional streets’ would be served by a 2m footway and would in some places include a 2m verge. They would continue to be surfaced in black bituminous material, except for where priority junctions are delineated by a change in surface material and colour. Some tree planting is proposed within verges, and within front/side gardens and between parking where space allows. ‘Garden edge drives’ reflect a tertiary status, more reflective of a private drive. A change in surfacing material/colour of the highway is proposed to delineate a change in character and priority within these streets. These are small intimate roads with no footway, constructed of bound material to reflect a shared surface and less formal space, to serve a small number of dwellings, generally between 5 and 6 residential units.

14.5.34. Parking is provided in a mix of formats including on-plot parking, parking courts, and some on street visitor parking. Where provided on-plot, these would have EV charging points in line with para 117(e) of the NPPF. Providing sufficient parking and having car parking spaces conveniently located to the front door avoids unsociable parking elsewhere. All units would have access to a parking space, 1 space would be allocated to serve 1 bed units, 2 spaces would be allocated for 2 and 3 bed units, and 3 spaces for 4 bed units, together with on-street visitor spaces. In phase A the resulting number of visitor spaces would be 29 (a further 8 visitor spaces are proposed along the central avenue adjacent to phase B, which will be factored in at the reserved matters stage for that phase). This meets the recommended number of visitor spaces required by the Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset Residential Guidelines. The Guidelines recommend, in addition to visitor parking, a number of unallocated parking spaces should be provided, 19 in total. While no additional unallocated parking is proposed, the number of allocated parking spaces provided exceeds that set out within the Guidelines, and overall, the Highway Authority consider that a suitable level of parking is shown, in accordance with the Authority’s guidance and which meets the operational needs of the development. Parking for the school will be considered at the reserved matters stage and is expected to be provided on site.

14.5.35. The Highway Authority consider most of the internal estate roads to meet the requirements of the Council’s ‘Adopted Highways’ policy, and it is accepted that several low order roads and/or footpaths, would not be offered up for adoption. Subject to a few minor amendments that could be dealt with by condition, mainly relating to the provision of footways, particularly across junctions and revision to the cycle way at the northern access (now addressed by the Jun 2026 plans), the Highway Authority raise no objection.

14.5.36. While the parking strategy is effective, and from a highway safety aspect, save for a few minor points raised by the Highway Authority, would be acceptable; the proposed arrangement of parking courtyards presents a number of urban design issues, as do the arrangement and position of on-plot parking. The Crime Prevention Officer likewise makes recommendations regarding parking. As this has not been raised as a highway safety issue, this will be explored further in the Layout/Design section of the report.

14.5.37. <u>Highways: Service Accessibility</u>

14.5.38. The Refuse and Waste Strategy has been developed in line with Dorset Council’s Guidance Notes for Residential Developments on waste storage, collection and management (2022). Gated access has been provided to rear gardens of dwellinghouses, providing space for the storage of bins away from the street frontage. Apartments are served by communal bin stores, accessed via private

parking courts. Details of tracking for the bin lorries has been provided indicating access and turning, and details of bin drag distances has also been provided. The number of cul-de-sac/dead end turnings have also been reduced to improve connectivity, in line with the Guidelines. No objection has been raised by the Dorset Waste Team, and the scheme is considered to take on board the recommendations contained within the Guidance note.

14.5.39. Access for Emergency vehicles including Fire Service vehicles would be provided to within 45m of the entrance of all one and two-storey premises and to within 36m of the entrance of the apartment blocks.

14.5.40. The swept path analysis carried out is suitable to demonstrate that refuse vehicles and fire tenders can access and manoeuvre within the proposed site.

14.5.41. Highways: Construction

14.5.42. The applicant has suggested that the development will take approximately 6 years to complete. The initial construction access would be from the proposed access off School Hill. Following construction of the 100th dwelling, the construction access would then be wholly from the Chickerell Link Road access, requiring the upgraded signals to be provided to facilitate safe use by construction traffic. The Highway Authority advise that a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CEMP) should be secured to address impacts from construction traffic on the local highway network, and this can be secured by condition.

14.5.43. Highways: Highway Drainage

14.5.44. A number of queries have been raised by the Highway Authority in respect of highway drainage. This relates specifically to the proposed changes to the highway drainage basins to the south of the site, currently serving the B3157 (Hampshire Road). Owing to the meandering route of the central avenue between two balancing ponds there has previously been a highway safety concern that if water is not appropriately managed and flooding were to occur at the site entrance, southbound traffic could be affected. On this basis, the Highway Authority have previously recommended refusal.

14.5.45. Additional detail has since been provided regarding the capacity of the resulting basins, providing assurance regarding their ability to effectively manage surface water and avoid potential flooding of the central avenue, addressing the above highway safety concern. In light of the additional information submitted, the Highway Authority have removed their objection and advise that the proposed works to the drainage basins would be acceptable, subject to conditions agreeing the methodology for undertaking these works to ensure appropriate provision for surface water is retained throughout the duration of any works. It is thus recommended that a condition requiring the submission of methodology for pond reconfiguration and works to be carried out in accordance with approved plans should be attached in the granting of any consent.

14.5.46. Highways: Conclusion

14.5.47. Overall, from a highway perspective, the development is considered to respond appropriately to the development brief set out under bullet point 1 of the policy (LP policy CHI2) which states the following:

14.5.48. *‘the development will be focused around a traditional street with frontage development connecting from the Chickerell Link Road to School Hill, and from School Hill to Chickerell Hill. The street should be able to accommodate a bus route. The development should also provide improved pedestrian /cycle links to Weymouth Town Centre and surrounding area’.*

14.5.49. The Highway Authority have considered the application and consider the proposed works to be acceptable having regard to highway safety, and raise no objection

subject to minor revisions which can be secured through condition. In light of the above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable having regard to the provisions set out in Local Plan Policy COM7 (Creating a safe & efficient transport network) and COM9 (Parking Provision).

14.6. Design and Layout - having regard to scale, design, impact on character and appearance

14.6.1. Design and Layout: Proposal

14.6.2. Phase A is located within the upper portion of the site and relates to the provision of 143 dwellings. Phase B relates to development to the south, situated either side of the central avenue. Phase C relates to development to the east of the site, adjacent to Phase A. Phase B and C are intended to collectively provide 185 dwellings. Areas are provided along the eastern periphery of the site and south of Phase A to accommodate drainage facilities, an area of play and some green space. Another area of open space is provided to the north of phase A, and to the west of the site adjacent to Mariners Way, which is intended to provide further play. Land is set aside for provision of a school located within the middle part of the site, to the west of the central avenue.

14.6.3. The overall layout of the site seeks to broadly deliver the objectives set out in LP policy CHIC2 , but to fully assess whether these ambitions are successfully achieved, detailed consideration is required having regard to adopted policy and National guidance on design. To best set out considerations on this hybrid application, consideration will be given to the outline and detailed elements separately.

14.6.4. Design and Layout: Detailed Phase A

14.6.5. The NPPF is unambiguous in its stance on the importance of design, and this is clearly set out in Para 131:

14.6.6. '*The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities*.'

14.6.7. Para 139 clearly stating that '*development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design'*.

14.6.8. The test for development proposals is therefore not whether they avoid bad design, but that they are achieving good design as contained in the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code as well as relevant local and neighbourhood plan policies.

14.6.9. NP policy CNP11 sets out a number of expectations having regard to general design principles. It expects that development should enhance the local landscape character, and demonstrate high quality of design, including details and materials that are sympathetic to the character of the area. This is in line with the expectations within the National Design Guide. In particular, the policy sets out that regard should be given to providing cottage-style properties within the housing mix, with clusters of cottages positioned around informal greens and drives, using a mix of materials, including use of local stone.

14.6.10. To ensure the development achieves this, advice has been provided by Officers, including the Council's Urban Design Officer, and the developer has also put the development before a Design Review Panel, both in 2021 and again in 2025.

14.6.11. Design and Layout: Detailed phase A – Layout, access and movement

14.6.12. Phase A relates to development to the west of the central avenue, with secondary and tertiary streets leading off, a cycle route running north-south, and pedestrian routes running east-west as well as north-south through the development, including an off-road pedestrian route running along the western boundary. Areas of open space, which seeks to accommodate drainage basins, space for play and footways is incorporated within phase A.

14.6.13. The National Design Guide provides advice on the various characteristics (there are ten in total) that help influence and establish the character of well designed places. A key characteristic, amongst others, identified within the National Design Guide that influences character is 'movement' having regard to ensuring developments are accessible and easy to move around. The National Design Guide provides the following advice:

14.6.14. '*A well-designed movement network defines a clear pattern of streets that: are safe and accessible for all, function efficiently to get everyone around, takes account of the diverse needs of all its potential users and provides a genuine choice of sustainable transport modes by limiting the impacts of car use by prioritising and encouraging walking, cycling and public transport, mitigating impacts and identifying opportunities to improve air quality; promotes activity and social interaction, contributing to health, well-being, accessibility and inclusion; and incorporates green infrastructure, including street trees to soften the impact of car parking, help improve air quality and contribute to biodiversity'*.

14.6.15. The submitted layout (Mar 2026) seeks to respond to Officer advice and comments from Design South West. Both in their 2021 and 2025 comments Design South West raised concern that the overall layout was heavily influenced by the linear vehicular linking street running north-south, and failed to respond appropriately to, and take opportunity to enhance, the walkable and cyclable east-west connections to the historic village centre. The panel recommended that emphasising and embracing these connections could offer opportunities to provide important nodal points within the development which could improve legibility and define the heart or centre of the new neighbourhood from which activities can radiate off. It was also advised that greater connections within internal roads could be made to avoid turning heads.

14.6.16. In terms of the linking road, advice by Design South West, and supported by Officers, has been to better integrate the central avenue within the development using junctions and/or flat tables to assist in slowing traffic while offering spaces where buildings can be grouped to add variety and placemaking, pedestrian crossings points can be prioritised easing movement and connectivity, and nodal points or activity hubs within the development can be formed. This approach is likely to assist in the creation of a 'street' as opposed to a 'link road', which is an important consideration given the CHIC2 policy requirement to create a 'traditional street' through the development. Also influencing the latest (Mar 2026) iteration of the scheme is the topography of the site. Managing the significant level changes on site has presented technical and design challenges for the developer, having regard to resulting impacts on accessibility of streets and properties, amenity, and placemaking, which have been a concern for Officers. Design South West consider that there are opportunities to respond more favourably to landscape and topography which will enhance the identity of the development. The latest iteration of the scheme seeks to manage topographical changes within plots, and to work with the contours running east-west to minimise impacts at street level. This has been a significant influence on layout. Careful balancing of topographical constraints has enabled the number of cul-de-sac/dead-end streets to be reduced, resulting in a better connected and permeable development, with pedestrian connectivity maintained throughout. In response to comments from Design South West the connecting north-south road has been moderately realigned, with the most significant change to the north where it has been more centrally aligned to run

through a northern block of development and green corridor, before returning to its previously shown route to the east of phase A in its southern part.

14.6.17. The central avenue nonetheless remains a continuous route, and though the provision of raised tables at junctions and at crossing points, occasional narrowing, and realignment of the route offers an attempt to address the points raised by Design South West, the central avenue would arguably act more as a ‘link road’ than a street. It does not significantly deviate or meander through the development to create small incidental ‘squares’ celebrating east-west connections framed by active frontages or landscaping, as envisaged by Design South West.

14.6.18. Where the central avenue does meander through the development to the north, development would not front the street to provide active frontages or particularly contribute to placemaking, with property boundaries instead framing the road. The above noted, it is acknowledged that the orientation of properties is in part a consequence of seeking to manage levels outside of the street scene, with alternative iterations where streets with frontage development running north-south presented significant issues in terms of the accessibility of properties and the effects of retaining structures within the street scene. It is also acknowledged that properties within this northern block do celebrate the surrounding green spaces and have a positive outlook in line with the notion within NP policy CNP11, and with appropriate tree planting, the relatively short stretch of boundary edges along the central avenue could be softened. Overall, the treatment of the central avenue, particularly in its northern part, is disappointing, but this needs to be weighed in the balance having regard to the significant topographical challenges of developing this site.

14.6.19. Further south within the scheme development would front the western edge of the central avenue offering an active frontage along one side of the route. Raised tables are proposed at crossing points to respond to north-south and east-west links, while slowing traffic and seeking to prioritise pedestrian movement. From an urban design perspective, it is questionable whether these would be successful in achieving incidental spaces that contribute to a sense of place, and they are not always positioned to respond to desire lines for people wishing to access areas of play, open space, and public rights of way further threatening their success. The use of raised tables, which are required to be lit throughout the night, in locations which intersect wildlife corridors presents further issues from a biodiversity perspective. These will be discussed within the remainder of the report, but the Urban Design Officer advises that the use of raised tables is an overly engineered response to creating ‘place’. The Urban Design Officer advices that narrowing the highway and changing its surface so there is a visual continuation of footpaths would reflect a place-based response to creating variation along the central avenue and contributing to a more pedestrian and green infrastructure focussed design. The Highway Authority have confirmed that other highway solutions exist to enable the slowing of traffic and prioritising of pedestrians and cyclists. It is therefore recommended that the design of highway features and traffic calming measures, including their placement which should respond to a clear and legible connectivity plan, is revised to avoid the number of raised tables currently proposed and to provide a less engineered approach to creating ‘place’ along the central avenue. The developer has committed to working with the Urban Design Officer and Highways Team to find a more suitable approach and it is considered that these amendments could be dealt with by condition.

14.6.20. The cycle route on the whole is a segregated route which maintains the route of the linking road, with the exception of its northern deviation where a shared pedestrian cycle route is shown. This provides a safe cycle route through the development and cycle storage is also proposed to be provided with each dwelling, encouraging active travel. As previously set out, the lack of a dedicated east-west cycle route linking the development with Lower Putton Lane and the rest of Chickerell is regrettable and

fails to respond to advice provided by Design South West who recommended enhancing east-west connections for pedestrians and cyclists. Para 117 (a) of the NPPF expects applications to give priority to pedestrians and cyclists, and the lack of an east-west cycle route would be a missed opportunity. Though wider footpaths are shown east-west, these paths are not ideal for cyclists due to their widths and potential for conflict. It is therefore considered that as part of any consent, a condition requiring an east-west cycle link between the central avenue and Lower Putton Lane should be secured, and the developer has agreed to addressing this through condition.

14.6.21. The latest iteration does well to respond to east-west pedestrian links, and to some extent responds to desire lines. There are some exceptions to this, though minor amendments to footpaths and the placement of crossing points in line with a legible connectivity plan could address this and it is recommended that this is secured through condition. A pedestrian link is also provided along the western boundary of the site to provide an off-road route. This could be a positive feature, and while it would need to be sensitively lit owing to its position within the wildlife corridor, it has the potential to offer an alternative route to and from school. There are a number of instances however where the route of this footway runs along the rear boundaries of gardens. Concerns have been raised, that lack of surveillance, embankment feature of unknown height, and the width of corridor (7m at its narrowest) coupled with close boarded fencing of rear boundaries could result in a route that is compromised. In response to Officer concerns, amended plans, alongside additional details in the form of sections (submitted Jun 2026) have been submitted. All timber boundary treatments facing the public realm have been omitted and replaced with brick boundary walls with native shrub planting against them to avoid poorly maintained boundaries fronting the footpath link and a soft edge. Section details provided indicate that embankments adjacent to the footpath link would not be significant (ranging from approx. less than 1m to 2.45m in places) and owing to sufficient width between the footway and nearest boundary (on the whole 2m or more), the embankments would grade away from the footpath, and would not significantly enclose it. The revised plans/additional details offer reassurance that the footway could operate as a pleasant alternative route through the development. Surveillance remains limited in parts which is regrettable, though this only relates to relatively short sections of the footpath, and increased openings shown within the apartment blocks would assist with surveillance. It will be important to condition details of levels as part of any consent. The revised (Jun 2026) plans also extend the footpath, where it previously ended at unit 19, to instead continue to connect with the wider footpaths running through the northern part of the site following natural desire lines. Overall, the revisions/additional details indicate that the western footpath link could present as a positive element of the scheme, and while surveillance of the footpath could ideally be increased, it is not considered to be so compromised to warrant refusal, particularly given other alternative north-south routes exist.

14.6.22. In concurrence with the Highway Authority advice, the Urban Design Officer notes that the intersection of cycle path, street and footpath at units 21-22 is awkward, stating that it is unclear who has priority and creates small left-over spaces. It is considered that this would need to be addressed by condition.

14.6.23. The use of retaining structures to the rear of properties to manage level changes within the site means that properties are proposed at street level, avoiding the high number of stepped entrances previously shown and avoiding significant level changes within garden spaces, which is considered to present a more accessible scheme having regard to Inclusive Mobility Guidance.

14.6.24. All dwellinghouses would have access to a garden, accessible from the street to assist in servicing bins/bicycles. The Crime Prevention Design Advisor makes a number of recommendations regarding the design of garden gates providing rear

access. Gates providing side access to rear gardens or yards should be of robust construction and match the height of the adjoining boundary treatment, with a minimum height of 1.8m. They should be capable of being securely locked, with key-operated access from both sides, in keeping with secure-by-design principles. It is considered that these recommendations can be secured through condition.

14.6.25. Owing to the level changes and use of retaining structures between rear properties and parking courtyards the previous scheme presented restricted access and poor connectivity between private rear gardens/property frontages and location of their parking in numerous places. Introduction of on street parking, and ensuring parking courtyards are well connected and overlooked was a recommendation of Design South West, as well as the need to celebrate pedestrian corridors and connections to Chickerell. It is considered that the current scheme generally overcomes previous issues with regards to connectivity between properties and parking. Parking is provided on the whole within easy access of units, either in front or to the side of dwellinghouses, or within a conveniently located courtyard. Where there was exception to this (plot 22) revised plans (Jun 2026) have been submitted which address this.

14.6.26. A range of parking solutions is proposed, with parking provided to the side of properties, front of properties and within parking courtyards. Where provided to the side of a property, parking is on the whole in close proximity but frequently laid out in a tandem arrangement, which can be less convenient for occupiers and can give way to unsociable parking. Though to some extent tandem parking can reduce the dominance of the car within the street scene, tucking the second car behind the dwellinghouse while keeping it close, however where parking sits uncomfortably tight against the pavement and/or side elevations this can have a detrimental impact on the visual quality of the street scene. The Urban Design Officer raises this as a continued concern and advises that '*where in plot spaces break the building line cars will be more visible in the street … where possible they should be set back behind the building line or framed by robust planting so that cars do not dominate the street*'. Revised plans submitted Jun 2026 shows on the whole increased space between parking and the edge of the pavement in an effort to address these concerns and avoid conflict between parked cars and the pavement. Ornamental planting to the fronts of plots would also assist to break up prominence of the car within the street.

14.6.27. In line with advice from Officers and Design South West, space incorporated within the street for parking is provided within this latest iteration which goes some way to offset possible unsociable parking and present increased options for residents and visitors, but it is not always provided in the most suitable and/or convenient locations. Therefore, while provision of on-street parking represents an improvement, the Urban Design Officer advises that it could be placed more conveniently. Otherwise, its provision is a positive revision to the scheme and street parking is on the whole broken up with landscaping which assists its integration in the street scene.

14.6.28. Where frontage parking is provided, these dominate the street scene due to lack of tree planting to break up the impact of parked cars. To alleviate this issues, revised plans (Jun 20206) have been submitted which shows additional street trees provided to break up parking within the street, with frontage parking on the whole broken up every four to five spaces with tree planting, with the exception of plots 87-89. This is considered an improvement to the scheme and to a large extent addresses the Urban Design Officer's concerns.

14.6.29. Amendments have been made in the Mar 2026 plans to reduce the number and size of rear parking courts. In terms of courtyards serving dwellinghouses, these have been reduced to three instances within phase A, and in each case would only serve

four dwellings. This represents a significant improvement on previous schemes, however these have not been wholly successful as spaces are relatively poorly surveyed. The Urban Design Officer advises that in one instance, the provision of an additional footpath link from the wider public realm which coupled with the lack of surveillance could increase the risk of crime and anti-social behaviour. The Crime Prevention Design Advisor likewise offers caution to car parking courtyards where surveillance is more limited. The Urban Design Officer also advises that entrances into courtyards are unnecessarily wide which would have a detrimental impact on the quality of the street scene and create a lack of distinction between public and private spaces. While concerns regarding parking courts remain outstanding, revised plans (Jun 2026) show the entrances into courtyards narrowed in an effort to improve the street scene. It is recommended that if permission is granted, this should be subject to a condition requiring an additional side facing window on plots 46 and 115 to improve surveillance of the courtyard.

14.6.30. Design and Layout: Detailed phase A – House design

14.6.31. Having considered matters relating to movement, another characteristic identified within the National Design Guide that influences character is 'built form' having regard to establishing a coherent pattern of development. This includes having regard to the height of buildings and the consistency of the building line in relation to the street itself, and the sense of enclosure that results; ensuring frontage development to provide interest, overlooking and active frontages; and careful consideration regarding the placement of taller buildings having regard to their relationship to context and impact on local character.

14.6.32. The submitted scheme (Mar 2026), showed dwellinghouses comprising on the whole 2 storey units with some 2 ½ and 3 storey units provided within the lower (southern) portion of Phase A. In line with officer advice, and advice from Design South West, split level properties which did not respond well to the street scene have been removed from the scheme.

14.6.33. The Mar 2026 plans indicated properties predominantly built using one roofing material (slate effect), and of 1 of 2 bricks, with some occasional render and stone facing, and use of weatherboarding or tile cladding. While improvements have been made to house types through the introduction of cills and headers and the occasional chimney (offering a more 'cottage style' property), the overall approach to architecture is simple with limited architectural detailing. Despite advice, chimneys are not always traditionally placed on the ends of units, affecting their ability to reflect a traditional feature, and the proposed use of tile and weatherboarding, materials that are not distinctive within the locality (red brick, stone and render tend to dominate), reduce the schemes ability to respond to its local context. It should be noted that split material properties are not commonly found in the area. Where different facing materials are used, previous advice to terminate facing materials at the unit edges rather than awkwardly partially wrapping around the unit seems to have been disregarded. These perhaps minor points, collectively reduce the design quality of the scheme and the lack of reference to local context through materials is disappointing, particularly given the advice of Design South West who have advised that the material palette would be a way to connect with and develop the character of the settlement.

14.6.34. To address these concerns, amended plans (Jun 2026) have been provided, amending the material treatment of properties. All hanging tile, a non-traditional material in the area, has been omitted from properties and either replaced with weatherboarding or replaced with render. While split materials are not a characteristic in the area, and this is maintained, the material palette is considered to be more appropriate.

14.6.35. Properties on the whole more cohesively respond to the street than previous iterations, providing a more continuous building line, but the Mar 2026 plans continue to include an inconsistent mix of house types within each street (with differences in height, roof pitch, porch, materials, and design) affecting the way streets and spaces are framed to the detriment of the character of the area. Advice from Design South West is that “in the formation of the blocks and the distribution of housing types it would be good to develop more consistency and repetition to create coherence to the way streets and spaces are framed by buildings”. While the Mar 2026 iteration does rationalise the number of house types and shows improvement in their placement compared to previous iterations, the Urban Design Officer continues to raise concern regarding the consistency and coherence of street formation and how streets are framed by buildings, and it is considered that this is a weakness of the scheme.

14.6.36. By way of an example, where 2 ½ story units are proposed (seen in the Saunton house type), there is continued concern that these would appear unbalanced in their design, with disproportionately high rooves (approx. 10m) and acute roof pitches of 90° compared to other house types (typically 110°). In the Mar 2026 submission, the number of 2 ½ storey properties have been reduced, with the Saunton proposed occupying just 5 plots. This is considered an improvement. The units would nonetheless be positioned within streets of mixed housing types, generally set back behind the building line owing to their front porch design, and would stand between 1.7 and 2m taller than their adjacent units, with a differing pitch, affecting how the units sit alongside each other and appear in the street scene. These concerns have been raised during previous iterations of the scheme, and so it is disappointing to see these continue to be proposed in the Mar 2026 iterations sitting amongst differing house types.

14.6.37. In turn, the number of 3 storey units have been reduced as part of the Mar 2026 scheme. Where these are provided (seen in the Ashdown house type) they are intermixed with other house types, so rather than consistently framing the street, they add further to the mix of house types which differ in their height (with a difference of more than 2.5m between adjacent properties). There is also concern that the Juliet balconies to the front of these properties would not positively contribute to the public realm. These are concerns that have been raised previously. Adding further to the mix is the disparity in the width of properties which range from (discounting the Birkdale and Chiltern house types which are only found at the end of a terrace) approx. 6.5m to 9.4m. The wide distribution of different house types within streets and resultant lack of coherence and rhythm to development fronting the street fails to take on board advice provided by Design South West to the detriment of the scheme and public realm.

14.6.38. In response to the above concerns, amended plans have been submitted (Jun 2026). These directly address concerns regarding the above referred to house types by omitting these (the Saunton and Ashdown) from the scheme and replacing them with more traditional house types. The resulting phase A development would comprise solely 2 storey units (with the exception of a three storey apartment block within the southern extend of phase A). The remaining units would be more akin to ‘cottage style’ properties (although only broadly so) better addressing the expectations of NP policy CNP11, and would sit more coherently next to each other offering more cohesivity and a stronger rhythm of development.

14.6.39. Apartment buildings are proposed in four separate blocks, and are of a similarly simple design. Three out of four of the blocks comprise 2 storey height buildings, with one 3 storey building. Having regard to the Mar 2026 submission, it is noted that the two larger apartment blocks have a single point of access to the rear, accessed via rear parking courts as opposed to from the street; this is a sign of poor design as set out in Building for a Healthy Life. Further, due to overly small windows

resulting in a particularly large void to brick ratio, the apartments do not have an overly domestic feel, they do not offer as much surveillance as they could, and overall they respond poorly to the street, further impacting the built form and placemaking.

14.6.40. In response to these concerns, revised plans (Jun 2026) have been submitted amending the arrangement of apartments. While it has not been possible to reconfigure units 37-42 to enable a front entrance, owing in part due to its position within the site, the remaining three apartment blocks now all include a front entrance such that they would be accessible from the street. Window arrangements have also been revised, enlarging window openings and introducing additional openings where lacking. These revisions would not only benefit light into the internal spaces, but present a more domestic feel to the apartment blocks, and increased surveillance of public spaces.

14.6.41. Revisions have also been made to their appearance, including material treatment and detailing. The previous split material treatment running horizontally through the blocks has been amended, with variation in materials now used to emphasise vertical elements within the building design, and with a simple horizontal brick course in some blocks. Lifting the gable within the two storey units also adds vertical interest. Window heads and cills have been added to rear elevations adding detail to the design. Materials would comprise on the whole a mix of render and weatherboarding. Ornamental hedging defining the rear amenity space and back edge of parking (in places) improves the external areas, and the repositioning of units 63-66 such that it has a better frontage with the street and greater separation from the rear parking spaces will improve the outlook for occupiers and benefit placemaking.

14.6.42. Overall, the proposed amendments to house types presents a significant improvement. The Material palette better responds to materials within the area, and buildings would more cohesively respond to the street, providing a more continuous building line and less variation in height between properties within the same street. This would establish a much stronger rhythm to development. The treatment of apartment blocks and their placement has also improved, though it is considered more could be done to improve their overall appearance and amenity value. House types continue to be relatively simple in their design with limited architectural detailing (though cills and headers do assist), chimneys continue to respond poorly to traditional placement, and split level materials continue to be proposed, which are elements that weaken the schemes response to local context and character. These matters would need to be weighed in the planning balance.

14.6.43. <u>Design and Layout: Detailed phase A – Character and street scene</u>

14.6.44. The importance of ensuring that proposals reflect and reinforce local character and identity, in terms of both landscape and built form, is fundamental in creating a development which integrates positively into its surroundings and is embedded within its local context. NPPF para 135 states that *‘Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments: are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities).’*

14.6.45. Establishing a clear ‘identity’ having regard to creating an attractive and distinctive development is identified as another key characteristic within the National Design Guide that influences character. This depends on development responding to the site’s local ‘context’ and ‘built form’ (other key characteristics), with identity derived from the composition of streets scenes; individual buildings, and their elements; the height, scale and relationship of buildings; views and vistas; the scale and proportions of streets; and hard and soft landscaping, amongst others.

14.6.46. In terms of built form, referencing local context includes street patterns, boundary treatments, set-backs, plot ratios and detailed design features. It is also accepted that there needs to be some flexibility so that layouts and street patterns can prioritise pedestrians and cyclists, minimise the impact of parked cars and make more efficient use of land, while also ensuring that there is space for open spaces, sustainable drainage features, trees and other landscaping.

14.6.47. Advice from Design South West is that "*more consistency in the relationship between building types, street interfaces and street types*" is needed and they reference applying consistency to parking approaches and boundary treatments as an example of reinforcing street typologies and creating well defined edges that are sociable and easy to maintain, as well as applying consistency to materials. They have advised that "*the development of character should be more positively evidenced…. Chickerell has a varied character, but this is not a rational for contributing an undefined character*".

14.6.48. There are 3 character areas identified on the submitted 'character and materials' plan. These relate to units fronting the central avenue (character 1), units fronting green spaces (character 2) and units fronting internal streets (character 3). However, between the proposed character areas there is little variation in terms of building type, building line, architectural style, architectural detailing, boundary treatments, and materials. With few distinctive architectural features between units, character is gained through a variation in materials. However, the parameters defining each character area are applied inconsistently across the three areas such that distinctiveness between the character areas is watered down. For example, character 1 is described as being defined by brick, weatherboarding and render, but there are nonetheless buildings proposed with stone frontages, and in fact only 3 rendered buildings proposed. Character 2 is described as consisting of brick, tile hanging (though this material has since been removed from the scheme (Jun 2026 amendments)) and weatherboarding, but it includes an entire street frontage of stone faced dwellings. In terms of boundary treatments, in character areas 1 and 3 where corner plots are described as being defined by railings, this is not always the case, and character area 2, where boundary treatments are described as comprising post and rail fencing, front boundaries include 1.2m high metal railings. There is subsequently little consistency in the house types, architectural detailing, materials and/or boundary treatments to define three distinct character areas within phase A.

14.6.49. A key characteristic identified within the National Design Guide that influences good design and the 'identity' of places is having an understanding of, and responding well to, 'local context' in terms of layout, form, scale, appearance, details and materials, as well as responding to topography, landscape character, movement and other environmental factors.

14.6.50. Having regard to local context, weatherboard and tile hanging are not commonly found in the area, nor are split material frontages. Amended plans submitted Jun 2026 have since removed hanging tile from the proposals. Roofing materials are more varied within the vicinity too and although grey coloured roofing is more common there are still examples of terracotta roofs. The materials proposed fail to add interest or strengthen the distinction of different character areas. While the formation of blocks and the distribution of housing types is more consistent than previous iterations of the scheme, it is not based on a considered understanding of the local context. Overall, there is limited variation or distinction between character areas and a disconnect with its local context. In this regard, the Urban Design Officer advises as follows:

14.6.51. "…*there should be more consistency and coherence in the way streets and spaces are formed and are framed by buildings. The layout and design should reference more than just local architectural styles and materials. It should also reflect*

relationships between existing buildings and the public realm; how buildings sit together in groups and make streets – how they curve and feel contained by buildings or open up in places to incorporate incidental landscape areas, trees and common boundary treatments. NPPF para 135, National Design Guide C1, I1, West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan ENV10".

14.6.52. As a consequence of the limited variation in character areas and the lack of reference to the development of Chickerell, there is concern that the built form would lack the identify and distinctiveness required to create a legible and characterful development that appropriately responds to its local context, where there is far greater variety in built form. While it is recognised that not all development in the area is of high quality there are still significant elements that can inform the scheme so that it better reflects the character of the area.

14.6.53. Some notable improvements have been made to the scheme over time to strengthen the relationship of units with the street. This has included greater consistency in the building line helping to define streets and refinement of the mix of house types proposed. Differences in ridge heights and building spans and the variation in house types, materials, and boundary treatments however continue to challenge cohesiveness. The use of timber fencing and lack of hard boundaries to rear gardens where they face the public realm has been a significant concern as timber fences are often maintained in an ad hoc manner due to different ownership which can negatively impact the street scene. Revised plans (submitted Jun 2026) have addressed this point with the provision of brick boundaries where they front the public realm. The Urban Design Officer advises that the lack of a consistent approach to hard boundary treatments to front gardens, particularly where they front the central avenue, also has the potential to degrade the public realm; where front gardens are left open there can be a lack of definition to plots and there is a risk that the overall quality of the street suffers as individual residents add features to help provide a more private space to the front of dwellings. This is especially likely to be the case along the central avenue which will be a busy, main route through the site and would further impact the street scene. The definition of front gardens through ornamental hedging is however shown on the landscape plans, and therefore while hard boundary treatment could be refined, the gardens would be defined to some extent by hedging.

14.6.54. Both 'identity' and 'context' are two of the 10 characteristics identified in the National Design Code as being essential to create well designed places and these concepts are integral to the 'Building for a Healthy Life', which para 138 and 139 of the NPPF gives weight to. Concerns regarding detailed elements such as placement of chimneys, lack of detailing and use of split level materials weakens the schemes response to local context and with little distinct differentiation in character between areas within phase A this impacts upon identify, legibility and distinctiveness compromising the quality of the scheme. These aspects would need to be weighed in the balance.

14.6.55. <u>Design and Layout: Detailed phase A – Topography</u>

14.6.56. In the latest iteration of the scheme, the number of retaining features within the public realm have been reduced. There continues to be a heavy reliance on retaining features to manage levels, but these are now shown running east-west across the site and positioned to the rear of gardens where properties sit back to back. Managing topographical changes within plots such that they are not visible from frontages aligns with the advice of Design South West (2020). Further detail would be required to understand how these features abut the street. The latest Jun 2026 revisions show them mainly terminating at brick boundary walls such that they would not be discernible from the street, therefore to a large extent retaining structures would be out of the street scene. Properties are proposed at street level,

avoiding the high number of stepped entrances previously shown, and properties would benefit on the whole from level gardens, resulting in improvements to both the street scene, accessibility and amenity. The shift in approach to managing levels on site has improved the relationship between properties and the street.

14.6.57. The consequence of these amendments is that the retaining structures at the rear of gardens are significant in height, ranging from 0.4m to 4.8m at its highest, with a 1.8m timber fence above, resulting in a substantial feature (at its maximum 6.6m in height) and positioned approx. 10m from the rear elevation of properties in some instances. Approx. 28 properties would have a retaining feature over 2m in height (plus a 1.8m fence above) along the northern edge of their garden. This would be an imposing feature at the rear of property gardens which has the potential to impact upon the amenity value of the property and outdoor space. To soften the impact of the proposed retaining features, it is proposed that the retaining features would comprise crib walls, that would gently grade back and be planted up to provide a green backdrop.

14.6.58. Managing levels in this way has had a positive impact on the street scene, accessibility to properties and the functionality of garden spaces serving dwellings, however the provision of such significant retaining features to the rear of dwellings and their potential to impact upon amenity of future occupiers needs to be weighed against these benefits, and the broader benefits of bringing forward development on a steeply sloping site. The impact on the residential amenity of future occupiers is explored further in the report, and is a matter to be weighed in the planning balance.

14.6.59. <u>Design and Layout: Detailed phase A – Open Space and play</u>

14.6.60. As part of Phase A an area of open space would be provided within the northern portion of the site, capitalising on available views from the higher ground designated as Land of Local Landscape Importance and providing a green entrance into the site. A further area of open space, providing opportunities for play is proposed within a pocket of land adjacent to Mariners Way at the western extent of the site and land along the eastern extent of the site. The remaining land in the March 2026 submission, including a portion of land to the East of the Central Avenue a portion of land to the south of Phase A development at the western pedestrian entrance to the site, and the remaining land along the eastern extent of the site has the potential to offer public open space, but was compromised by the number of large engineered drainage basins proposed.

14.6.61. Incorporating drainage basins into the site is challenging owing to the sloping levels at the site. As part of the 2024 submission, a combined approach was taken to managing water, with increased reliance on above ground basins, in response to National Guidance, in combination with a series of linked attenuation tanks and oversized sewers. This in-combination approach was accepted as a sensible compromise between seeking to manage water at surface level where possible, while seeking to increase the developable area of the site and area for public open space. The Mar 2026 submission however moved away from a combined approach and seeks to manage all surface water through above ground drainage basins.

14.6.62. The basins would on the whole be grassed, with some marginal planting at their base and, with the exception of a few basins that would retain a small micropool of water, they would otherwise be dry outside of a design flood event. Owing to their relatively shallow depths and 1:3 slopes, it is not considered that fencing of the features would be necessary in line with the SUDs Manual, however the drainage basins would present significant engineered features within the public open space and would reduce the usable area of open space to the detriment of the recreational and visual amenity of the site.

14.6.63. In particular, two large basins shown on the Mar 2026 plans located at the eastern pedestrian entrance to the site would completely dominate this important focal point within the development. Advice from Design South West was to take opportunity in the layout to embrace east-west as well as north-south links where pedestrian movement would be at its greatest to create multi-functional nodal points within the development. The central area, located north of the school and west of the proposed play and open space, and a gateway location for pedestrians entering the development, should be a prime location to create a space which contributes positively to placemaking and a focal point for activities to radiate form. However the effectiveness of this space in achieving this is lost owing to the space being consumed by two large drainage basins, with a single path running through. These would appear as engineered features with sloping sides and gabions at their bases near the outlet. Being dry and grassed they would offer little in the way of biodiversity benefits, and owing to their engineered design they would not have the appearance of a naturalistic feature within the landscape. Due to being poorly integrated within the layout they would reduce the usable area of open space for informal play, gatherings and social interaction, and the SuDS would fail to meet the expectations set out within the SuDS Manual, National Design Guide and National Standards for SuDS.

14.6.64. The area of open space to the east of the development is proposed for play and includes areas of landscaping, but as shown in the Mar 2026 plans the remaining land is largely dominated again by drainage basins. This space also has the potential to be well used and to provide recreational amenity space, being located adjacent to the school and being well connected with east-west and north-south connectivity. The space is nonetheless compromised by two drainage basins located to the north of this space, which would be dry outside of a flood event with 1:3 slopes, and a further drainage basin located to the south of this space, which would include some micro-pooling offering biodiversity benefits.

14.6.65. Other areas of open space include land to the north of development within phase A, at the entrance to the site on land designated as land of local landscape importance and (LLLI). This area would create a green entrance into the development and would provide opportunity for planting and capitalising on views available from this higher ground.

14.6.66. The Mar 2026 plans also indicate a further area of open space proposed within the outline element of the scheme adjacent to phase B. This is proposed to incorporate a ‘trim trail’ and footpath. However, based on a golf strike assessment commissioned by Persimmon and a submitted ‘golf ball trajectory plan’ submitted Jun 2026, this land falls within an area at risk from ball strike from the adjacent golf course. As such, public access to this land should not be encouraged and the use of this area to deliver open space is not considered appropriate.

14.6.67. Owing to the above, the area of meaningful public open space to be provided as part of the Mar 2026 scheme was considered limited, with much of it compromised either by ball strike or overly engineered drainage basins. It is not considered that all drainage basins have been designed to meet the multifunctional benefits expected by the NPPF and without these benefits, they would unnecessarily negatively impact the value of public open space proposed.

14.6.68. Owing to the steepness of the site and the need to form large embankments to the southern extent of the basins to ensure their effectiveness, together with the need to strike a balance between the developable area and other competing demands upon space, designing naturalistic features that integrate well will the space has been a significant challenge for the developer. The resulting overly engineered approach and large quantum of drainage basins proposed means that they consume much of the open space and do not positively contribute to the development.

14.6.69. While it is accepted that some above ground storage would be beneficial in line with National Guidance and advice, to overcome the issues raised the developer has revisited the drainage strategy to consider whether a combined approach to managing water could enable a reduction in drainage basins, particularly where basins would be seasonally dry and would provide less benefits. In particular, the omission of drainage basins from the open space at the pedestrian gateway to the site, north of the school and adjacent to Lower Putton Lane, and the reduction in drainage basins within the public open space to the east of the central avenue would significantly benefit the scheme such that a combination of below ground storage would be well justified in this case.

14.6.70. Revised plans together with a revised drainage strategy (submitted Jun 2026) shows the removal of four basins and seeks to adopt a combined approach to managing water above and below ground. Water would continue on the whole to be managed through a series of drainage basins running through the site, but where these compromise the open space, water would be managed by a series of underground tanks in these locations. The revised plans show the removal of the two drainage basins within the gateway location east of Lower Putton Lane and the two most northern drainage basins to the north of the public open space located east of the central avenue. The Lead Local Flood Authority have confirmed that the principle of these amendments could be accepted. On this basis, the proposed development would be served by a larger area of open space that has the potential to offer meaningful benefits to the scheme. The larger space could provide for informal play, social interaction and would also enable sufficient space to accommodate an east-west cycle link improving movement and connectivity between the site and existing development. To ensure that the public open space is appropriately managed a financial contribution towards maintenance of this space has been agreed. It is considered that these revisions address the concerns raised regarding open space provision.

14.6.71. The Mar 2026 proposals offered two areas of play, at the western extent of the site, and to the east of the central avenue. In light of the Jun 2026 amendments to the drainage strategy and the opening up of the space to the south of phase A and north of the school, this could provide a more desirable location for equipped play, the same side of the central avenue to the school. Within the area of open space to the east of the central avenue and south of phase C, space is thus provided for naturalistic/informal play. Within the pocket of green space east of Mariners Way the developer proposes for a trim trail. The design of these spaces is considered to follow the general principles of the ‘Advice Note for Practical Design and Management of Greenspace’, in line with the advice of the Environmental Mitigation Delivery Team, but further detail would be required at the condition stage in respect of surfacing of paths, access and crossing points, cycle facilities, benches, signage and other relevant details. In turn, the design of these spaces would need to follow recommendations set out in Secure by Design taking on board the need to ensure appropriate surveillance, effective lighting, access and management arrangements in line with the advice of the Crime Prevention Design Advisor. It is recommended that these details are incorporated into an Open Space management Plan secured by condition.

14.6.72. All spaces would be of sufficient size to provide a Local Area of Play (LAP) and a Local Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) and some informal play. They would be located at nodal points within the development at activity corridors such that they would respond well to desire lines and form an integral part of the open space. All future residents would be within 700m of the play space to the east and west of the central avenue which would each provide approx. 0.11ha of play space; and residents of phase A and C would be within 400m of the play space to the West which would provide approx. 0.06ha, totalling 0.28ha of play space within the development. The

latest guidance indicates play provision for the development should equate to 0.45ha. Broken down this equates to approx. 0.2ha of equipped play (in this case FiT recommend provision in the form of a LAP and LEAP), and 0.25ha of informal play, which can include Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) and skateparks, play trails, sensory routes and other. In terms of play provision, the site would consequently offer a shortfall of approx. 0.17ha of play, with a particular shortfall in an area large enough to support informal play.

14.6.73. Consideration has been given to incorporating informal play, and play for older children, such as a skate park within the development. It is recognised that, while not a policy requirement, the provision of a skate park within Chickerell is strongly desired locally, and this has been highlighted by Chickerell Town Council (CTC) who wish to see this delivered and brought forward on the site. Following withdrawal of the land to the south from the application submission (which previously included provision of a skate park) consideration has been given to whether another suitable location can be found for a skate park within the application site boundaries. While the developer has reviewed a number of alternative sites for the skate park, owing to a lack of detail relating to the skate provision proposed, it has not been possible to rule out concerns relating to alternative siting and potential impacts upon amenity of future occupiers. Following liaison with Environmental Health, the Crime Prevention Officer and Urban Design Officer, the developer has chosen not to provide a skate park as part of the development, but to provide a financial contribution towards such a facility being provided within the locality.

14.6.74. The existing play provision within Chickerell at Willowbed Hall, which includes informal play including a MUGA is within approximately 537m from the development, such that it would be accessible for some but not all. Through liaison with CTC, it is clear that there is a local demand for play to support the increase in population within the town, and this development would increase the use of the existing play facilities at Willowbed Hall. CTC are keen to see a contribution to enhance these facilities in addition to the LAP/LEAP provided on site. Owing to the challenges associated with incorporating informal play such as skate provision and/or a MUGA within the development (having regard to potential siting and potential impacts on housing numbers), it is considered reasonable in this case, that the shortfall in play provision at the site is addressed through a financial contribution to enhance the facilities at Willowbed Hall and/or provide a skate park within the Parish which would support older children which are not catered for within the development.

14.6.75. While the developer has set out intentions for each of the play spaces, the play facilities are to be brought forward by Chickerell Town Council (CTC), and it is considered reasonable to provide flexibility within the S106 legal agreement as to how these spaces are used to address play, with a requirement that two LAPs are provided, together with a LEAP in one location and some informal play in another. Minimum specifications will be set out for the LAP and LEAP in line with FiT Guidelines, and details would first need to be submitted to, and agreed by, the Local Planning Authority. Taking on board advice from the Crime Prevention Design Advisor boundary treatment should be incorporated around equipped play areas to enhance safety. It is recommended that a minimum 1.2m high fence should be provided to help deter casual access, create a defined and secure play environment, and reduce the potential for damage to equipment. To maintain visibility and support natural surveillance, the fencing should consist of open-style materials, such as hooped-top metal railings or similar. In addition, providing a single, clearly defined entry and exit point will assist parents and guardians in supervising children effectively. These specifications can be secured through condition, and in line with advice from the Environmental Mitigation Delivery Team should form part of a comprehensive Play Strategy, developed having regard to ‘Design for Play’ Guidance. Regarding the trim trail, it is understood that a trim trail is already

provided for within the town, so by building in flexibility into the S106, this will allow CTC to ensure play provision provided best serves the community. The contributions towards on-site provision have been based on the West Dorset Planning Obligations SPD tariff which applies to open market units only. It is noteworthy that the removal of the SuDS, and the release of an increased area of open space, does present Chickerell Town Council more opportunities for play in the future, subject to relevant permissions.

14.6.76. Design and Layout: Outline - Phases B and C

14.6.77. Having regard to the outline aspect of the proposal, consideration is given to the principle of new housing in the eastern and southern extents of the site, totalling 185 units. Limited details have been provided in respect of scale, layout, appearance or landscaping as these are reserved matters for subsequent consideration. To assist consideration, an indicative plan showing a possible layout has nonetheless been provided, and this is useful in terms of demonstrating whether the site is capable of accommodating the number of units and infrastructure sought, with this being a key concern in the previous iteration which sought 210 units within these two phases.

14.6.78. Other constraints on phase B development in particular is the adjacent golf course and potential for balls surpassing the boundary. To fully assess the impacts of potential ball strike within the development a ball strike assessment has been submitted. Matters relating to this are considered in more detail in the report, but the potential for ball strike has presented a further constraint on development and influenced the developable area of the southern portion of the site.

14.6.79. Phase B would provide 88 units comprising a mix of dwellinghouses plus a number of apartment blocks and is shown to the south of the proposed school site, with units located either side of the central avenue. The Design and Access Statement envisages a ‘contemporary front garden range’ of housing within this phase. While this is not explicitly clear within the indicative plans, with some properties appearing set back from the street and others fronting on to road edges, matters of detailed design and siting can be reviewed at the reserved matters stage to ensure development positively defines streets and spaces with consistent plot patterns and frontages to establishing a strong sense of character. The indicative plan shows a single cul-de-sac to the north of the housing block and the remaining housing accessed via an interconnecting street to the west of the central avenue. Due to differences in levels, retaining structures are shown at the rear gardens of properties to manage levels at the site away from the street scene. Along the central avenue, properties would on the whole front the main thoroughfare, with development to the east following the length of the avenue. This is in part to keep properties outside of areas at risk from potential ball strike from the adjacent golf club to the east.

14.6.80. Along the western edge of the site a swale would offer a way of managing water above ground, which has the potential to contribute positively to the character of the site. This would feed into drainage basins to the south of phase B, west of the central avenue. Along the eastern edge of phase B, an area of open space is proposed with a shallow drainage basin at its northern and southern extent. The most southern basin would include a permanent micro-pool, but otherwise the features would only be seasonally wet. The golf ball trajectory plan shows that the open space indicated on the Mar 2026 plans along the eastern edge of phase B would fall within the golf strike zone. Providing public access in this area would be a concern and revised plans (submitted Jun 2026) removes public access to this area. it is recommended that at the reserved matters stage this green space is planted for biodiversity providing a green link for wildlife along the eastern boundary, with public access discouraged through planting. It is considered that this could be secured through condition, and that subject to a revised drainage scheme and removal of

drainage basins from land north of the school, sufficient public open space would be provided on site to serve the development.

14.6.81. A raised table and visitor parking area is proposed within a central location of phase B along the central avenue to add variation and a break in the street. Careful consideration should be given to the treatment of units framing this area to ensure clear legibility and identity of this space such that it contributes to placemaking. These matters are however for the reserved matters stage. Overall, previous concerns regarding the compact nature of this part of the site are alleviated and it is considered that in principle, the quantum of development shown could be accommodated within phase B with matters of layout, scale, landscaping and appearance reserved for future consideration.

14.6.82. Phase C is shown to the East of the central avenue, adjacent to phase A and would provide 97 units comprising mainly dwellinghouses plus an apartment block. The main part of phase C sits behind north-south and east-west wildlife corridors where units are shown fronting an interconnecting road with incidental squares within. Retaining walls are again used to manage levels across the site and placed at rear gardens. Where these run down the slope, careful management of levels and the effects of these on street frontages would be required. A further pocket of development north of the public open space is proposed as part of phase C, which as currently indicated would accommodate an apartment block. The quantum of development indicated is considered to be acceptable in principle with matters of layout, scale, landscaping and appearance reserved for future consideration.

14.6.83. Based on the indicative drawings, the Urban Design Officer advises that having reviewed the size of the development parcels at Phase B and C, and recognising the constraints of the site having regard to surrounding land uses, the requirements for drainage, landscaping, parking provision, and a balanced mix of dwelling sizes, it would be possible to successfully accommodate 185 units with landscaping across the 2 phases such that the development would meet the NPPF expectations set out under para 135 for achieving well designed places.

14.6.84. <u>Design and Layout: Outline - School Phase</u>

14.6.85. The provision of a school within the development responds to the policy requirements set out within policy CHIC2, and would serve to address capacity issues resulting from the wider allocation and resulting population increase of Chickerell. A review of education capacity is ongoing and will inform how future needs within the settlement are best met in terms of whether the school provides an enlarged replacement, or an additional school alongside the existing Chickerell Primary Academy. In the event of the former scenario, Policy CHIC3 in the Local Plan supports the potential redevelopment of the existing school in the event a new replacement school is provided. In this regard, the allocation of land towards a primary school suitable to accommodate a 2 form entry (FE) school is considered to respond appropriately to future education needs within the locality.

14.6.86. In terms of the siting of the school, this is located within a central location, aiding ease of access from both the proposed development and existing development, with pedestrian links provided directly to the north with Lower Putton Lane. These links are important in terms of providing pedestrian access from the school to the heart of the settlement, as well as providing a link between the two school sites in the absence of a direct vehicular link. An additional off-road pedestrian route is proposed along the western side of the development, in addition to that provided along the central avenue, which provides an alternative off-road link to the school from development to the north of Chickerell. The school is shown accessed directly off the central avenue running through the development, which provides suitable widths to accommodate buses, and provides additional pedestrian and cycle access.

14.6.87. In terms of the positioning of the school on its plot, the indicative layout is led by a number of factors, and responds to the significant variation in levels at the site. The school is currently shown with a single point of access and with the built element positioned to the east of the plot fronting the road, and its playing fields located to the rear. The external Design Review Panel considered that it could be beneficial to orientate the school west, as apposed to east, and this will need to be considered at the detailed design stage. The site levels, security needs and access limitations to the existing built development to the west are limitations that will need to be factored in alongside this, matters which the Crime Prevention Design Advisor notes. For this outline stage, the plans are sufficient in showing that the site is capable of accommodating a 2FE school on the site, which would address pressures in education resulting from the development. The current proposals therefore achieve the policy objectives to provide a school, and this will be secured through legal agreement. The detailed design stage will provide opportunity to further consider how the school can innovatively respond to its setting, levels and site characteristics to promote a positive relationship between the school and surrounding development, natural environment, access and play. At this stage, it is not clear whether the school will be brought forward by Dorset Council or the Department of Education. It is recommended that a condition be placed on the consent seeking a phasing plan for the delivery of the school to ensure that it is provided alongside the development.

14.6.88. Design and Layout: Conclusion

14.6.89. Having regard to the revised plans (submitted Jun 2026) and noting amendments to material treatment (removing non-traditional materials); the rationalising of house types (removing 2 ½ and 3 storey units); positioning of properties; revisions to boundary treatments; the set back to on plot parking; narrowing of parking courtyard entrances; additional street planting/landscaping; improved termination of retaining structures; and the opening up of public open space (enabling and east-west cycle links improving movement improvements) it is considered that the resulting scheme goes some considerable way to improve the built environment. Buildings would more cohesively respond to the street, providing a more continuous building line and with less ad hoc variation in height would establish a stronger rhythm of development within streets. There continues to be concerns regarding detailed elements such as placement of chimneys, lack of detailing and use of split level materials that weaken the schemes response to local context and character. Further, owing to loose application of the parameters defining different character areas, there would be little distinct differentiation in character between areas within phase A. It is nonetheless considered that the revised scheme, despite some misgivings surrounding character, goes some way to meeting the policy objectives set out in policy.

14.6.90. Overall, the proposed revisions go some way to addressing the concerns, but given the high bar set by policy to deliver high quality developments, there are a number of elements that let the scheme down. It is therefore questionable whether the proposal truly meets the ‘high quality’ expectation as set out in Policy ENV12 and NPPF para 135. This is a matter that would need to be weighed in the planning balance.

14.7. Impact on amenity

14.7.1. The application site is located adjacent to residential development on its western side, and along its eastern side is bound by a golf course and electricity substation.

14.7.2. LP policy ENV16 confirms that development should be designed to minimise its impact on the amenity of existing neighbours and confirms that proposals will only be permitted provided that they do not have a significant adverse impact on the living conditions of occupiers of residential properties through loss of light, privacy, activity/noise or emissions. LP policy HOUS4 seeks to ensure apartments are provided with sufficient private amenity space.

14.7.3. Residential amenity: Phase A – impacts on existing occupiers

14.7.4. Starting at the northern extent of the site, the development would sit adjacent to the rear boundaries of 20B School Hill and properties along Woodland Way, comprising on the whole 2 storey properties but also some single storey properties. The rear boundary of properties comprises on the whole timber fences but also timber post and wire fencing with the existing field boundary running along the western edge of the site. This field boundary comprises, in places, a raised shallow bund with some 'patchy' sections of hedgerow and a number of trees and shrubs within providing variable levels of screening between existing properties and the application site. Some properties (at the most northern extent) benefit from a green boundary and others (further south) are provided with an open aspect over the application site as the hedge line diminishes. It is proposed that existing hedgerow and trees are retained along this boundary, and that the boundary is enhanced to create a green corridor for biodiversity to include woodland/tree block planting and native scrub planting, with some wildflower planting also proposed. This would create a soft edge to the development and offer occupiers of the existing development a green backdrop. A 10m wildlife buffer is applied along the length of this boundary in the interests of protected species; consequently the built form of the proposed development would be set back from this boundary with a footpath link separating the proposed development from the edge of the development site. While some lighting would be required to light the footpath, this would be in the form of sensitive down-lit lighting in the interests of biodiversity.

14.7.5. The proposed development would sit along existing contours running east-west through Woodland Way and the development site, such that proposed properties would not be sited on significantly higher ground to the existing development, with proposed ridge heights on the whole lower than that of neighbouring two storey dwellings. The greatest impact would be in relation to plots 37-42 and no. 11 and 12 Woodland Way. This is owing to the single storey nature of these existing properties adjacent to a proposed two storey apartment block which would be of greater massing and height compared to the existing bungalows. In this regard there would be a height difference of approx. 4.8m, though this is less a result of ground levels, and more due to the differing heights between properties. While proposed properties adjacent to this boundary would be 2 storey in height, they would be positioned in excess of 13m from the edge of the rear boundary of properties and in excess of 24m from the rear elevation of dwellinghouses. Owing to the set back position of proposed development from the boundary and resulting separation distances between the existing and proposed built form, together with enhanced planting along this boundary, the proposed development is considered to present an acceptable relationship with neighbouring properties such that it would not significantly compromise the light, privacy or general amenity of neighbour occupiers.

14.7.6. As the development extends further south the proposed built form of development moves away from the western boundary to respond to existing hedgerows and desire lines and to form an area of open space adjacent to Mariners Way suitable for play. Properties here do not front or have their main outlook on to the application site but some have secondary windows at first floor allowing a vantage across the fields. Currently, existing timber fenced boundaries to properties bound the area, and shrub and bramble vegetation consumes the parcel of land with a small footway cut through. It is proposed that the area would be cleared of brambles and along the western and southern boundary would be a hedgerow, with native scrub planting and wildflower planting offering a natural green buffer between existing development and the proposed area of play. The area would also include tree planting within, including a feature tree. No details are currently provided in respect of the proposed play facilities for this area, as the Town Council wish to develop these spaces in consultation with their residents. It is recommended that the provision for play is

secured by S106 and that details of play facilities are first submitted to and agreed with the Local Planning Authority in the interests of safeguarding residential amenity. With these provisions in place, the proposed treatment of this area is considered to be appropriate, and responds to significant third party objection to development in this area previously.

14.7.7. Neighbouring occupiers continue to seek a hard boundary in the form of a wall be provided along the western edge of the site between the existing development and the application site. While there is no prospect currently of providing a connecting route into Mariners Way at present owing to ransom strips, such a hard feature would prevent any future opportunities to create pedestrian or cycle links into the existing development which would be a missed opportunity if ever it arose, particularly given the constraints of the adjoining footway. Development should seek to connect and integrate seamlessly into the existing built form as opposed to having hard boundaries built between ‘older’ and ‘newer’ developments. In this case, it is considered that the proposed soft treatment to the boundary would be an acceptable approach, and the lack of built wall would not be reason to refuse the application.

14.7.8. As the development extends southward and eastward it abuts the eastern boundary of properties along Lerrett Close, and the northern boundary of properties along Lower Putton Lane. Here boundaries are variable comprising timber fencing, hedging, post and wire fences and/or low stone boundary walls, all of varying heights. Properties comprise a mix of two storey dwellinghouses, chalet bungalows and single storey properties which currently enjoy an outlook across the open fields. It is proposed that hedging, and some shrub planting, as well as tree planting, would extend along the rear boundary of properties which would provide a consistent soft boundary to the development edge.

14.7.9. Due to the topography of the site, the application site would sit on higher ground to existing properties. Particular regard is given to the relationship between existing and proposed properties where the impact of the development would at its greatest. The proposed development would be set back from neighbouring boundaries with a footpath link continuing to separate the proposed development from the edge of the existing development. In this regard the rear boundaries of plots 83-86 would be set approx. 10m back from the rear boundary of properties along Lorrett Close and approx. 15m from the rear boundaries of Putton Farm Cottages on Lower Putton Lane, with a separation distance of more than 20m between the existing and proposed built form at Lorretts Close and Putton Farm Cottages. Owing to the higher finished floor levels of plots 83-86 compared to the existing development, proposed units would sit at a higher position to properties along Lorretts Close and Putton Farm Cottages with a ridge height of between 3.6m and 4.8m higher than that of existing dwellinghouses. Notwithstanding this, given the significant set back distances and the orientation of the proposed dwellings, it is not considered that the proposed development would unduly dominate or significantly compromise the light, privacy and general amenity of existing occupiers to warrant refusal of the application.

14.7.10. This relationship of proposed properties sitting on higher ground to existing development continues along the length of Lower Putton Lane owing to the topography of the site. The ridge height of plot 87, which is positioned approx. 9.1m from the nearest boundary of properties along Lower Putton Lane would have a ridge height approx. 2.8m higher than the ridge height of no. 8 Putton Lane Cottages. In this instance the difference in ridge height is noteworthy, but less severe and there would be a separation distance of approx. 17.7m between the built form of dwellinghouses such that this relationship would be acceptable.

14.7.11. Differences in ridge height between existing and proposed development increases further along Lower Putton Lane owing to the 1 or 1 ½ storey nature of existing

properties, though properties also sit further back in their plot from the development site. For example, the difference in ridge height between the apartment block (units 96-99) and the chalet bungalow at 18 Putton Lane would be approx. 5.5m. This difference is in part a result of the topography of the site, but also a consequence of 2 storey properties abutting 1 and ½ storey development. The apartment block would be positioned approx. 11m from the boundary of properties at Lower Putton Lane with a separation distance of more than 25m between the built form of development. As the development extends south past Lower Putton Lane, there continues to be a difference in ridge heights given the single storey nature of the bungalow at the corner of Lower Putton Lane. In this regard there is a difference of approx. 4.9m between the ridge height of plot 100 and the bungalow at 17 Lower Putton Lane. Here, plot 100 would be set back approx. 20m for the boundary of no. 17, and would not affect the main outlook of this property. As such, the relationship between properties here is considered to be acceptable.

14.7.12. While there are noteworthy differences in height between proposed dwellings and the existing built form, either resulting from the topographical changes or owing to differences in building heights (and in some places a combination of both), owing to the set back distances of the proposed dwellings, it is not considered that proposed properties would be significantly overbearing in their impact or that they would significantly compromise the light, privacy and general amenity of existing occupiers to warrant refusal of the application. Full details of levels, including sections through the existing development, would be required by condition in the interest of safeguarding the residential amenity of existing occupiers.

14.7.13. Residential amenity: Phase A – impact on future occupiers

14.7.14. Careful consideration has been given to the siting of properties, placement of windows and management of levels on site to avoid overlooking and loss of light. In terms of window placement and positioning of properties, no significant issues are raised, with appropriate boundary treatments providing privacy at ground floor, and properties positioned so as to avoid loss of light or overbearing impacts.

14.7.15. In terms of the nationally described space standards, all properties have access to a separate storage space, accessed from the street making provision for bins/cycles/prams, as well as adequate storage within the properties. Rooms are appropriately sized and meet the necessary widths and floor areas required by the Technical Standards, in accordance with the provisions of Local Plan Policy ENV12. The living space within the one bed dwellinghouse at plot 85, due to its positioning at the end of a terrace, has less restricted openings meaning that the open plan space at the front of the property is well lit, but as it extends to the back of the property it would benefit from less natural light. This property also, while benefiting from a small garden area, would not have direct access to its outdoor space from the property. While these aspects are less ideal, it is not considered that the living conditions would be compromised to such an extent that this would be reason to refuse. Overall, the proposed scheme would provide appropriate living spaces well served by natural light and with an outlook from all habitable spaces, such that the scheme is considered to accord with the provisions set out in Policy ENV16. All dwellinghouses would have access to a garden. Garden sizes range from generous (approx.13.9.m by 15.8m (plot 10)) to small but adequate (approx. 5.5m by 7.8m (plot 43) and 3.6m by 7m (plot 85 and 86), with most gardens sizes falling somewhere within this range. No individual garden space is provided to serve the apartments which is regrettable. The Urban Design Officer recommends that where appropriate to the street scene, apartment blocks could be reorientated to provide ground floor apartments with an area of private amenity space, and that balconies positioned to the rear of apartments could provide an open aspect for upper floor apartments. In this respect LP policy HOUS4 seeks that sufficient private amenity space (it recommends 20% of the site area) is provided to serve flats. It is

regrettable that the scheme does not cater for this. The latest revisions (June 2026) do amend the siting of one block to better respond to the street, providing more space to the rear, and adds ornamental hedging to better define communal green open space, but the revisions do not go so far as to address the Urban Design Officer comments or the requirements of policy HOUS4 in respect of providing individual plots with private amenity space. Accepting that the apartment blocks would on the whole have some limited green space around them and have access to the open space to be provided within the scheme, the impact on future occupiers is lessened; it is nonetheless a matter to be weighed in the planning balance.

14.7.16. Various layouts adopting different approaches to managing levels have been submitted prior to the latest submission which have been fraught with issues. In addition to urban design and placemaking issues, these have frequently led to significant retaining features within close proximity to properties combined with terracing and rollovers within garden spaces making them less usable, substantial stepped entry to access properties, and inconvenient access to parking, to the detriment of the residential amenity of future occupiers. The latest submission seeks to address some of these issues, but in doing so other issues present. The most significant and influential changes includes the reduction in housing numbers, the realignment of the layout to better work with the contours of the site (all retaining features within phase A run along the contours of the site east-west), and the provision of crib walls at the rear of gardens to manage levels outside of the street scene. This has presented a number of benefits in terms of placemaking, as well as amenity benefits in terms of providing more usable garden areas and avoiding uncomfortable retaining features within immediate proximity to properties. The consequence of seeking to manage all level changes at the rear of plots is the resulting height of retaining features proposed, ranging from 0.4m to 4.8m at its highest, far greater than previous iterations. The retaining features would have a 1.8m timber fence above, providing the rear boundary to the properties at the higher level resulting in a substantial feature (at its maximum 6.6m in height) and positioned approx. 10m from the rear elevation of properties. For perspective, this would be approx. 1.2m lower than the eaves height of some properties. While this is the most significant example, consideration has to be given to the effect of this on the amenity of future occupiers, as this would be an imposing feature to have at the rear of your garden. In order to soften the impact of the proposed retaining features, it is proposed that the retaining features would comprise crib walls, that would be planted up to provide a green backdrop. Crib walls comprise a cellular structure, constructed of either timber of concrete, which would gently grade back with the slope away from the property. It is proposed that planting would be incorporated within the cellular structure to soften what would otherwise be a hard boundary. The retaining walls would be sited to the north of properties, so would be unlikely to affect direct sunlight.

14.7.17. Whilst presenting a more usable garden space that would not be compromised by significant terracing, the provision of such significant retaining features to the rear of dwellings is less than ideal and could be overbearing. The retaining wall would certainly present a dominant feature to the rear of properties and would no doubt affect the feel of rear garden spaces by reducing the openness of those spaces, and would also alter the rear outlook from living spaces, negatively impacting upon residential amenity. As to whether such a feature would have a ‘significant’ negative impact on the amenity of future occupiers having regard to Local Plan policy ENV16 is perhaps more difficult to conclude. The retaining walls would be set back from the rear of properties, would grade away, and the design of the crib walling would allow a ‘green wall’ to establish which would go some way to softening the impact. Future occupiers would be fully aware of the presence of the crib wall prior to purchasing and would have the opportunity to review whether its presence would be of concern

to them or not. Occupiers if they so wished could swap the planting for their own and would benefit from a level garden. It is considered that the provision of 1.8m fencing would prevent overlooking and loss of privacy between neighbours. The presence of significant retaining features to the rear of properties certainly weighs against the proposal and will need to be weighed against the benefits of managing levels within plots as opposed to in the public realm. These matters all need to be weighed in the wider planning balance in terms of delivering development on this steeply sloping site.

14.7.18. All properties are proposed to include air source heat pumps. No details of the air source heat pumps have been provided, and it will be necessary to seek details of these prior to their installation to ensure that they meet the Microgeneration Installations Standards: MCS-20 having regard to their sound output. Subject to details of the air source heat pumps first being agreed, taking into account their positioning relative to openings of habitable rooms, and boundary treatments between neighbours, it is not considered that the proposed air source heat pumps would significantly compromise the amenity of future occupiers, having regard to occupiers of the property and neighbouring occupiers.

14.7.19. Amenity: Outline element

14.7.20. Limited detail has been provided relating to detailed layout and design of properties for the outline elements of the scheme. Nonetheless, from the indicative layout, it is considered that the quantum of development proposed would be acceptable and would enable appropriate levels of amenity to be achieved. Further detailed consideration of matters relating to the relationship of properties, windows and so forth is reserved for subsequent consideration.

14.7.21. Having regard to the position of phase B relative to the golf course, it is necessary to consider potential impacts, both in terms of impacts upon the development and future occupiers resulting from potential ball strike from the golf course, and impacts upon the running of the golf course which could be compromised due to a more sensitive use being introduced on the adjoining land thereby increasing safety implications resulting from potential ball strike (the indirect impacts on the golf course is referred to as the agent of change principle). Para 200 of the NPPF highlights this as a material planning consideration.

14.7.22. At the time of allocation and as part of the Local Plan Review, neither the golf course nor Sport England objected to the site being allocated within the Local Plan, and no specific comments were made in relation to the Chickerell allocation within the 2021 consultation review regarding concerns over the relationship of the site with the golf course. However, as part of the current application Sport England has made representation raising concerns regarding the impact of development on the golf course due to risk of ball strike. It is thus appropriate for the developer to consider mitigation measures to protect the development from the impacts of golf strike.

14.7.23. To fully assess the level of risk, two ball strike assessments were submitted in line with the advice from Sport England. The initial golf strike assessment found (taking into account the type of golf course and type of player, together with the format and profile of the course) that there was a ‘significant’ risk of a ball surpassing the boundary. The trajectory suggested balls would be between the height of 4 and 30m (30m max height). It noted that 30m fencing would not stop all golf balls but would significantly reduce their frequency. The second report looked at whether a lower fence of 5 or 10m would be suitable. That report concluded that this would not be a practicable solution to reduce the risk posed by balls surpassing the boundary. The submitted strike assessments seek to take a balanced and proportionate approach to assessing risk. Accepting that all risk can’t be ruled out and accepting there is a risk in everyday activities, the advice looks to reduce risk following good practicable health and safety principles considering likelihood and severity.

14.7.24. In an effort to mitigate the impacts, the developer proposed a 30m high golf net between the development site and golf course, taking on board the recommendations of the golf strike assessment. Following consultation on the revised plans, and through careful consideration of the resulting impacts of such a high fence, the proposed 30m high fencing was considered unacceptable by Officers in terms of the visual amenity, landscape and ecological impacts associated with its provision (these concerns are discussed in greater detail within the consultation replies to those plans).

14.7.25. Following consideration of the strike assessments, the developer was asked to provide a more detailed risk assessment which sought to better quantify the risks to enable further consideration of the issues. A further golf risk assessment was submitted which provided a more detailed review of the likelihood of balls surpassing the boundary at different heights depending upon the angle and speed of the shot. It considers the greatest risk to site boundaries relates to an iron shot on hole 7 and driver shot on hole 8, where the report indicates a risk of the ball surpassing the site boundary.

14.7.26. In respect of an iron shot on hole 7, at a worst case scenario (that is if hit at 135mph and at an angle of 12 degrees) there is a risk of the ball surpassing the boundary at a height of 20m (with no mitigation). The report does not attempt to predict the likelihood of such a strike. The report recommends a fence of up to 16.5m would reduce the risk from ball strike by 20%.

14.7.27. In respect of a driver shot on hole 8, at a worst case scenario (that is if hit at 167mph and at an angle of 11.9 degrees), this shows that there is a risk of the ball surpassing the boundary at a height of approx. 24m (with no mitigation). The report does not attempt to predict the likelihood of such a strike. The report recommends a fence of up to 20.5m would reduce the risk by 20%. The difference in hight to reduce the risk to 40% is not significant.

14.7.28. The latest assessment reveals a 30m high fence would not be required as first predicted, which is welcomed, however Officers continue to share significant concerns surrounding the acceptability of fencing up to 20.5m in height. It is understood that these recommendations are based on worst case scenarios, but taking the median results, it is noted that fencing of a significant height is still recommended to minimise risk. It is also clear from the latest report, that to reduce the height of the fencing to as low as 10m for example, as assessed under Risk Assessment 2 (V3), fencing at this height would only capture a very limited number of strikes.

14.7.29. In an effort to address the issues and in line with Officer advice in the interests of seeking a resolution, the developer has reviewed other potential options such as working with the golf club to reprofile/reorganise tees/holes within the site and/or provide fencing of a reduced height closer to the tees in an effort to mitigate the impacts in a more sensitive manner. It is incumbent on the LPA to seek the most sensitive solution, and having regard to the risk assessment and its recommendations, it was considered reasonable that this be explored as an option. If an appropriate solution could be reached and all parties were willing to sign up to a legal agreement to secure such measures, this could have presented a more sensitive solution, however, no agreement has been reached with the golf course in this respect.

14.7.30. There are a number of competing considerations here, and these include the need for housing delivery and other policy considerations, matters of safety (a material planning consideration), and the impact upon third party land (the agent of change principle). It is not for the planning system to rule out all risk, that would be an impossible task as everyday life carries risk, but safety is a material planning consideration, and it is relevant to consider the level of risk, what measures can be

put in place to moderate that risk, and to weigh up whether matters around safety are significant such that they outweigh housing need in this case.

14.7.31. In the absence of an acceptable solution to mitigate the impacts of golf strike on the development, and in seeking to strike an appropriate balance between managing risk and delivering housing, Officers have advised that careful consideration needs to be given to land use within the area of impact identified within the risk assessment, and any dwellings within the impact zone should be removed.

14.7.32. The later more detailed risk assessment indicates likely impact zones from golf strike and the developer has shown these on a golf ball trajectory plan. This shows that the central avenue and associated pedestrian and cycle routes would fall outside of the area of risk, such that there would be no reasonable grounds to refuse the principle of development, subject to risk being appropriately managed on site. Officers consider that the risk of ball strike from hole 7 would be limited to the area proposed as a drainage basin within the southern extent of phase B. The risk of ball strike from hole 8 would however extend across the area of public open space and proposed trim trail within the eastern extent of phase B as, shown on the indicative plans submitted Mar 2026. It is considered that providing public open space within the area would not be an appropriate way to manage and reduce risk, placing future occupiers at risk from ball strike. To address this it is recommended that the final landscape plans for this area (which fall within the outline element of the scheme) should show this area planted up in a way that discourages public access and which could provide biodiversity benefits. Signage should also be erected to alert passers by of the potential risk. The developer is agreeable to these amendments, and it is recommended that conditions be placed on any consent to require the submission of a golf strike mitigation strategy.

14.7.33. Having given careful consideration to the appropriateness and feasibility of mitigation features at the site taking into account the resultant impacts of such measures, and having carefully reviewed the level of risk and the proposed land use of those areas subject to high levels of risk, it is considered that through revisions within the layout of the scheme, significant risk can be avoided by ensuring public access and housing is kept away from those areas most at risk. While all risk cannot be ruled out, it is considered that the developer has done all they can to reduce and moderate the risk, such that the benefits of progressing the site for development would outweigh the harm, both in terms of safety within the site, and in terms of impacts upon the neighbouring golf course.

14.7.34. <u>Amenity: Whole site – Noise impacts</u>

14.7.35. Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement reviews the potential effects of noise from surrounding land uses on future occupants together with the effects of the development on surrounding noise-sensitive receptors.

14.7.36. To address noise during construction, in the interests of the amenity of neighbouring residents, the Environmental Statement makes a number of recommendations. These include careful consideration of plant and machinery type, and use of hoardings to minimise noise from construction, together with the adoption of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), which would be expected to detail construction hours in respect of noisy activities, require the public display of site contacts, detail waste management plans, and mitigation measures as appropriate. The CEMP should take into account the effects from noise, vibration, odour and dust on the amenity of nearby residents, and in line with the advice of Environmental Protection, should form a condition of any consent. The Environmental Statement concludes that with appropriate mitigation and control measures in place potential noise and vibration effects would be reduced to an acceptable level for residential development.

14.7.37. On the above basis, Environmental Protection raise no objection in this regard, and with a CEMP in place, and bearing in mind the temporary nature of the construction stage, the impacts of construction are considered to be within the acceptable range, and would not be reason to refuse the development.

14.7.38. In terms of the effects from activities arising from other land uses, the site sits adjacent to an existing electricity sub station, with an Open Cycle Gas Turbine (OCGT) to provide supplementary electricity for the grid when needed. It also sits adjacent to a nearby solar farm, and to a committee approved site for a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS). Other noise sources include nearby roads and the proposed school site.

14.7.39. In terms of noise generated by increased traffic on nearby roads, the Environmental Statement considers the impacts of noise would not cause significant adverse impacts. In terms of the nearby solar farm, the Environmental Statement considers the impacts from noise generated by the inverter containers on the proposed development and, following noise monitoring, finds no adverse impacts associated with the operation of the solar farm. These findings are accepted by Environmental Protection who raise no objection in respect of these elements.

14.7.40. Planning permission for a Battery Energy Storage System (application P/FUL/2023/04657) located on land to the north east of the proposed development was granted Jan 2025. Given the approved status of this application, the BESS is a material planning consideration. A noise assessment was prepared to accompany the planning application for the BESS, which considers the potential impacts upon the proposed development. The assessment concluded that the operation of the BESS would not result in a potential for adverse noise impacts within the residential development, subject to mitigation measures. Conditions are attached to the grant of planning permission, specifying numerical limits on BESS noise emissions at that development's site boundary, requiring any mitigation necessary to achieve those limits, and requiring operational noise monitoring tests to confirm that these limits are not being exceeded. Given the measures secured under that consent, it is considered that future occupiers of the proposed development would be appropriately safeguarded from unacceptable levels of noise.

14.7.41. The Environmental Statement provides calculations to support the position that noise from the electricity sub station would be acceptable, and its findings on this specific issue and in relation to current noise sources on this site are accepted.

14.7.42. The above noted, para 200 of the NPPF sets out the importance of ensuring that new development can be integrated effectively with existing businesses and, in this regard, the NPPF is clear that existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed upon them as a result of development permitted after they were established (known as the 'agent of change' principle). As set out in Para 009 of Planning Practice Guidance (Noise):

14.7.43. *'….the agent of change will need to take into account not only the current activities that may cause a nuisance, but also those activities that businesses or other facilities are permitted to carry out, even if they are not occurring at the time of the application being made….*'

14.7.44. This important point is considered in detail by Environmental Protection.

14.7.45. The question of whether unforeseen (but legitimate in planning terms) changes could occur at the existing substation under permitted development, but which could present significant additional noise to the proposed new dwellings is considered by Environmental Protection. The applicant's report outlines that in the past an OCGT was legitimately (in planning terms) added to the substation, and this was noisy, and led to complaints from nearby residents. SSE responded to concerns by employing an acoustic consultant and by enclosing the OCGT in an acoustically designed

building. This demonstrates two points, 1) it is thus foreseeable that additional noise generating infrastructure could be introduced at the site, and 2) with appropriate mitigation, the effects of noise from such equipment can be reduced to acceptable levels (confirmed by the Environmental Statement, and informed by a noise assessment).

14.7.46. Environmental Protection have reviewed these matters closely, having regard to the level or risk, ability for the operator to moderate noise, and the effects from the agent of change. Planning guidance clearly conveys the principle that the planning regime should not seek to unnecessarily manage matters that another regime already address'. It is thus relevant to consider the remit of Statutory Nuisance, with the two regimes intersecting over matters such as noise. Environmental Protection advise that whilst the two regimes differ in terms of their legal concepts and point of engagement, their common aim in terms of noise is a material consideration. Environmental Protection advise that under the Statutory Nuisance regime, utility operators will wish to demonstrate that they have exercised 'best practicable means' to avoid causing a nuisance, in order to provide a strong defence to any abatement notice, should one be issued due to a statutory noise nuisance being identified. It is thus in the operator's interests to mitigate the impacts of noise when introducing new equipment, otherwise such measures can be required under the Statutory Nuisance regime. In this respect, it is clearly possible that should an additional OCGT, or other noise emitting equipment, be introduced to the site, that noise can be mitigated to an acceptable level, as this is demonstrated by the presence of the existing OCGT on site, and acoustic reports carried out which indicate acceptable noise levels. The utility operators will wish to use 'best practicable means' to mitigate noise, and if not, such measures could be reasonably legally required. It is thus considered possible for additional equipment required as part of the operation of the substation site to be brought on to the site, and for noise to be appropriately mitigated, with the added safeguard of the statutory nuisance regime if not, to safeguard future occupants. Given the proximity of the site to existing residential areas, the requirement to employ appropriate mitigation when introducing noisy equipment would not be considered to be an unreasonable expectation or restriction on the operator.

14.7.47. Weighing up the matters, and having regard to the 'agent of change' principle, while it is perhaps impossible to rule out all risks of unforeseen noise, when considering the levels of such risk, the significance of the statutory nuisance regime, and the reasonableness to expect mitigation measures to be employed by the operator, on balance, Environmental Protection do not consider it reasonable to require changes to dwellings design, or to refuse the application, having regard to the 'agent of change' principle. It follows, that the proposed development is not considered to place unreasonable restrictions upon the operations of the sub-station, with appropriate acoustic mitigation considered a reasonable consideration for the operator. It is also relevant that no objection has been received from SSE (the current operators) to the latest consultation.

14.7.48. Having regard to cumulative impact on background noise levels, the Environmental Assessment fails to fully consider the possibility that different noise sources might combine to have a greater effect, and there is a lack of explicit clarity in the Noise report about this issue. To better understand the likely cumulative impacts, Environmental Protection have offered comment:

*"Whilst this is of course acoustically quite conceivable, the question is whether such combination effects might be significant. I've looked in careful detail at the locations of the various sources in relation to the proposed dwelling locations and considered this in mathematical acoustic terms. I think in fact that the likelihood that such a phenomenon would be significant here is very low; whilst it would have been useful t*o have greater clarity in the report, that of itself does not merit refusing the

application on this point. Therefore on this specific point I have no adverse comment."

14.7.49. In light of the above, Environmental Protection raise no objection, subject to a suitably worded condition to require a CEMP to address air quality and noise during construction. Owing to noise levels from surrounding uses being assessed as low and within acceptable ranges, it is not considered that the amenity of future occupiers would be significantly affected to warrant either additional mitigation measures on site, or refusal of the scheme. In this regard the application has been reviewed in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance (noise), and other relevant nationally recognised acoustic standards / criteria, and the Dorset Council Local Plan Policy ENV16, and it is considered that noise has been satisfactorily addressed when considered in the context of all material considerations.

14.7.50. Amenity: Conclusion

14.7.51. It is not considered that the proposed development would significantly detract from the residential amenity of existing occupiers through loss of light, privacy, noise or general amenity, in accordance with policy LP policy ENV16. The presence of significant retaining features to the rear of properties would however compromise the rear garden space and outlook for future occupiers and this matter will need to be weighed in the balance having regard to the benefits of managing levels within plots as opposed to in the public realm.

14.7.52. Sufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the impacts of ball strike would be limited to a small area to the east of the development site such that the principle of development is acceptable and the quantum of housing proposed is considered achievable.

14.7.53. While all risk cannot be ruled out, it is considered that the developer has done all they can to reduce and moderate the risk, such that the benefits of progressing the site for development would outweigh the harm, both in terms of safety within the site, and in terms of impacts upon the neighbouring golf course.

14.7.54. Owing to noise levels from surrounding uses being assessed as low and within acceptable ranges, it is not considered that the amenity of future occupiers would be significantly affected.

14.8. Impact on the visual amenity of the area/Landscape Impact

14.8.1. Visual and Landscape Impact: Setting

14.8.2. The application site lies to the east of the built development of Chickerell, within the Weymouth Lowlands National landscape character area and Ridge and Vale local character area. The site falls outside of the designated Dorset National Landscape, but falls within its setting at approx. 700m from its boundary to the west.

14.8.3. The National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CRoW) 2000, sets out the general duty of Local Planning Authorities in relation to AONB's/National Landscapes and para 85 (1) states the following:

14.8.4. In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty. This duty applies to designated National Landscapes (former AONBs; the terminology of which is considered interchangeable having regard to local and national policy references).

14.8.5. Policy ENV1 of the WDWP Local Plan seeks to safeguard the natural beauty of the landscape. In this regard, policy ENV1 states the following:

14.8.6. Development which would harm the character, special qualities or natural beauty of the Dorset Area of Outstanding Beauty or Heritage Coast, including its characteristic landscape quality and diversity, uninterrupted panoramic views, individual landmarks, and sense of tranquillity and remoteness, will not be permitted.

14.8.7. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places great weight on conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty, offering National Landscapes/AONB's the highest status of protection in relation to these issues (para 189 of the NPPF).

14.8.8. The site comprises agricultural land that has been allocated within the Local Plan for development, with the exception of the site's most northern extent which falls outside of the allocation. This most northern extent of land forms part of a large piece of land designated under NP policy CNP10 as Land of Local Landscape Importance (LLLI), in recognition that the land comprises a locally valued landscape. This sits at a high point towards the ridge to the north and provides a vantage point across the lower land to the south, with the remainder of the site sloping steeply down towards a small watercourse before rising and falling again as the site extends south. LP policy ENV3 seeks to safeguard green infrastructure, such as LLLI's from harm.

14.8.9. To review the wider visual impacts related to development of the site, including its impact upon the setting of the National Landscape, an updated Environmental Statement (ES) has been submitted and includes an updated Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). Also included within the ES is an arboricultural assessment, context baseline views and photo views, internal site views, and photomontage viewpoints (dated Oct 2024). While the Landscape Officer has not offered detailed comment within the latest consultation, the Landscape Officer was previously content with the viewpoint photography and the viewpoint coverage within the area, which has been undertaken regarding best practice. The photomontages offer a guide to visual impact but it is understood that these have not been updated to reflect the latest iteration of the scheme, having been prepared in 2024 relating to an earlier revision. These will not therefore represent the additional landscaping proposed nor will they respond to the reduction in storey heights. In this regard the Landscape Officer recognises that the proposed east-west band of planting proposed within phase A would provide a green link running across the development, and would assist in breaking up longer-distance views from the south, for example from Lane House Rocks Road. This will not however be evident in the photomontages. It is also noted that housing has been modelled with the same elevational treatment and roof type, and so does not offer a full representation of the proposed scheme as a result, portraying a uniform treatment across the site. The photomontages therefore need to be treated with caution.

14.8.10. The LVIA, forming part of the ES, nonetheless concludes that the proposed development would not result in significant effects on landscape character, including the Dorset National Landscape. In turn, the LVIA concludes that the proposed development would not result in significant effects on visual amenity at representative viewpoints located in the wider landscape, during any phase of the proposed development. The LVIA concludes that short lengths of existing footpaths which cross the application site would experience a 'major' and 'significant' effects during the construction phase and at year 1. By year 15, the LVIA concludes that the effect would reduce to 'moderate' as the proposed green infrastructure within the application site establishes and matures. No potential significant cumulative effects with other development in the area were found. The Landscape Officer has not raised a principle objection to the development of the site, and the land is allocated for housing within the Local Plan.

14.8.11. The National Landscape Officer is content with the conclusions of the LVIA regarding impact upon the National Landscape and provides the following advice:

14.8.12. *The site is within the setting of Dorset National Landscape, at approximately 755-850m from its boundary. The LVIA concludes that impacts on the defining characteristics of the National Landscape would not be significant during construction, operation and in the long term. Visual effects on users of Public Rights of Way within the National Landscape, including the South Dorset Ridgeway, are also assessed as not significant, owing to intervening topography, vegetation and distance, with the development not breaking the skyline nor altering key panoramic views. It is noted that Footpath S16/37 (Viewpoint11) would experience a moderate effect. This is the most substantial foreseeable effect on the National Landscape, although it is not considered significant given the site's relationship with surrounding built development. Overall, it is our opinion that the proposal is unlikely to result in undue harm to the setting of the Dorset National Landscape.*

14.8.13. Visual and Landscape Impact: Policy considerations

14.8.14. Having regard to the part of the site that is designated LLLI, the policy seeks that the land should be protected for its qualities, including its ability to provide long range views towards the National Landscape to the west; its function to provide a rural setting to the built up development, acting as a 'green wedge'; and its links with the wildlife corridor to the south, safeguarded by NP Policy CNP4. Provision is made for the inclusion of the central avenue and the policy supports opportunities taken to enhance the landscape features, biodiversity and informal recreational use of the land.

14.8.15. Local Plan policies ENV1 (landscape, seascape and sites of geological interest), ENV10 (the landscape and townscape setting) and ENV11 (the pattern of streets and spaces) seek to ensure developments contribute positively to the character of the area, contributing to local identity and distinctiveness, seeks the conservation, retention and enhancement of natural features and that appropriate soft and hard landscaping is secured, and seeks that streets and spaces are well defined, safe and pleasant.

14.8.16. Para 135 (b) and (e) of the NPPF seeks that developments 'are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;' and '*optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks*'. Para 136 states that '*trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments (such as parks and community orchards), that appropriate measures are in place to secure the long-term maintenance of newly-planted trees, and that existing trees are retained wherever possible….*'.

14.8.17. Two key characteristics identified within the National Design Guide that influences good design are 'nature' and 'public spaces'. In this regard the Design Guide recognises that nature contributes to the quality of a place and people's quality of life. It recommends that natural features including natural and designed landscapes, high quality public open spaces, street trees, and other trees, grass, planting and water are integrated into development to form well designed places. It recognised that public spaces can take different forms are the setting for most movement. The design of a public space encompasses its setting and integration into the wider network of routes and should incorporate trees and other planting for people to enjoy, whilst also providing shade, and air quality and climate change mitigation.

14.8.18. These objectives are supported by Local Plan policies ENV1 (iii) which requires appropriate measures to be in place to moderate the adverse effects of development on the landscape, ENV10 (ii) which requires the retention and protection of trees,

and policy CHIC2 which requires strategic planting to be carried out in advance of the site being developed … to reduce the impacts of the development on longer views. It states '*This to include a connecting corridor of semi- natural green space along the eastern margin of the allocation and biodiversity enhancement. A network of open green spaces, for amenity /recreation and drainage purposes, should run through the development and link to the open countryside'.*

14.8.19. NP policy CNP11 also sets out a number of expectations having regard to general design principles. It expects that development should enhance the local landscape character, and expects regard to be given to the retention and inclusion of hedgerows, trees, grass verges, informal greens and gardens to promote a generally 'green feel' to streets and spaces within the built-up areas – both through the retention of existing site features and the introduction of new elements.

14.8.20. In line with the provisions of LP policy CHIC2, a strategic landscape masterplan has been submitted. This indicates a connecting ecological corridor and a network of open space together with varying types of soft landscaping. No detailed landscape drawings including planting schedules indicating size and densities of planting have been submitted with the latest submission, though a 'concept on-plot' drawing has been submitted providing an indicative planting palette comprising small-scale trees, specimen shrubs, ornamental hedgerows, and ornamental shrub/herbaceous planting.

14.8.21. To help achieve the policy objectives relating to landscaping, advice has been provided by Officers and Landscape specialist from Design South West. Design South West advised that the layout should be developed to create more multi-functional east-west links across the site to connect the development into the existing settlement as well as the surrounding green assets.

14.8.22. They recommend using the local high point to capitalise on local views and recommend the location and layout of open spaces and landscaping be informed by further examination of local topography. In this regard they advise as follows: '*The gateway to the north can work harder in terms of placemaking and celebrating the topography. Here, the natural high point could be developed as a landscape space e.g. a grove of robust evergreen trees – which could work as a transition to the wider ridgeline beyond the site as well as shelter more vulnerable deciduous natives. There are opportunities to enhance the character of this locally valued area of landscape'*.

14.8.23. Design South West also recommended revisiting the location of community areas and play to ensure that it is strategically placed to optimise movement corridors. In this regard they advise as follows:

14.8.24. 'The parcel of unmanaged land adjacent to Mariners Way, currently proposed for homes, has great potential to provide an area of natural play as well as delivering biodiversity net gain uplift'; 'We suggested reviewing the location of the proposed village green. There is potential to move this focal point to a more strategic position where pedestrian movement will be at its greatest, en-route to the proposed school, and where it can serve as an asset to both the new and to create a green, pedestrian gateway from the town. Locating the village green at the west end of Lower Putton Lane, would capitalise on a sheltered position within the site'.

14.8.25. Consideration will be given to matters of visual amenity/landscape impact in two parts, first consideration will be given to the general layout as a whole, and second consideration will be given to the detailed element of the scheme.

14.8.26. <u>Visual and Landscape Impact: Strategic landscaping</u>

14.8.27. As part of Phase A an area of open space would be provided within the northern portion of the site, capitalising on available views from the higher ground designated

as LLLI and providing a green entrance into the site. In this regard, the submitted plans seek to restrict development within this area, save for the central avenue, and to take opportunities to enhance the landscape and ecological value of this area through provision of planting, and to support informal recreational through the provision of footpath links. It is considered that the proposed landscape led approach to this area of LLLI responds appropriately to its valued qualities set out within NP policy CNP10. The footpath links would enable people to pass through the green space and appreciate its elevated position offering vantage points across the development site, and the retention of the area as a green space responds appropriately to its function as a rural backdrop to development in the area. It is considered that the treatment of this local high point largely responds to the advice by Design South West, though views from the high point have not been tested. The Landscape Officer advises that the scattered tree planting within this area would create a green and pleasant space but recommends that more could be done in terms of placemaking in this area in terms of sheltered areas for benches and a recognised viewpoint. It is considered that these features could reasonably be incorporated, and it is recommended that this is addressed through a condition seeking hard landscape details.

14.8.28. Overall, proposed planting within this area, which wraps around and extends along the eastern boundary of the site to connect with the wildlife corridor to the south would enhance the biodiversity and landscape value of the space, and the area would provide a soft green entrance into the development site from Chickerell with two feature trees shown at the entrance of the development. Buildings abutting this area of open space would be two storey in height and while lighting would be required along the central avenue, through minimising the built form in this area, light spillage would be kept to a minimum. Having regard to the requirements of NP policy CNP10, it is considered that the layout of the site takes into account the provisions set out and responds appropriately to the LLLI designation.

14.8.29. A wide east-west green ‘corridor’ (in excess of 30m width in places) is proposed to the south of the most northern block of housing, separating the northern-most development block from the block to the immediate south. This green corridor would accommodate a proposed native species hedgerow which, although segregated by the central avenue, would otherwise extend from the western boundary of the site to an existing hedgerow running along the northern boundary of phase C and connecting with the eastern boundary of the site. The area would provide wildflower meadowed grassland with tree planting, largely comprising a mix of large forest type trees, including Oak, Hornbeam and Field Maple along the edge. The Landscape Officer advises that the tree planting appears somewhat ‘scattered’ in terms of its layout and species selection, comprising a mix of native and ornamental planting, and recommends that the species selection, in particular the two Royal Red trees proposed, is reviewed for this area to ensure that they respond appropriately to the landscape setting while ensuring they support the proposed ecological enhancements across the corridor. The submitted Landscape Plans show a commitment to planting, and revised landscape plans show the removal of the Royal Red from this area and their replacement with Oaks in response to the Landscape Officer’s concerns and in line with advice provided. It is considered that final details of species selection, size and densities could be secured by condition to ensure an appropriate mix of tree planting is provided which addresses concerns raised by the Landscape Officer. Subject to securing any revisions and/or planting schedules, it is considered that this green link would offer pause within the built form and promote a ‘green feel’ to spaces in line with NP policy CNP11 while providing a wildlife corridor in the interests of enhancing biodiversity, in accordance with NP policy CNP12.

14.8.30. A smaller east-west green corridor is provided at the pedestrian entrance to the site from School Hill, running along the line of an existing hedgerow to be retained and

which would connect to the eastern boundary of the site. This hedgerow would be enhanced with woodland planting and native shrub planting and together with a small pocket of green space to the east of Mariners Way would provide a multi-functional green link at this pedestrian entrance, connecting with the settlement to the west and footpath links to the east, while creating a space for people to gather and offering biodiversity benefits through provision of a wildlife corridor. It is considered that this directly takes on board advice by Design South West.

14.8.31. A number of large specimen trees, comprising two Oaks, are proposed within the green space amongst other trees including Field Maple together with woodland planting, native shrub planting and wildflower meadow offering biodiversity benefits and a 'green feel' to the space. This area would enable the retention of existing hedgerows while offering opportunities for play. While tucked away from the main thoroughfare, its location adjacent to an east-west pedestrian link and footpath into the site, and its connection north-south by proposed footpath links offers logic to its placement, and responds to the advice of Design South West. Overall, it is considered that this space responds well to site constraints and would contribute positively to the character of the area. No objection is raised by the Landscape Officer regarding the landscape treatment of this space.

14.8.32. A further east-west green corridor runs to the immediate north of Footpath S16/21, to the south of phase A and phase C development, segregated by the central avenue. This is a substantial area within the development site and a key location for movement and activity, adjacent to the Lower Putton Lane pedestrian entrance, north of the school and providing footpath links to the east of Chickerell. The Landscape Officer notes that the open space within this area would be significantly physically and visually impacted by the dominance of drainage basins and earth embankments.

14.8.33. In response to concerns the developer has submitted revised plans (Jun 2026) together with a revised drainage strategy which would rely on a combined approach to managing water above and below ground. The revised plans show the removal of the two drainage basins within the gateway location south of phase A, to be replaced by underground tanked storage and a small swale running east-west within this space, and to remove the two most northern drainage basins within the public open space located south of phase C and east of the central avenue. It is considered that the revisions would better serve the development with a meaningful public open space, allow for improved movement links, and providing areas which could accommodate more meaningful tree/shrub planting to form an improved natural green link with swale that is integrated with the development and contributes positively to the character of the area. It is considered that such amendments would address the concerns raised by the Landscape Officer and takes on board advice by Design South West, such that the space could offer a high quality and valued community space within the scheme and offer enhanced opportunities for play. Revised plans indicate large specimen trees being incorporated into the area, including Oak, Willow, Beech and Alder, amongst smaller specimens including Hornbeam and Cherry, which would add interest, shade and enhance the quality of the green space. It is recommended that final planting details should be subject to condition to ensure appropriate landscaping and maintained surveillance of the public open spaces. It is recommended that the detailed design of the open spaces forms part of an Open Space Management Plan, secured by condition to ensure accordance with the Advice Note for Practical Design and Management of Greenspace' and in line with Secure by Design Guidance, taking on board the need to ensure appropriate surveillance, effective lighting, appropriate access and the provision of appropriate management arrangements in line with the advice of the Crime Prevention Design Advisor.

14.8.34. The southern entrance to the site will be influenced by the presence of the existing, albeit modified attenuation basins. These relate to basins serving the existing highway. Further attenuation basins are provided on approach to phase B. These will to some extent influence the character of the area, but will sit amongst larger species of trees, including Oak, together with a native woodland mix, native shrubs and marginal planting offering a naturalistic approach to the area. This approach follows the advice of Design South West and the Landscape Officer is supportive of the proposed landscaping at this southern entrance to the site.

14.8.35. Along the western edge of Phase A, and along the eastern edge of the site, north-south green corridors are formed providing connectivity with the east-west wildlife corridors and with the wildlife corridor to the south. These boundaries are on the whole enhanced with woodland planting and native shrubs, with some tree planting. Along the western edge of phase A a footpath link is provided within the green corridor, and the Landscape Officer raises concerns regarding the containment of this footpath link owing in particular to embankments proposed of unknown heights. This matter is considered in more detail at para 14.6.21. Advice is that the footpath link is surfaced in a less formal material such as bound gravel, as opposed to tarmac. It is considered that surfacing materials and treatment of footpaths could be dealt with through an appropriately worded condition.

14.8.36. <u>Visual and Landscape Impact: Street planting</u>

14.8.37. Para 136 makes clear the expectation that new streets should be tree lined, and this is supported by the National Design Guide which highlights their contribution to softening the impact of car parking while benefiting the environment and nature. Tree lined streets, with trees placed within the public realm as opposed to private ownership, is also a green flag within Building for a Healthy Life guidelines.

14.8.38. Turning to the central avenue, planting is shown within the verges either side of the vehicular route where space permits. The approach to planting along this route was reviewed by Design South West. In this respect they advised as follows:

14.8.39. *'The idea of a tree boulevard and use of single trees was discussed in detail, with the suggestion that a more clustered approach to tree planting may be more successful in terms of placemaking and especially given the microclimate. The potential value of copse and clumps of trees to maintain and re-enforce east/west connections (noting on site constraints re utilities and lighting requirements) was highlighted'.*

14.8.40. Notwithstanding the above advice, the approach to planting along the central avenue is to provide formal planting comprising on the whole a single species; field maple. The Landscape Officer advises that this is a medium-large compact tree frequently used for street plantings, and has previously advised that avenue planting comprising a single 'large canopy' species of tree such as the native Lime tree could be acceptable. However, following a design workshop with Design South West, this formal approach to provide 'avenue planting' conflicts with the latest advice provided by Design South West, who recommend a more naturalistic approach. It is considered this more naturalistic approach would provide greater opportunities to overcome constraints resulting from street lighting, allow placement of trees to best respond to ecological corridors and would better respond to the landscape character of the area. Further, reliance on a single species would not aid resilience to drought and/or disease. The Landscape Officer subsequently advises that the tree planting shown along the central avenue would not be appropriate taking on board Design South West's advice. The developer has offered a commitment to reviewing landscape details further and as such it is recommended that any grant of consent be subject to conditions requiring a revised landscape scheme to address treatment of the central avenue. It is recommended that if a formal approach be taken, a single larger specimen tree is used along the avenue, which would present a strong

‘identity and visual coherence; otherwise, it is recommended that a more naturalistic approach be taken to planting along the central avenue to build in resilience and provide a less formal approach.

14.8.41. In terms of on-plot planting, properties along the central avenue would consistently have an ornamental hedgerow at their frontage, often with ornamental shrub planting behind or less frequently ornamental gravel. This is carried through to several streets within the development, but not all, and the Landscape Officer raises concern regarding the subsequent lack of identity and character formed between development blocks as a result of inconsistent application of landscape treatment to plots. Provision of ornamental hedgerows to the fronts of properties is applied consistently within particular streets, but their provision appears to have little corelation between character areas or street typologies. On the whole, it is the connecting streets that appear to have been treated this way, with those streets which terminate with no through access tending to be planted with ornamental shrubs where no frontage parking exists.

14.8.42. Generally, where side boundaries front the street, and where crib walling terminates within the street, tall shrubs are proposed to assist screening and soften hard boundaries. Further details of how the crib walls will terminate within the street scene are sought by the Landscape Officer. Details of this should be agreed and can be dealt with at the condition stage.

14.8.43. Within internal streets, streets on the whole are tree lined, with trees on the whole provided within the public realm, strengthening their presence in the street and reducing risks of inconsistent maintenance by home owners. Street trees tend to be placed within the verges and contribute to breaking up and softening visitor parking within the street.

14.8.44. The developer has shown a commitment to increasing street trees through the submission of a revised planting plan for Phase A. In particular, this shows additional street trees provided to break up parking within the street, with frontage parking on the whole broken up every four to five spaces with tree planting, with the exception of plots 87-89. This is considered an improvement to the scheme.

14.8.45. To better assess the impacts of light spill within the development and to ensure all planting within streets is achievable, details of lighting have been sought. While matters surrounding the position and design of lighting are matters often left to post determination, having details up front would have enabled more detailed assessment of the likely impacts having regard to implications of lighting on both landscaping and ecological matters, and would have helped inform the landscape scheme. Street lighting needs to be provided in line with best practise and columns need to be spaced appropriately to provide appropriate lighting levels. To ensure there is no conflict between lighting columns and the canopy of trees, as well as ecological corridors, it would be necessary to have details of the lighting strategy. Due to this information not having been submitted, it is not possible for the Lighting Team or Landscape Officer to verify whether the Landscape Scheme shown would be achievable. Given the sensitivities of the site having regard to the LLLI and wildlife corridors and to ensure proposed landscaping is achievable, it is considered reasonable that a condition be placed on the consent requiring a full lighting strategy to be submitted, indicating the location of lighting columns relative to ‘dark wildlife corridors’ and mature canopy sizes in the interests of ensuring an appropriate and deliverable landscape scheme is secured, and in the interests of ensuring minimum light spill is achieved within the LLLI and ecological corridors.

14.8.46. <u>Visual and Landscape Impact: Rights of way</u>

14.8.47. In terms of incorporating the rights of way within the development, these would be subject to a rights of way diversion order. From an initial review of the planned

diversion, whilst it has not always been possible to avoid re-directing the footpaths along streets within the development, no footpath has been simply absorbed into estate roads. Footpath S16/21 is currently compromised at its western end by poor surfacing and its funnelled nature running along the backs of rear gardens. On leaving the built development of Chickerell, this footpath is currently predominantly rural in nature, albeit heavily influenced by the built form of the settlement, the electricity generating centre and electrical pylons it passes by. The proposed plans would see the resurfacing and upgrading of this footpath at its western extent. The proposed diversion would see this footpath transitioning from existing built form, into a proposed green link within the development site. It is likely the path would need to be directed along the central avenue, though only for a short stretch. Footpath S16/22 relates to a short connecting footpath between S16/21 and S16/23 which is entirely rural in nature. This route would be diverted around the perimeter of the site within the green wildlife corridor. This route would avoid the estate roads but the nature of the route would alter from running through open fields, to a more constrained footpath running within a green link between the existing and proposed development. Footpath S16/23 is rural in nature, but influenced by the built forms which surround it. This footpath would likewise be directed along a green wedge within the development avoiding estate roads on the whole. The Ramblers Association raise disappointment that the proposed footpath diversions would require walkers using footways alongside estate roads, and in some places cross the 'primary movement route'. While the character of the footways would alter as a result of the development, in terms of the longer footpath routes S16/21 and S16/23 this is only for a relatively short stretch, and by avoiding long stretches of estate roads, the rural nature of the path is not completely lost. Given the requirement for a north-south link it would not be possible for the footpaths to avoid crossing the central avenue, however safe crossing points would be essential to ensure ease of movement along the footpath route. It is considered that minor amendments to the placement of crossing points in line with a legible connectivity plan would be required and it is recommended that this is secured through condition.

14.8.48. The Rights of Way Team raise no objection subject to a condition requiring the submission of a Rights of Way Management Plan that covers the lifetime of the development. This shall include the provision for the design of access and public rights of way routes and their surfacing, widths, gradients, landscaping, and structures; any proposals for diversion and closures of public rights of way and alternative route provision; and should take on board advice contained on the recommended informative listed in their comments. It is considered that such a condition would be reasonable to ensure re-routed public rights of way are provided to an acceptable standard, and it is recommended that flexibility is built in to any such condition to ensure the Rights of Way Management Plan can be amended depending on the outcome of the footpath diversion order. It is recommended that this could be provided in addition to, or combined with, a Public Open Space Management Plan. It is considered that securing these matters through condition would also meet the requirements of the Environmental Mitigation Delivery Team.

14.8.49. In this interests of improving links into the development and in the interest of the amenity and visual experience of footpath users, a contribution of £20,000 is sought towards the upgrading of footpath S16/23 to improve pedestrian links with Weymouth, as sought under policy. This includes provision of two sleeper bridges, surfacing, and vegetation clearance. A contribution of £12,000 is sought towards the upgrading and resurfacing of footpath S16/21 which is currently in poor condition with uneven footing, to improve pedestrian links with the heart of Chickerell. It is considered that these contributions are directly related to the development and respond to requirements by LP policy CHIC2 to improve connectivity.

14.8.50. The Rights of Way Team also seek financial contributions of £45,000 towards the resurfacing of footpath S16/24. This footpath runs along the western perimeter of the site, outside of the application site itself, and is in good condition; it having been resurfaced and lit as part of the adjacent development. Where the route meanders south through the wildlife corridor, the proposed development would see the provision of a segregated cycleway and footway providing north-south connectivity. It is not thus considered reasonable or necessary to collect a financial contribution towards the resurfacing of this footpath link, given appropriate provision is made within the development to improve pedestrian connectivity. The Rights of Way Team also seek £21,560 towards replacing styles with gates, within a 1 mile radius of the site, and upgrading bridges/water crossings within half a mile of the application site. It is not considered that these improvements are directly related to the development, and as such, they do not meet the tests for applying obligations under para 58 of the NPPF.

14.8.51. Visual and Landscape Impact: Conclusion

14.8.52. Overall, the scheme (submitted Mar 2026) offers an improved treatment to landscaping, with a commitment to retain and enhance existing natural features, as per the provisions of LP policy ENV10, and would provide enhanced east-west green corridors and improved better connected green infrastructure. Internal planting, while perhaps ineffective at contributing to the identify of character areas, would offer a ‘green feel’ to streets, with an increased number of street trees incorporated into the layout.

14.8.53. The developer has submitted revised plans (Jun 2026), and has committed to revising the landscape treatment of the central avenue through an appropriately worded landscape condition. Additional landscaping has been provided within plots. Final details of on plot planting is also a matter that can be refined and agreed at condition stage.

14.8.54. Based on the latest revisions it is considered that, in line with policy CHIC2, the scheme would provide a network of green spaces for amenity/recreation and drainage purposes which run through the development and link to the open countryside, while providing a connecting green corridor along the eastern margin. Streets and spaces would generally have natural features incorporated within them in line with the advice within the National Design Guide a ‘green feel’ in line with NP policy CNP11

14.8.55. Subject to a revised landscape scheme to be secured by condition, it is considered that the revised plans appropriately address the key concerns raised by the Landscape Officer. Matters that would need to be conditioned, include details of landforms including heights/profile to ensure these are not excessive; a detailed landscape scheme to include refinement of species and their positioning and a planting schedule to include size and densities; tree pit designs to ensure the effective establishment of landscaping; stock proof fence protection to woodland buffer and native shrub planting within open space areas until established; landscape phasing plan to ensure advanced planting in line with the requirements of policy CHIC2; and detail of how the crib walls will be terminated within the street.

14.8.56. In light of the above, subject to conditions, the revised (Jun 2026) submission is considered to provide for the retention of existing hedgerows and present visually attractive spaces through landscaping, optimise the provision of well planted public open space, and provide tree lined streets to soften the development. The scheme design would safeguard the LLLI to the north of the site from the impacts of development and would not have a significant impact on the setting of the National Landscape. It is thus considered that these latest revisions appropriately address the key concerns raised by the Landscape Officer. Further the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the setting of the National

Landscape. As such, the scheme would be in compliance with LP policies ENV1, ENV3, ENV10, and CHIC2; NP policy CNP10 and CNP11, and NPPF para 189.

14.9. Affordable housing and Housing mix

14.9.1. Local Plan Policy HOUS1 and HOUS2 support an appropriate mix of affordable housing and tenure, to be distributed throughout the site. To comply with Policy HOUS1 35% of the accommodation provided should be affordable housing, with any shortfall collected in the form of a financial contribution. Within this provision, 70% of the accommodation should be rented and 30% shared ownership.

14.9.2. The Housing Enabling Team raise no objection, noting a policy compliant 35% affordable housing provision, and a policy compliant tenure mix, with affordable housing well distributed across phase A. Noting comments from CTC it is considered reasonable to include a local clause be applied within the S106 to ensure priority is given first to local residents.

14.9.3. The proposed revisions to house types do not affect affordable housing. Though amendments to the three storey apartment block have resulted in changes to the apartment provision, the net number of 1bed and 2bed units remain unchanged. Essentially, where three 2bed units have become a 1 bed unit, elsewhere three 1 bed units have been revised to provide 2 bed units. It is not therefore considered that the revised plans affect the provision of affordable housing, and the scheme remains compliant with policy HOUS1 and HOUS2 of the adopted Local Plan.

14.10. Ecology

14.10.1. Ecology: Policy consideration

14.10.2. The Council has a legal duty to protect, conserve and restore habitat sites, having regard to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the Habitat Regs), and this is supported by policy ENV2 of the Local Plan which seeks to safeguard Internationally designated wildlife sites, including Chesil and the Fleet, and seeks to resist development that would cause unmitigated likely adverse impacts on the site's integrity. In turn, the policy seeks to support proposals that conserve or enhance biodiversity, encourages ecological enhancement and expects opportunities to be taken to improve the wider ecological network, particularly for major developments. The policy seeks adequate provision to be made for the retention or relocation of protected species. NP policy CNP12 seeks that development protects, and where practicable enhances biodiversity, and NP policy CNP4 which relates specifically to the Chickerell wildlife corridor, seeks to avoid development that would significantly detract from its function as a wildlife corridor, noting that the central avenue should not result in significant adverse impacts.

14.10.3. The above aims, having regard to mitigating and enhancing biodiversity on site, are supported by para 187 and 192-195 of the NPPF. Para 195 is noteworthy as it makes clear that the presumption in favour of sustainable development at para 11(d) does not apply where proposals are likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site. In terms of conserving and enhancing the natural environment, para 187 sets out that developments should minimise impacts and provide net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures and incorporating features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs. Para 193 (a) sets out that '*if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused'*.

14.10.4. There are therefore two key considerations that need to be considered in respect of ecology; that is the direct impact of the development on species and habitat at the site, and the impact of the development on European Protected sites.

14.10.5. Ecology: Impact on protected species

14.10.6. To assess the impacts upon ecology the Ecology and Nature Conservation Chapter (chapter 7) of the ES substitutes as an Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA). A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) has also been submitted in support of the application. These document the habitat and species surveys carried out at the site. The surveys confirm bat activity within the area, though found no active roosts within the application site. The survey results indicate use of the site by badgers, but no active badger setts on the site itself, and it is considered that the application site supports a modest assemblage of breeding birds and low populations of reptiles. The presence of potential dormouse nests were also identified within field boundaries. Natural England and the Natural Environment Team advice that in the absence of further dormice surveys, it should be assumed that dormice present on the development site form part of a wider dormouse population that includes occupation of the habitats to the west of Putton Lane. The ES concludes that with the mitigation and enhancement measures proposed, the proposed development would not result in any significant adverse residual impacts on habitat or species, would have an overall positive impact having regard to European protected species/habitat, and would provide a net increase in biodiversity at the site.

14.10.7. Significant concerns have previously been raised regarding the impact of the development on ecology. In particular, due to the proposed central avenue bisecting the existing east-west 'wildlife corridors', together with the lack of arboreal connectivity and lack of large canopy trees at intersections with the central avenue, ecological permeability east-west through the site, for dormice and bats in particular, was poor. Without mitigation, the central avenue has the potential to isolate the woodland and scrub habitats present at Chickerell Downs and the Water Gardens and fragment the local dormouse population. Both bats and dormice would be further impacted by light spill from street lighting and there was also concern that the proposal would result in a significant loss of on-site habitat for dormice. It is considered that past iterations of the scheme have not previously incorporated appropriate biodiversity mitigation to moderate the effects on protected species.

14.10.8. In an effort to mitigate the impacts of the development on protected species and address both Officer's concerns and the comments of Design South West, the revised site layout (Mar 2026 and Jun 2026) seeks to respond to ecological constraints, and facilitates the retention and enhancement of existing hedgerows, with development buffers of approx. 10m around these, and introduces a number of key east-west and north-south green links through the site. A naturalistic approach to the southern wildlife corridor has been taken, in line with advice. These east-west links are in some places of substantial width and have the potential to provide valuable ecological corridors; the difficulty remains at their intersection with the central avenue, which has the potential to impede protected species. NP policy CNP4 specifically seeks to avoid development within the Chickerell wildlife corridor (accepting the central avenue will need to run through) that would significantly detract from its function as a wildlife corridor. It is therefore important that concerns regarding connectivity within the south of the site are carefully considered.

14.10.9. To assist connectivity, the developer proposes the provision of a dormouse bridge within the wildlife corridor to the south. No details of the dormouse bridge have been submitted with the application, so these details would need to be conditioned, and again, concerns are raised by the Natural Environment Team regarding its effectiveness in the absence of lighting details. Natural England are supportive of

the dormouse bridge and advise that there is some useful evidence that these can be effective at maintaining links across routes. The Natural Environment Team advise that to ensure its effectiveness it will be necessary for street lighting along the stretch of the central avenue where the bridge is located to be designed such that light spill onto the bridge is minimised as far as is possible. Accepting that the central avenue will need to meet adoptable standards for street lighting this should be achieved by: requiring lighting columns to be located at the greatest possible distance from the bridge; having street lighting switched off at night; ensuring that the bridge terminates in dense vegetation at each end; and requiring provision of large canopy trees adjacent to the bridge to create a screening effect. Natural England support the advice of the Natural Environment Team, and recommend suitable conditions be placed on any consent to secure the bridge in perpetuity with appropriate provision provided for any necessary repairs and potential replacement.

14.10.10. To improve connectivity for other amphibians and small mammals such as toads, great crested newts and hedgehogs, the developer proposes to provide tunnels under the central avenue. Natural England and the Natural Environment Team are supportive of this, and advise that such tunnels can function for both groups. The developer currently shows these in two locations, but Natural England and the Natural Environment Team recommend a further five be provided along the central avenue, in correlation to east-west/north-south green corridors, to aid connectivity. Subject to this further connectivity for small mammals and amphibians, the Natural Environment Team are satisfied that appropriate mitigation would be in place, including for great crested newts which are known within the area. In turn, it is recommended that mitigation would need to be in place and agreed prior to commencement to safeguard great crested newts during the construction stage.

14.10.11. Other forms of mitigation within the development include the provision of nest boxes within new dwellings. In this regard, bird boxes would be installed at a ratio of 1:1 with dwellings, provided in clusters of 3- 4 as opposed to on each dwelling. Bat boxes are proposed to be erected on retained semi-mature/ mature trees or integrated within new buildings at a ratio of 1:5 with dwellings. Bee bricks and reptile and amphibian hibernacula are also proposed. These would be secured through the provision of a LEMP.

14.10.12. The Natural Environment Team advise that in respect of badgers, a pre-commencement condition requiring that an update survey is undertaken no more than one month prior to any ground works commencing would be required, such that appropriate mitigation can be put in place and a licence sought where necessary ahead of works. This will also be addressed by a suitably worded condition requiring the submission of a CEMP for each phase of the development.

14.10.13. Having regard to the ecological hierarchy, National Planning Policy is clear that priority should be given to avoiding harm, mitigating harm and compensating harm to protected species, in that order. The provision of the central avenue as a connecting north-south route is considered to cause unavoidable harm; without the central avenue the proposed development would fall contrary to policy and would result in a poorly connected development with highway implications to local roads. The north-south linking route is thus considered essential if development is to be successfully brought forward on this allocated site, and in the planning balance, it is accepted that there would be some harm caused in the interests of bringing the site forward. Where harm is unavoidable, it is nonetheless necessary that the development provides appropriate mitigation to minimise and mitigate that harm to protected species.

14.10.14. It is considered that the provision of the dormouse bridge and tunnels at strategic locations, together with the incorporation of wildlife corridors, would be an appropriate mitigation measure to limit the harm to protected species and their

population. As part of the latest revisions (Jun 2026) large canopy trees are indicated either side of the central avenue within the northern wildlife corridor running east-west, which has the potential to further assist with connectivity. The siting of these trees, together with proposed tunnels and the proposed dormouse bridge will however need to be reviewed having regard to the position of lighting columns, a detail currently absent, offering uncertainty regarding their finalised siting and casting doubt over the effectiveness of the east-west corridors if not well planned. However, the plans do show a commitment to providing connectivity across the central avenue where possible. In other locations, large specimen trees do not offer the same provision, and it would be necessary to condition a revised landscape scheme to ensure the appropriate siting of large canopy tress to assist the function of east-west corridors where practicable.

14.10.15. One of the ways to help mitigate the impacts of development will thus be to carefully consider a sensitive lighting scheme adjacent to wildlife corridors and strategically place large canopy trees either side of the road to enable dormice to cross over intersections through the tree canopies. Street lighting is discussed at para 14.8.45 of the report, and owing to the lack of detail provided it is not possible for Officers to make a judgement on the impacts of lighting and tree placement as these will need to be agreed in conjunction with one another to ensure deliverability. The absence of detailed information about lighting is a significant concern for the Natural Environment Team, as it means there is uncertainty about the efficacy of certain key elements of ecological mitigation including the east-west ecological corridors and dormice bridge.

14.10.16. Further, the Street Lighting Team advise that vertical elements within the highway (i.e.. raised tables) would need to be permanently lit throughout the night. Where these are provided at intersections within the wildlife corridor, these threaten the effectiveness of these green links to support the movement of protected species. As a consequence this remains a concern for the Natural Environment Team.

14.10.17. The provision of raised tables are discussed at para 14.6.19 where alternative softer options to manage traffic and provide safe crossings are recommended that do not require installing humps or raised tables. It is considered that by adopting a softer less engineered approach to highway intersections this would offer benefits from a placemaking and ecological perspective. It is therefore recommended that the design of highway features and traffic calming measures are revised to avoid raised tables or other features which would require all night lighting, particularly where these crossing points intersect with wildlife corridors. While revisions to highway features are not shown within the latest set of amended plans (June 2026), the developer has committed to working with Officers to find a more suitable solution and it is considered that these amendments could be dealt with by condition.

14.10.18. <u>Ecology: Biodiversity Net Gain</u>

14.10.19. Having regard to the mandatory requirement to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG) introduced in 2025; given the submission of the application pre-dates these requirements coming into effect, the mandatory provisions regarding BNG do not apply in this case. In line with policy ENV2 which seeks to encourage opportunities to incorporate and enhance biodiversity in and around developments, and in line with NPPF para 187(d) and 193, schemes should nonetheless secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature. Advice from Design South West was to enhance biodiversity and to raise aspirations to deliver 10% biodiversity net gains. They also noted insufficient data to provide meaningful comments on BNG.

14.10.20. To assist in understanding the measurable net gain for the site, a BNG calculation has been provided in respect of the Mar 2026 submission. This sets out that there would be an approx. 8% net gain relating to habitat areas; through the enhancement

to the existing hedgerows and new planting of hedgerows, there would be an approx. 81% biodiversity net gain on site; and in terms of water features, there would be a measurable net gain of approx. 16%. The revised drawings submitted Jun 2026 provide greater areas for planting, and while it would see the loss of four basins, given these would only be seasonally wet, it is expected that the revisions would not significantly compromise net gain on the site. The Natural Environment Team in their latest review of BNG confirmed that they were satisfied that the Biodiversity Metric submitted demonstrates that net gains for biodiversity can be achieved, and raise no objection in this regard. Overall, it is thus considered that the proposed developments would provide a net increase in biodiversity within the application site, and would be in accordance with LP policy ENV2, NP policy CNP12 and para 187 and 193 of the NPPF.

14.10.21. Ecology: European Protected Habitats - Chesil and the Fleet

14.10.22. Chesil Beach and the Fleet is designated as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and a Ramsar site in recognition of its exceptional ecological importance. Natural England have advised that development which results in an increase in population within 5km of the Chesil Beach and the Fleet European site may contribute to an unacceptable increase in recreational pressures on the features of the designated area. The proposed development is approximately 1.2km to the northeast of the Chesil and the Fleet European site and will result in an increase in population. Therefore, the proposed development would result in a likely significant effect upon Chesil and the Fleet.

14.10.23. Prior to evidence being gathered and a strategy being adopted to manage the effects of recreational pressure upon the Chesil and the Fleet, an interim strategy has been introduced to temporarily address the effects of recreational pressure. The Interim Strategy provides a mechanism for collecting financial contributions from new development and using them to deliver a package of mitigation measures to ensure that an adverse effect upon the integrity of the Chesil and the Fleet European Site is avoided. The cost of these mitigation measures is £191,673 per year, which over the period to 2038 equates to a total cost of £3,450,114.

14.10.24. The anticipated housing supply within 5km of the Chesil and the Fleet over the period to 2038 equals 6,904 dwellings. The cost charge per dwelling is therefore £3,450,114 / 6,904 = £499.73. An administration fee of 5% of the total contribution is also applied to the per dwelling charge to account for Dorset Council's cost of collection and distribution of the obligation, resulting in a contribution of £524.72 per dwelling. This contribution would be secured through a S106 agreement. Mitigation in respect of Chesil Beach and the Fleet would thus be addressed through a financial contribution. A completed Appropriate Assessment has been considered by Natural England, who concur with the assessment conclusions setting out that likely significant impacts would be appropriately mitigated in this way.

14.10.25. Ecology: European Protected Habitats – Crookhill Brick Pit

14.10.26. Crookhill Brick Pit is a disused brick pit which contains several ponds which support populations of Great Crested Newt *Triturus cristatus.* One of the ponds supports one of the highest counts of the species in Dorset and indeed across the UK. Crookhill Brick Pit also contains a variety of habitats used by Great Crested Newt in the terrestrial phase, including grassland, scrub and quarry spoil.

14.10.27. The proposed development is approximately 780m from the Crookhill Brick Pit SAC, which is considered to be at a sufficient distance to avoid disturbance, loss of habitat, and splitting and subsequent isolation of the population of great crested newts associated with the SAC.

14.10.28. Natural England have been consulted on the application and amendments, and acknowledge the proximity to the Crookhill Brick Pit SAC and that it is immediately

adjacent to the Chickerell Water Lily Farm SNCI (a County Wildlife Site) that supports a significant population that is likely to form part of the metapopulation of GCN from the SAC. However, based on the results of the GCN surveys of the development site completed in support of the application Natural England remains satisfied the potential impacts to the Crookhill Brick Pits SAC may be screened out from assessment under the Habitat Regulations.

14.10.29. Ecology: Conclusion

14.10.30. Overall, it is considered that the proposed developments would provide a net increase in biodiversity within the application site in line with expectations set out within policy ENV2 and para 187 and 193 of the NPPF

14.10.31. To ensure the best possible outcome in terms of mitigating impacts upon protected species, it would be necessary to condition final details of landscaping and a lighting strategy to ensure that these components all work successfully together. Reworking of the highway intersections to avoid raised tables and all-night lighting would also be necessary. It is regrettable that details of lighting have not been provided up front to be able to assess its impact on the ecological corridors in more detail at this stage, however, accepting the need for the central avenue, what is fundamental is to mitigate that impact as far as practicable in line with the ecological mitigation hierarchy set out at para 193(a) of the NPPF, and it is considered that final details with regards to the above can be secured by condition. Conditions will also be required in relation to details and placement of tunnels and the dormice bridge, with careful consideration of landscaping adjacent to the bridge, as these comprise critical component of the mitigation strategy owing to reservations surrounding the impacts of the central avenue. Subject to agreeing the above, it is considered that the proposed scheme would, as far as practicable, provide coherent ecological networks and connectivity across the site in line with the policy, and the function of the Wilfie corridor would be maintained in line with NP policy CNP4.The Natural Environment Team also advice that conditions would be necessary to install stock fencing along the interior edge of the woodland planting so as to prevent access into this habitat and to provide an effective buffer to disturbance.

14.10.32. As such, the proposed scheme is considered to be in accordance with the provisions of LP policy ENV2 and NP policies ENP4 and CNP12. Furthermore, the proposal, subject to conditions would seek to mitigate and enhance biodiversity on site in line with para 192-195 of the NPPF.

14.11. Flood Risk

14.11.1. Local Plan policy ENV5 seeks to safeguard development against flood risk. Paragraphs 170, and 173-175 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) seek that development should be steered to areas with the lowest flood risk. This advice relates to risk from all forms of flooding. Further advice is provided in the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).

14.11.2. The site falls largely within flood zone 1 which indicates that the site is at low risk from fluvial flooding, with the exception of a linear (east-west) stretch designated as flood zone 2 and 3 running through the middle part of the site reflecting the position of the Southill Watercourse. There is localised surface water flooding around the Southill Watercourse, and existing flow routes across the site which are considered to present a medium 1% (1 in 100 year event) and high 3.3% (1 in 30 year event) risk of flooding. Applying an allowance for climate change shows these areas more severely affected in the future. The site also lies within an area susceptible to groundwater.

14.11.3. Given parts of the site are identified as being at high risk from fluvial, surface water and groundwater flooding, para 175 of the NPPF expects that a sequential test be applied. Given the sites allocation within the Local Plan the site has already been

sequentially tested. In these circumstances para 180 of the NPPF sets out that the sequential and exceptions test need not be applied again, unless there are aspects of the proposal that were not considered previously, and/or unless new flood risk data should be taken into account. It is not considered that there has been any material change to the anticipated development to be brought forward on the site since its allocation, and while flood data has been updated since its allocation, it is not considered that the flood risk has substantially changed at the site to warrant a further sequential and/or exceptions test being applied.

14.11.4. Matters of flood risk are considered within Chapter 12 (hydrology) of the ES, which includes a Flood Risk Assessment. The ES concludes that having regard to the drainage strategy proposed, the effects of the proposal on surface water drainage and flood risk would be minimised to an acceptable level.

14.11.5. The site rises from the south to the north by approximately 57m, and drains into two catchment areas, defined by watercourses. The upper part of the development would drain (via what is referred to by the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) as the 'northern drainage line') into the Southill watercourse, which receives water from much of the Chickerell catchment, taking it east through the site, where it is culverted beneath the electricity sub-station through to Southhill, and eventually into the River Wey and into Radipole Lake.

14.11.6. The southern part of the development would drain (via what is referred to by the LLFA as the 'middle drainage line') to an un-named stream (referred to by the LLFA as the 'southern watercourse') located north of the B3157 which discharges into Chafey's Lake to the east and eventually Radipole Lake via a culvert running under the A345. The highway drainage ponds located to the south of the unnamed watercourse collect surface water from the B3157 and drains into the unnamed watercourse.

14.11.7. Water levels at Chafeys Lake and Radipole Lake are controlled via sluice gates which regulate flows into Weymouth Marina and out to Weymouth Bay.

14.11.8. The Environmental Statement recognises that the proposed development would disrupt the existing surface water drainage regime and increase the extent of impermeable area leading to a potential increase in the rate and volume of surface water runoff discharged to the receiving watercourse and disruption to the natural drainage regime. Unless mitigation measures are put in place the Environmental Statement identifies that there would be an increased risk of flooding both onsite and offsite as a result of the development. To address the risk of flooding, a drainage strategy has been developed.

14.11.9. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) confirms, that following site investigation, the ground conditions are not suitable for the use of soakaways to effectively dispose of surface water runoff, with the underlying soil showing poor permeability. To effectively manage surface water at the site it is proposed to store and attenuate runoff, discharging at greenfield run off rates to the local watercourse, ditch system and sewer network.

14.11.10. The detention basins seek to utilise the existing topographical catchment areas and associated discharge points to best mimic pre-development conditions. It is accepted by the Lead Local Flood Authority that this would be an appropriate strategy given the ground conditions at the site.

14.11.11. The attenuation storage is proposed to be provided using Sustainable urban Drainage Systems (SuDS), where possible in the form of drainage basins. Latest revisions (June 2026) show basins used in combination with a series of linked attenuation tanks and oversized sewers.

14.11.12. It is understood from the submitted FRA and plans that the proposed basins would be grassed and on the whole designed to drain completely such that they would only be seasonally wet, with the exception of a portion of some of the basins which would retain a wet base/micro-pool. The maximum depth of any of the ponds is 1.5m, though during a design flood event (1 in 100yr event plus an allowance for climate change) they would not be expected to reach those levels. Where permanent micropools are incorporated into the design, these are anticipated to be approx. 0.3m deep. The swale to the west of phase B would have a depth of 0.2m-0.3m during a design flood event and would only be seasonally wet.

14.11.13. They are designed to have a 1:3 slope to allow access in and out and where permanent pools of water are proposed to be retained a 1.5m aquatic bench is proposed for safety. Depending on the siting of the pond, surveillance towards them is variable, but generally present. Owing to the shallow nature of the drainage basins, and their design, fencing would not be considered necessary in this case, in line with the advice contained within the SuDs Manual.

14.11.14. In response to concerns already outlined in this report the developer provided a revised drainage strategy (June 2026) to address concerns, which would rely on a combined approach to managing water above and below ground. Water would continue on the whole to be managed through a series of drainage basins running through the site, but where these compromise the open space, water would be managed by a series of underground tanks in these locations. In this regard, the developer proposes to remove the two drainage basins within the gateway location east of Lower Putton Lane and the two most northern drainage basins to the north of the public open space located east of the central avenue.

14.11.15. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) have been reconsulted on the June 2026 revisions and note the replacement of four drainage basins with tanked storage. While the LLFA generally prefer open storage features such as basins rather than closed underground features such as tanks from a surface water management perspective, it is understood that the changes proposed respond directly to concerns relating to poor open space provision. Noting that the tanks discharge to open features within the site, the LLFA confirm that the revised drainage strategy would be acceptable, and consequently raise no objection.

14.11.16. To seek to manage flood risk to properties, it is proposed that the minimum ground floor levels of properties located within proximity to the Southill watercourse would be set at least 600mm above the 1 in 100 year risk of surface water flooding level.

14.11.17. The FRA also sets out the need to manage runoff flows that minimise risk to property. Previous schemes raised a number of drainage related issues with overland flows of surface water relating to the northern drainage line traversing the proposed built development, placing proposed properties in this area at risk from flooding. There were also concerns regarding whether the northern drainage line could be adequately accommodated within the recipient drainage basin, with insufficient detail provided in respect of the volume of run-off, frequency, and the effects on the functioning of the drainage basin. There was also a lack of clarity in respect of the flow path for the middle drainage line and how this reaches the unnamed watercourse. All these matters have been addressed as part of the latest drainage strategy addressing previous concerns raised by the LLFA.

14.11.18. Previously, the submitted drainage scheme also indicated an increased risk of flooding (both in area and depth) on third party land, resulting from the effects of the proposed development on the middle and southern drainage lines such that the scheme failed to meet policy requirements. The revised flood modelling now shows no increased risk of flooding to surrounding dwellinghouses or to the B3157 Chickerell Link Road. There would be some small worsening to flood depths at the undeveloped southern periphery of the golf course, but this would be countered by

significant betterment across a much wider area of the golf course, which would experience reduced flood depths such that there would be an overall reduction in flood risk at the site. The FRA states the increase in flood depth at the southern extent is less than 30mm in 'an area of scrub that is not actively used by the golf course'.

14.11.19. Para 181 of the NPPF is clear that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. In this regard, the proposed Surface Water Management Scheme for the site would lead to a general overall and tangible reduction in flood risk to the golf course. On this basis, it is considered that the requirements of the NPPF with regards to ensuring that flood risk is not increased elsewhere has been satisfied and the LLFA raise no objection.

14.11.20. The latest Drainage Strategy provides sufficient detail to show how runoff from the west would traverse the proposed link road without leading to flooding of this route, which was another concern with the previous Drainage Strategy, and appropriately details the reconfiguration of the B3157 drainage ponds, ruling out further impacts on surface water flooding.

14.11.21. Flood Risk: Conclusion

14.11.22. Having regard to the benefits to placemaking through adopting a combined approach to surface level and below ground attenuation storage to manage water across the site, and in light of an acceptable drainage strategy having been submitted, it is recommended that a condition be placed on the consent requiring the development to proceed in accordance with the updated plans and drainage strategy received Jun 2026.

14.11.23. Based on the above assessment, the proposed scheme is considered to be acceptable on flood risk grounds, and in accordance with the provisions of Local Plan policy ENV5 (Flood Risk), and is considered to accord with the aims of para 181 and 182 of the NPPF (2024), supported by the National Planning Policy Guidance on Flood Risk.

14.12. Impact on heritage assets

14.12.1. Impact on heritage assets: Policy consideration

14.12.2. Local Plan policy ENV4 seeks to ensure development respects its historic environment. Section 16 of the NPPF, and specifically paras 212-216, requires great weight be given to the conservation of heritage assets having regard to their significance and the effects of the proposal on their significance.

14.12.3. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that when considering whether to grant planning permission for a development which affects a listed building or its setting, there is a general duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

14.12.4. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

14.12.5. Chapter 8 of the ES considers the impacts of the development on heritage features and has helped inform considerations of heritage impacts.

14.12.6. The site contains no designated heritage assets. However, development on the site has the potential to affect the significance of a number of nearby heritage assets, including through impacts on their setting. These include:

- Montevideo House (Grade II listed)

- Chickerell Conservation Area
- Lime Kiln near Putton Farm (non-designated)
- Romano-British Field System/Enclosures (non-designated)
- Historic (post medieval) Field Boundaries (non-designated)

14.12.7. Impact on heritage assets: Designated heritage assets

14.12.8. Para 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets. Para 213 goes on to state that '*any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting) should require clear and convincing justification*'. Para 215 sets out that '*where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use*'.

14.12.9. The views NE from Montevideo House are extensive, owing to the fall of the immediate land and the low-lying relief of land further towards Weymouth. Direct line-of-sight of the proposed development would be impeded somewhat by land-form and intervening tree cover and modern development. Where visibility of the development from Montevideo House is possible, then it is not considered that it would form a distinct or prominent visual element.

14.12.10. The setting of the Chickerell Conservation Area has been much reduced by the extent of 20th century and later development around the historic core, particularly to the E and to the S. For this reason, and taking into account the more modern character of the 2008 extension along East Street to the recreation ground, it is not considered that the development of the site would impact upon such contribution that remains.

14.12.11. Taking into account the elements of significance of potentially affected designated heritage assets above, it is not considered that the proposals will result in a discernible impact on them and no harm to these assets is identified by the Design and Conservation Officer.

14.12.12. Impact on heritage assets: Non-designated heritage assets

14.12.13. Para 216 of the NPPF sets out that '*the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset*'.

14.12.14. The archaeological field evaluation has confirmed that the area around the site was occupied by the Romano-British period and identified ditched features relating to a field system and/or enclosures. It seems likely that these features indicate the agricultural hinterland of a Romano-British settlement in or near Putton Brickworks, where other contemporary finds and burials have been discovered. This area continued to be a focus for settlement and agriculture in the medieval period and the earlier name of Putton, 'Podington', indicates an Anglo-Saxon settlement. The site is in close proximity to the recently discovered manorial complex on Lower Putton Lane, during which finds from the 9th to the 11th century seem to point to this earlier phase, whilst the main structural remains related to late 12th to 14th-century manorial buildings. The site is likely to have formed part of open arable field system associated with this manor, though later enclosed to form a series of fairly regular, straight-sided fields. The whole area remained agricultural throughout the 19th

century, with only slight incursions of industrial activity, such as the brickworks at Putton and the lime-kiln on the application site.

14.12.15. The proposals would see the total loss of the lime kiln, and the Romano-British field system/enclosures will be affected. In terms of the latter, there will be some loss of the historic field boundaries which divide the current fields, though in the main hedgerows are retained. These assets are of local interest but are not designated features. The County Archaeologist advises that following archaeological evaluations and the recording of finds, no further archaeological evaluation or mitigation is required, and no objection is raised. The Design and Conservation Officer considers the harm to these elements to be less than substantial, whose nature and extent is such as to be acceptable.

14.12.16. In light of the above, having regard to the significance of the non-designated heritage assets (of local interest), the archaeological evaluation that has allowed for the recording of finds, and the advice of the Arcaheological Officer and Design and Conservation Officer, that the impacts would be acceptable; weighed in the balance, the resulting impact to these assets is not considered to outweigh the benefits of the scheme (including bringing forward a strategic allocated site for the delivery of housing and a school) or cause significant harm to warrant refusal.

14.12.17. Impact on heritage assets: Conclusion

14.12.18. Taking into account the lack of harm to the significance of identified designated heritage assets and an acceptable level of harm to non-designated heritage assets by the development, it is considered that the proposed scheme would be acceptable, and would comply with the provisions of LP policy ENV4 and para 212-216 of the NPPF.

14.13. **Contaminated Land**

14.13.1. The proposed site is subject to an area of contaminated land. Policy ENV9 of the West Dorset Weymouth and Portland Local Plan seeks to ensure development does not result in an unacceptable risk of pollution to waters, the environment, future occupiers or neighbouring uses. This is supported by para 196 and 198 of the NPPF.

14.13.2. Matters relating to contaminated land are considered within the submitted Environmental Statement at Chapter 13. These rely on site investigation and reporting and identify no significant contaminant linkages on site. WPA, having reviewed the conclusions of the ES recommend land contamination conditions including a watching brief concerning potentially unidentified contamination. WPA advice that further reporting concerning unexpected finds, adherence to standard protocols for alerts in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), Waste Management Pan (WMP) and reported demolition / materials management processes would be required prior to discharging contaminated land planning conditions. Subject to these conditions no objection is raised, and the proposed scheme is considered to be acceptable having regard to impacts arising from land contamination.

14.13.3. In light of the above assessment the proposed works, subject to appropriate conditions, are considered to be acceptable and to comply with the provisions of Policy ENV9 of the Local Plan, and para 196 and 198 of the NPPF.

14.14. **High Pressure Gas Line**

14.14.1. The proposed application is within the vicinity of a high pressure gas line, which resulted in an initial holding objection being raised by SGN until they considered the detail. Following further assessment, the high pressure gas line would be in excess of 20m from the application site, and in excess of 100m from the nearest built development. The proposed development therefore falls outside of the SGN building

proximity buffer of 16m and SGN have confirmed that they have no objection to the proposal. It is recommended that informatives be placed on the consent to ensure that the development is mindful of this constraint.

14.15. Infrastructure Provision

14.15.1. Infrastructure Provision: Policy considerations

14.15.2. In order to make development acceptable in planning terms, applications for housing developments are expected to make infrastructure contributions, and this is usually collected by way of the adopted Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charge. Owing to the scale and complexity of the allocated site at Chickerell, the site is excluded from CIL, on the basis that some forms of infrastructure would need to be provided as part of the proposed development, and in recognition that the impacts of such a large scheme are likely to differ from smaller sites. As such, a bespoke S106 legal agreement is required to make suitable provision for community infrastructure, in line with Local Plan Policy COM1.

14.15.3. Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) (CILR) provides that: -

14.15.4. A planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is –

(a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;

(b) directly related to the development; and

(c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

14.15.5. The NPPF reiterates that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all three of the tests set out in Regulation 122(2) are met.

14.15.6. Where unacceptable impacts are identified, in line with Policy COM1 it is considered necessary to require either provision on the ground or a financial contribution towards enhancement and improvement of specific infrastructure, in order to mitigate the impacts, and make the development otherwise acceptable in this regard.

14.15.7. Infrastructure Provision: Key Heads of Terms

Planning Obligation	**On/Off site provision**	**Contribution**
Affordable Housing	On site	35% on site provision, in accordance with West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Adopted Local Plan 2015 Policy HOUS1.
NHS Contribution	Off site	£722 per dwelling, in accordance with the Developer Contributions for NHS Infrastructure report.
Chesil & the Fleet Mitigation	Off site	£524.72 per dwelling; £357.77 per flat, in accordance with the Interim Strategy.
Education (Primary)	On site	Land transfer
Education (Primary)	Off site	A contribution towards SEND provision of £1,487.62 per qualifying dwelling, plus a contribution of £1,736.06 per

		qualifying dwelling (less land value discount of £482,000) towards primary education, in accordance with DfE 2023 Guidance.
Sports pitches and training facilities	Off site	£22,524, in accordance with Sport England's Sports Facilities Calculator.
Weymouth Swimming Pool	Off site	Contributions of £106,413
Play provision	On site	Land transfer The proposed development will bring forward 0.28ha of play space, which shall include two LAP's, a LEAP, and informal play.
Play provision	Off site	A financial contribution based on the following: • 2-bed at £411.84 • 3-bed at £587.34 • 4+ bed at £669.24 • Less land value discount of £98,800 To address the shortfall in provision, a financial contribution of £50,000 will be secured towards enhancing the play facilities at Willowbed Hall and/or towards a skate park within the town.
Play Maintenance	Off site	A maintenance contribution of £420,000 is sought to cover maintenance costs of the LAP/LEAP for a 20 year period. These have been based on guidance provided by DC leisure team and are based on experience of average costs.
Open Space	On site	Land transfer
Open Space Maintenance	Off site	£348,532.80
Willowbed Hall	Off site	£50,000 towards improvements to the Willowbed Hall site.
Bus Services & Sustainable	On site	Provision of a route suitable for a bus

Transport Contributions		
Bus Services & Sustainable Transport Contributions	Off site	£81,675.76 towards bus infrastructure and travel cards This includes: • A total of 4 bus stopes (provided both sides of the road in two locations); • A shelter at the stops closest to the school, and a pole at the phase A stops. These should be fitted with real time technology. • A Sustainable Travel Voucher up to the value of £139 per dwelling, either to be used towards 2 adult bus cards per dwelling or towards cycle equipment. • Updating Walking and Cycling map.
Footpath S16/23 E	Off site	£20,000 towards the upgrading of footpath S16/23.
Footpath S16/21 W	Off site	£12,000 towards the upgrading of footpath S16/21
Highways	On site	Completion of the central avenue prior to more than 100 dwellings being occupied.

14.15.8. Having regard to the Regulation 122(2) tests the above infrastructure contributions are considered necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. This is supported by Policy COM1 of the Local Plan, and where relevant, detailed justification is offered within the report. Further detail is provided below, for those infrastructure types not already discussed.

14.15.9. Infrastructure Provision: NHS Contribution

14.15.10. In response to competing needs across the health care service, having regard to both primary care and secondary (acute) care, together with the acknowledgement that all new dwellings have an impact upon the healthcare service, a message that is borne out from consultation replies to the publicising of the application, Dorset Council has agreed a Framework for calculating developer contributions, which applies to all new dwellings. On CIL liable developments this is collected via CIL, and for developments not subject to CIL, a per dwelling cost of £722 towards health care is applied. This financial contribution is considered to meet the tests set out within the NPPF.

14.15.11. Infrastructure Provision: Education

14.15.12. Serviced and accessible land for 2FE Primary School (c.2.4ha) is sought under the current application.

14.15.13. The education contribution is calculated by the number of Qualifying Dwellings (house or flat with 2 or more bedrooms) multiplied by £5,444. This is split between

primary and secondary education provision, £1,739.06 towards primary and £3,705.36 for secondary.

14.15.14. Since the application was first submitted there has been a reduction in demand for secondary places such that the Local Authority would not be able to demonstrate a sufficiency argument to secure funding for secondary education. Chickerell nonetheless continues to be in demand for expanded primary provision. As such, only a contribution towards primary education is sought in this case at £1,739.06 per qualifying dwelling. The proposals directly respond to the demand for a new primary school by allocating land for its provision within the development site. In recognition of this, the financial contribution will be discounted by the land value of the site.

14.15.15. In line with the DfE 2023 Guidance, a contribution towards special education needs and disabilities (SEND) provision, commensurate with the need arising from the development is sought. The contribution is justified where the Local Authority can evidence a shortage in SEND provision resulting in long travel times for placements within the Local Authority area, calculated in line with guidance having regard to pupil yield data. In this case, a contribution of £1,487.62 towards SEND provision is sought per qualifying dwelling.

14.15.16. Infrastructure Provision: Sport

14.15.17. Sport: Weymouth Swimming Pool

14.15.18. Following a Borough Sports Facility Strategy 2014, a detailed report reviewing the options for Weymouth Swimming Pool and Fitness Centre was prepared in 2015. This reviews the value and usage of Weymouth Swimming Centre, sets out some of the limitations surrounding the existing leisure facility, identifies and defines the Centre's catchment for its main users (within a 10min drive), and explores opportunities and costs to provide an improved facility. A Built Facilities Assessment – April 2018 further explores the need for improvements to the facility.

14.15.19. The assessments confirm that Weymouth Swimming Pool is rated as 'below average' in terms of quality, and that quality is expected to continue to deteriorate to 2031 as demand increases. Sport England's Facilities Calculator recognises that population increases will add to the demand for pool space in Weymouth and Portland (by 2031) by 1.12 lanes at a cost of £1,026,093. The application site falls within a 1 mile radial catchment of Weymouth Swimming Pool, and with no community accessible pools within Chickerell, it would serve the proposed development.

14.15.20. The 'Options for Weymouth Swimming Pool and Fitness Centre' document identifies a changing village as an appropriate project to improve capacity, particularly at peak times. Contributions have thus been collected towards a project to enhance the existing changing provision within the existing centre which has been identified as being well below modern standards. The project has been calculated at £350,000, which includes the conversion of the existing wet changing rooms to a village changing area (an open plan area where all changing takes place within individual cubicles and where there is a unisex shower area), creation of sperate male and female dry changing rooms for fitness suite customers, and increasing capacity within one of the fitness studios. These works would increase capacity at the Centre and also makes it easier for parents to accompany children (e.g. male parent and female child).

14.15.21. The calculations for the Chickerell contribution has factored in the anticipated growth from the Council's key strategic sites around Weymouth and surrounding areas, including Chickerell developments and the Littlemoor development to ensure any contribution is proportionate. As such the contribution sought is a pro-rate amount of the overall cost.

14.15.22. Sport: Sports Pitches and Training Facilities (in lieu of 'Senior Grass Pitch' & 'Changing Facilities')

14.15.23. On first submission of the application, an additional parcel of land was provided to the south, to provide a senior and youth football pitch and changing facilities. This was provided in response to identified needs at the time, connected to Chickerell Football Club and the limitations of the existing sloping football ground in terms of enabling progression within the league. Following an initial Sport England objection, and concerns raised by Chickerell Town Council, further assessment of need was undertaken, in consultation with the local football team, Town Council, Sport England, Dorset Football Association and the Football Foundation. The solution at the time was to provide a flexible pitch that could meet the needs of various formats, including senior, junior and mini teams. Since then, the land has been withdrawn from the application, and on-site provision is no longer proposed. The provision of grass pitch and changing facilities is not a policy CHIC2 requirement, but consideration needs to be given to whether the development would contribute to an increased demand and place unacceptable pressures on existing facilities which could be addressed by an off-site contribution.

14.15.24. In response to this, Sport England has set out a need to secure contributions towards pitches. They refer to the Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) and Action Plan. The PPS is reflective of a point in time, and though it takes into account population growth, it does not take into account population growth resulting from planned urban developments. It is therefore a useful evidence base and sets out an overall demand for pitches, and supports the need for additional pitch provision as well as the need for improvements to the quality of pitches within the area. In particular, it recognises the latent demand for match pitches and training facilities within Chickerell, and in particular 11v11 pitches at the time of reporting. It is not considered that the need for improvements to, and/or additional, pitches has been met, and the resultant increase in population resulting from the current developments is likely to increase demand on both adult, youth and mini pitches. It is therefore considered that an off-site contribution towards sports pitches is justified in light of the omission from the application of the football pitch and facilities previously proposed to be provided on site. This is also supported by Sport England's Sports Facilities Calculator (SFC), which is a tool used to predict the increasing demand upon facilities resulting from development.

14.15.25. Turning to the contribution itself, the SFC looks at the provision of artificial pitches, and takes into account the likely population increase resulting from the development. Referring back to the PPS the demand locally seems to relate more to grass pitch provision and improvements to existing pitches and facilities, including changing facilities, and liaison with the Local Football Club and Town Council supports this. On this basis, it is considered reasonable to use the relevant figure provided by the SFC of £22,524 and, to ensure it is effective in targeting local need, seek that it be allocated to increase provision of pitches (including grass pitches) locally and/or improvements to pitches and facilities locally where the contribution could secure improvements to the quality of pitch provision and training facilities which support those pitches, all identified under the PPS as a need. It is considered that this would be more deliverable locally, and better respond to local need, than a contribution specifically allocated to artificial pitches.

14.15.26. In particular, Chickerell Town Council have identified a specific costed project to upgrade the existing changing facilities at the Pavillion, located at the Stalls (in lieu of the previously proposed 'changing facilities' which has since been withdrawn from the application). Further details are required in respect of the project, however, it is considered that this project could be funded through the above contribution as an improvement to the facilities at the Stalls pitch within Chickerell, and by doing so

would address an identified local need, which would be increased as a result of the development. In light of the above, a contribution of £22,542 is considered justified.

14.15.27. Infrastructure Provision: Play provision

14.15.28. The proposed development will bring forward 0.28ha of play space, which shall include two LAP's, a LEAP, and informal play.

14.15.29. The play facilities are to be brought forward by Chickerell Town Council (CTC) and the contributions towards on-site provision have been based on the West Dorset Planning Obligations SPD tariff which applies to open market units only.

- 2-bed at £411.84
- 3-bed at £587.34
- 4+ bed at £669.24
- Less land value discount of £98,800

14.15.30. A maintenance contribution of £420,000 is sought to cover maintenance costs of the LAP/LEAP for a 20 year period. These have been based on guidance provided by DC leisure team and are based on experience of average costs.

14.15.31. To address the shortfall in provision, an additional financial contribution will be secured of £50,000 towards the enhancement of the play facilities at Willowbed Hall and/or provide a skate park within the town. This costing is based on a total estimated cost to deliver a skate park of £250,000, and is a proportionate cost based on other developments coming forward locally.

14.15.32. Infrastructure Provision: Willowbed Hall

14.15.33. There is a costed project to increase the capacity of the community facility to respond to the increase in population resulting from this and other developments. In particular, the project to extend the hall seeks to respond to the need to expand indoor sporting facilities, creating greater recreational space for classes and other indoor activities serving the local catchment. While the project to extend the hall is underway, a further financial contribution would enable further improvements to the Willowbed Hall to support the current project to improve the site. Residents of the site are likely to use the Willowbed Hall regularly as the nearest community facility and add pressure to this valued site. It is thus considered reasonable that a financial contribution is sought to support the project to improve the facility. This would be in leu of a contribution to Redlands Sports hub.

14.15.34. Infrastructure Provision: Sustainable Transport Contribution

14.15.35. The need for bus contributions is discussed at para 14.5.25-29 of the report. The contribution has been costed taking into account the cost for 2x single poles with real time technology, including installation at £6,263.03 and 2x bus shelters with real time technology, including installation, at £11,653.85, totalling £35,833.76 to serve the installation and provision of bus stops.

14.15.36. In addition, costings for a 30 day bus card scheme, plus admin for distributing tickets, works out at £69.50 per card. In the interests of supporting the establishment of a bus route, it is considered reasonable to seek a contribution accounting for a bus card for each household up to a maximum cost equivalent to 2 adult tickets per dwelling. At £69.50 per card this would equate to £45,592.

14.15.37. Taking on board advice from the Sustainable Transport Team, and recognising the policy need to prioritise pedestrian and cycle movements within the development, it is considered reasonable that the per household contribution towards bus tickets can be interchangeable with a voucher towards cycle equipment. It is considered that a sustainable travel voucher towards either bus provision or cycle equipment would best address active travel objectives in line with policy.

14.15.38. A further £250 is sought by the Highway Authority to cover the cost of updating the interactive Weymouth & Portland Walking and Cycling Map to include the new development so that it can be utilised as part of the active travel plan.

14.15.39. The above contributions are recommended by the Highway Authority and Dorset Travel.

14.15.40. Infrastructure Provision: Conclusion

14.15.41. The above financial contributions are evidenced through consultation with Chickerell Town Council, relevant consultees, and through your Officer's assessment of the direct impacts that the proposed additional housing would have on existing infrastructure. The above figures are based on the best available information including local best practice and regard has been given to national guidance & policy to ensure obligations remain proportionate to the scale of development and reasonable in all other regards. No viability appraisal has been submitted and it is not contested that the cost cannot be met while securing the development.

14.15.42. In light of the above, the contributions have therefore been demonstrated to be reasonable, necessary and proportionate, to meet the regulations for Community Infrastructure Levy and the NPPF, and have in turn been agreed in principle by the developer.

14.16. Use of Conditions

14.16.1. The agent is supportive of addressing the outstanding issues, identified in this report, through conditions, and whilst it would be desirable to have all information up front, through the use of pre-commencement conditions, it would be possible to secure satisfactory details ahead of development proceeding. This is considered a reasonable way forward given the outstanding concerns relate to matters of detail rather than principal matters. To refuse the application on matters of detail that could be reasonably conditioned would add vulnerability in the event of an appeal. As pre-commencement conditions, the development could not proceed without appropriately satisfying matters of detail, providing appropriate assurance regarding the resolution of matters. It is considered that through revisions secured by condition this would appropriately respond to the comments of Officers including the Landscape Officer, Urban Design Officer and Highways Authority.

14.17. Summary of Issues and Planning Balance

14.17.1. The above assessment sets out some remaining issues with the proposed scheme, but also identifies significant benefits. To assist in the weighing up of these matters these are considered in turn and separated for ease into 'benefits' and 'impacts'.

14.17.2. **Benefits**

14.17.3. Housing delivery

14.17.4. The proposed development would see the provision of 328 dwellings. The delivery of housing on this allocated site is considered to accord with LP policy CHIC2, and is supported by CNP4 and CNP10. Owing to the demonstrable lack of 5 year housing land supply, and the need for housing delivery, substantial weight should be given to the proposed delivery of housing on the site, weighing in favour of the proposal.

14.17.5. Provision of a school

14.17.6. The proposed development would see land brought forward for the delivery of a 2FE primary school in accordance with LP policy CHIC2. Given the need for additional primary spaces locally, this should be given substantial weight in the planning balance, and weighs in favour of the proposal

14.17.7. Affordable Housing

14.17.8. The proposed development would comprise 35% affordable housing, equating to approx. 115 affordable dwellings delivered as part of the scheme. The provision of affordable housing is considered to comply with policies HOUS1 and HOUS2 of the adopted Local Plan. Its provision should be attributed substantial weight in the planning balance in light of the high need for affordable housing, and weighs in favour of the proposal.

14.17.9. Promotion of a bus link, and walking and cycling

14.17.10. The proposed scheme, subject to conditions to secure an east-west cycle route, would maximise pedestrian and cycle movement links and provide a route suitable for a bus, in line with the requirements of LP policy CHIC2. It would also fund bus infrastructure as appropriate, and fund sustainable travel vouchers interchangeable for either bus tickets or cycle equipment. The proposal would also see the upgrading of local footways, improving pedestrian links in the area. It is considered that the benefits of promoting active travel should be given significant weight in the planning balance, weighing in favour of the proposal.

14.17.11. Western Pedestrian link

14.17.12. Having regard to the proposed pedestrian link along the western boundary of the site, there has been concerns, partly owing to a lack of detail in the submission, regarding its effectiveness to provide a safe and pleasant off-road route owing to its position, at times running along the rear boundaries of properties; the width of the corridor; and topographical impacts. The latest details address some of these concerns, showing that the embankments would not be significant or overbearing and would grade away from the footpath, revisions to boundary treatments and enlarged openings within the apartment blocks would also assist in ensuring the footway is a safe and pleasant route. While there are elements of the footpath which are constrained in parts, given there are also other alternative routes within the development, weighed in the balance, the proposed footpath is considered to be a positive element of the scheme. For the purposes of the planning balance, taking heed of the fact that some elements would be constrained, but that overall it would positively contribute to the scheme, it is given limited weight, in favour of the proposal.

14.17.13. Permeability and highway related matters

14.17.14. Turning first to matters relating to highways and strategic connectivity. Owing to restricted opportunities to provide connecting routes between the existing and proposed development, regrettably permeability is to some extent compromised. However, these limitations have been reviewed by the developer and are outside of their control and are thus issues with the allocation and its relationship with the existing built form rather than a consequence of the proposals submitted. However, through revisions in the layout which seek to maximise east-west/north-south connections, and the incorporation of pedestrian and cycle links, connectivity between the existing settlement and its facilities and the proposed development has been strengthened such that the scheme would be appropriately connected to the existing built form. The scheme also shows good connectivity with wider movement networks. As such, and on balance, the proposed scheme would be acceptable in this regard, and it is not considered that this should weigh unfavourably in the planning balance.

14.17.15. From a highway perspective, it would be necessary to condition the detailed design of junctions and the design/placement of crossing points; the latter should have regard to a connectivity plan. Details of footways and cycle provision would also need to be finalised at the condition stage, and it would be necessary to condition an east-west cycle route linking with Lower Putton Lane. Subject to conditions, the proposal presents an acceptable scheme in highway safety terms and would be in

accordance with Local Plan Policy COM7 (Creating a safe & efficient transport network) and COM9 (Parking Provision).

14.17.16. Overall, maximising points of connection to strengthen connectivity and permeability is an important consideration and is given moderate weight in the planning balance, weighing in favour of the proposal.

14.17.17. Public Open Space/Play

14.17.18. Significant concerns raised regarding the quality of public open space have been addressed through the revision of the drainage strategy for the site. In this case, the benefits to placemaking justifies adopting a combined approach to drainage (including above ground and below ground attenuation). The public open space south of phase A development would provide meaningful public open space, allow for improved movement links, and provide areas which could accommodate more meaningful tree/shrub planting to form an improved natural green link with a swale that is integrated with the development and contributes positively to the character of the area. Large specimen trees are shown incorporated into the area which would add interest, shade and offer a high quality and valued community space within the scheme and enhanced opportunities for play. This would be a benefit of the scheme.

14.17.19. Subject to conditions, including a revised landscape scheme (addressing concerns relating to the treatment of the central avenue) and phasing plan, the revised submission seeks retention of existing hedgerows and provides robust east-west green infrastructure and wildlife corridors; enhances green infrastructure links where pedestrian movement is at its greatest; provides tree lined streets and on plot planting to soften the impacts of development; and offers well landscaped public open spaces within the development that would act as visually attractive gateway locations. It is thus considered that the June 2026 revisions appropriately address the key concerns raised by the Landscape Officer and meet expectations set out in policy. Given the policy drive to bring forward high quality development this should be given significant weight in the planning balance, weighing in favour of the proposal.

14.17.20. Further the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the setting of the National Landscape, nor would it significantly compromise land designated as LLLI. As such, the revised scheme would be in compliance with LP policies ENV1, ENV3, ENV10, and CHIC2; NP policy CNP10 and CNP11, and NPPF para 135-136 and 189.

14.17.21. **Impacts**

14.17.22. Impact on amenity

14.17.23. Having carefully reviewed the level of risk from ball strike from the adjoining golf course, it is considered that the revised plans (June 2026) to the layout of phase B indicate that significant risk can be avoided by ensuring public access and housing is kept away from those areas most at risk. In this regard, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable having regard to impacts on amenity on site and in terms of impacts to the golf course having regard to the ‘agent of change principle’ as set out in para. 200 of the NPPF.

14.17.24. There is however conflict with policy HOUS4 owing to the lack of private amenity space serving the proposed apartments.

14.17.25. In addition, accommodating the significant level changes on site has presented challenges, resulting in large retaining structures. The significant height of retaining structures at the rear boundary of some gardens, ranging from 0.4m to 4.8m at its highest, with a 1.8m timber fence above, would present a substantial feature at the rear of properties. This has the potential to impact upon amenity of future occupiers, and through glimpsed views of the structure between properties has the potential to

detract from the quality of some streets. Having regard to policy ENV16 which seeks to safeguard the residential amenity of future occupiers from significant adverse effects, it is considered that the impacts would not be significant, though the impacts do weigh against the proposal.

14.17.26. The benefits of managing levels in this way are noteworthy. It would present more accessible streets and spaces (though these would still be compromised to some extent), reduce the high reliance on stepped entry to properties, present more usable level gardens, contribute to placemaking by removing large retaining structures from the street scene, and present a more accessible, safe and attractive environment.

14.17.27. Overall, the provision of large retaining structures and the lack of private amenity space to apartments is regrettable and does weigh unfavourably in the planning balance. In light of the challenging site levels at this allocated site, and acknowledging the far greater impacts resulting from various other iterations to manage levels at the site, and noting the large areas of open space to be provided to serve the development, the impact on amenity is given moderate weight, weighing against the proposal.

14.17.28. Design Quality

A significant concern running through consideration of the various iterations of the scheme has related to the detailed design and the treatment and landscaping of the built environment. Planning policy is clear in its aims to support high quality sustainable and inclusive design that is sympathetic to the character of the area and includes appropriate planting of streets and public spaces in the interests of creating attractive well designed places. This is set out in policy ENV12, ENV10, NP policy CNP11, and para 117, 131-139, 182 of the NPPF. Managing the significant level changes on site has presented technical and design challenges for the developer, with resulting impacts on accessibility of streets, amenity, and placemaking. Layout and design has subsequently been heavily influenced by the topography of the site, amongst other factors including provision of a linking route suitable for a bus, ensuring the layout responds to movement corridors, making provision for biodiversity and incorporating appropriate landscaping and placemaking considerations.

14.17.29. Design Quality – central avenue

14.17.30. A shortfall within the scheme affecting the quality of the built environment has been the treatment of the central avenue. The latest submissions show an improved layout that works better with topography, but it falls short of meeting the expectations of Design South West in terms of creating a route that meanders through the development with small incidental spaces at nodal points.

14.17.31. There are parts of the central avenue at its most northern extent where development would not actively front this central route with property boundaries and native shrubs instead framing the road. This challenges the requirement for ‘frontage development’ as per policy CHIC2. It is acknowledged that the orientation of properties is in part a consequence of seeking to manage levels outside of the street scene, and these properties would have a pleasant outlook onto green spaces. However, the lack of frontage development properly framing the street affects the character of the central avenue and, further, owing to the highway requirements surrounding the design of the bus route and cycle/pedestrian paths, its resulting width also negates its ability to offer a ‘traditional street’ as sought under LP policy CHIC2. Details such as the raised tables at crossing points can be designed out at the condition stage.

14.17.32. It is also of note, that roads and footpaths most frequently are greater than 1:20, but where they are less than this, this does present a conflict with Inclusive Mobility

Guidance recommendations and could present restrictions to pedestrians and cyclists and their ability to move easily throughout the scheme.

14.17.33. Owing to the concerns raised, and the high expectations within policy to provide high quality design, it is questionable whether the proposal truly meets the high bar set by LP policy ENV12 and NPPF para 135 in terms of design. Taking on board the policy and highway requirements relating to the provision of a linking route suitable for a bus, together with topographical challenges at the site, it is considered in this context that the resulting harm to the overall quality of the development should be given moderate weight, weighing unfavourably in the planning balance.

14.17.34. Design Quality – Parking

14.17.35. Also affecting design quality is parking. Treatment of car parking is always problematic within schemes owing to the practicalities of high car ownership and the desire to deliver places that are not dominated by the car. The proposed parking provision is acceptable having regard to the Dorset, Bournemouth and Poole parking Guidelines, but concerns have been raised in relation to its placement and impact on the built environment. The Urban Design Officer advises that visitor parking could be placed more conveniently, where tandem parking is proposed it could be better tucked behind the building line in places, street planting could work harder to soften the effects of parking, and rear courtyards could be better overlooked. The latter being a matter raised also by the Crime Prevention Design Advisor.

14.17.36. Trees and on-plot landscaping are however incorporated into all streets (previously they were not) and these will help to soften the impacts of parking, in particular visitor parking within the street and, to some extent, frontage parking. It is noteworthy that the Landscape Officer offers little comment relating to lack of street trees within the internal roads in this latest iteration of the scheme. The entrance to parking courtyards has been narrowed, and conditions can be placed on the consent to require additional side facing windows to properties adjacent to the courtyards, reducing their impact in the street scene and providing a more ‘private’ but surveyed feel. The latest layout does also show parking sited closer to the building line, though not always.

14.17.37. While it is considered that further improvements could be made to parking, and it is acknowledged that subtle amendments can make noteworthy differences in terms of placemaking, it is not considered that the impacts relating to parking would be significant in the planning balance. The resulting harm is given limited weight in the planning balance, but weighs against the proposal.

14.17.38. Design Quality – House types and character

14.17.39. Having regard to the design quality of house types, amendments (June 2026) to material treatment (removing non-traditional materials), the rationalising of house types (removing 2 ½ and 3 storey units) and their position in the street, these go some considerable way to improve the built environment. Buildings would more cohesively respond to the street, providing a more continuous building line and with less ad hoc variation in height would establish a stronger rhythm of development within streets. There continues to be concerns regarding detailed elements such as placement of chimneys, lack of detailing and use of split level materials that weaken the schemes response to local context and character, as required to by para 135 of the NPPF. Further, owing to loose application of the parameters defining different character areas, there would be little distinct differentiation in character between areas within phase A. Matters of material treatment can be further explored at condition stage, and there is opportunity at the reserved matters stage to refine and distinguish different character areas between the three phases, but within phase A, there lacks a clear identity between different areas within the development, to the detriment of character, legibility and distinctiveness, challenging the schemes

compliance with the National Design Guide. These matters weigh against the proposal. Given the increased cohesivity resulting from the above amendments, and opportunities to further refine material at condition stage, the impact is considered to be moderate, weighing against the proposal.

14.17.40. Ecology

14.17.41. Significant concern is raised regarding the impact of the development on ecology, in particular, due to the proposed central avenue bisecting the existing east-west 'wildlife corridors', including the designated wildlife corridor to the south. The provision of the central avenue nonetheless forms a critical component of the development, required by policy in the interests of ensuring effective movement without harm to traffic movement within the existing settlement. The provision of the central avenue through the wildlife corridor thus has the potential to result in unavoidable harm.

14.17.42. To ensure the best possible outcome in terms of mitigating impacts upon protected species, the application includes the provision of east-west wildlife corridors, as well as maintaining north-south green links, and proposes the use of tunnels and a dormice bridge to mitigate the impacts of the development and maintain connectivity. It is regrettable that details of lighting have not been provided up front to be able to assess its impact on the ecological corridors in more detail at this stage. It would be necessary to condition final details of landscaping and a lighting strategy to ensure that these components all work successfully together and minimise as far as practicable light spill within the wildlife corridors. In doing so, it is considered that in line with the mitigation hierarchy as set out in para 193(a) of the NPPF, appropriate mitigation measures are proposed to avoid impacts where possible and mitigate the impacts where impacts are unavoidable.

14.17.43. The proposal would provide suitable ecological enhancements such that there would be a biodiversity net gain on site in line with the provisions of policy ENV2, and the proposal would provide appropriate mitigation to avoid significant impacts on the Chesil and the Fleet European protected site.

It is considered that the proposed scheme would, as far as practicable, provide coherent ecological networks and connectivity across the site in line with LP policy CHIC2, and the function of the wildlife corridor would be maintained in line with NP policy CNP4. It is nonetheless considered that some harm to protected species is likely to occur. This harm weighs against the proposal, but acknowledging the mitigation proposed, and the policy requirement for the central avenue, the impact on ecology is given limited weight in the planning balance.

14.17.44. **Planning Balance**

14.17.45. It is noteworthy the various submissions that have been submitted to the Council since the application was made, none of which have presented acceptable treatment of streets and spaces, particularly owing to topographical issues amongst others. Impacts associated with the steep sloping nature of the site are significant, but to some extent unavoidable if development is to be brought forward on this allocated land, and therefore these impacts need to be weighed against the substantial benefits of delivering much needed housing, including affordable housing, at a time when the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. The latest submission, while not without its impacts, presents significant improvements to a number of matters compared to previous iterations having regard to providing a successful development that best meets the objectives of planning policy.

14.17.46. The assessment above sets out the benefits and the impacts of the proposed development and throughout this report consideration has been given to the policies of the development plan, the NPPF and other relevant material considerations. The presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out at Paragraph 11d of

the NPPF is engaged due to the Council's lack of 5 year housing land supply. Having regard to 11d(i) it is considered that the application of the policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance do not provide a strong reason for refusing the development and regard must therefore be had to 11d(ii).

14.17.47. Para 11d(ii) of the NPPF says that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework, taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination. The assessment of the benefits and impacts, as above, sets out the weight attributed to them.

14.17.48. It is considered that as a result of the latest iteration of plans (June 2026) and the ability to further refine details at condition stage that the planning balance is such that the benefits of the scheme, namely the housing delivery, provision of affordable housing, provision of land for a school and the provision of high quality amenity space are not significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the adverse impacts of granting planning permission and therefore in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the NPPF planning permission should be granted.

15. Recommendation

Recommendation A:

To delegate authority to the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager Southern and Western Team, in consultation with the Chair of the committee, and subject to no new material planning objections being received to the amended plans the current subject of consultation to grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report and the completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation under Section106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (S106 agreement) to secure the following:

- No more than 100 dwellings to be occupied prior to the completion of the central avenue;
- Provision of 35% affordable housing;
- Financial contribution of £722 per dwelling towards NHS;
- Financial contribution of £524.72 per dwelling and £357.77 per flat towards Chesil and the Fleet mitigation;
- Financial contribution of £1,736.06 per qualifying dwelling (house or flat with 2 or more bedrooms), less land value discount of £482,000, towards primary education; plus a contribution towards SEND provision of £1,487.62 per qualifying dwelling, together with the transfer of land for the school;
- Financial contribution of £22,524 towards sports pitches and training facilities;
- Financial contribution of £106,413 towards Weymouth swimming pool;
- The provision of 0.28ha of play space, which shall include two LAP's, a LEAP, and informal play, together with the transfer of the land to Chickerell Town Council and a financial contribution of £411.84 per 2 bed unit; £587.34 per 3 bed unit; and £669.24 per 4+ bed unit; less land value discount of £98,800 towards play provision; a financial contribution of £420,000 towards maintenance, and to address the shortfall in play provision, a financial

contribution of £50,000 towards enhancing the play facilities at Willowbed Hall and/or towards a skate park within the town;

- Financial contribution of £348,532.80 towards open space maintenance, together with transfer of the land to Chickerell Town Council;
- Financial contribution of £50,000 towards improvements to Willowbed Hall;
- Financial contribution of £81,675.76 towards bus infrastructure; sustainable travel cards to be exchanged for 30 day bus ticket or cycle equipment; updating the walking and cycling maps;
- Financial contribution of £20,000 towards the upgrading of footpath S16/23;

16. Financial contribution of £12,000 towards the upgrading of footpath S16/21.

Conditions:

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

Received 28th Oct 2024:

LOC-00 Rev C Location Plan

Received 31st March 2026:

2602-02-FMOB Full Matters & Outline Boundary Plan

P932/01 G Southern Access

P932-02 G Northern Access

Received 1st April 2026:

P18_2525_EN_52 Rev A Site Location Plan

P932-84 E Phase A General Arrangement Plan 4 of 4

P932-88 E Phase A Proposed Levels and Contours Plan 4 of 4

P932-92 C Phase A Main Drainage Plan 4 of 4

P932-96 C Phase A Swept Path Analysis 4 of 4

P932-97 C Phase A Longitudinal Sections 1 of 4

P932-98 D Phase A Longitudinal Sections 2 of 4

P932-99 D Phase A Longitudinal Sections 3 of 4

P932-100 D Phase A Longitudinal Sections 4 o f4

P932-101 B Phase A Adoptable Construction Details

P932-103 A Phase A Adoptable Drainage Details

P932-104 B Phase A Fire Tender Plan Sheet 1 of 2

P932-105 B Phase A Fire Tender Plan Sheet 2 of 2

Received 22 April 2026:

2602-02-HT-So(mid)-2Br a Solway (mid) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-So(mid)-1Br a Solway (mid) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-So(end)-3Br a Solway (end) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-So(end)-2Br a Solway (end) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-So(end)-1Br a Solway (end) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Sh-2St+C a Sherwood Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Re(mid)-3Br a Rendlesham (mid) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Re(end)-3Br a Rendlesham (end) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Lb-3Br a Lambridge Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Kn-3Br a Knebworth Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Kn-1Wb a Knebworth Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Hd(mid)-2Br a Haldon (mid) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Hd(end)-3Br a Haldon (end) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Hd(end)-2Br a Haldon (end) Plans & elevations)

2602-02-HT-Hd(end)-1Wb a Haldon (end) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Hd(end)-1Br a Haldon (end) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Gd(end)-3Br a Grizedale (end) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Ga(mid)-3Br a Galloway (mid) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Ga(end)-3Br a Galloway (end) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Ga(end)-2St+C a Galloway (end) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Da(end)-3Br a Danbury (end) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Da(end)-2Br a Danbury (end) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Da(end)-1Br a Danbury (end) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Ct-3Br a Chiltern Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Cd-3Br a Charndale Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Cd-1R a Charndale Plans & elevations

ARo_2602-02-HT-Br-3Br a Brampton Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Br-2St+C a Brampton Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Br-2Br a Brampton Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Bi-1Wb a Birkdale Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Be-3Br a Barndale Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Be-2St+C a Barndale Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Be-1Wb a Barndale Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Be-1R a Barndale Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Al(mid)-3Br a Alnmouth (mid) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Al(mid)-1Br a Alnmouth (mid) Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Al(end)-3Br a Alnmouth (end) Plans & elevations

Received 9th June 2026:

P932-83 H Phase A General Arrangement Plan 3of4

P932-85 G Phase A Proposed Levels and Contours Plan 1of4

P932-86 G Phase A Proposed Levels and Contours Plan 2of4

P932-87 G Phase A Proposed Levels and Contours Plan 3of4

P932-89 E Phase A Main Drainage Plan 1of4

P932-90 E Phase A Main Drainage Plan 2of4

P932-91 E Phase A Main Drainage Plan 3of4

P932-93 E Phase A Swept Path Analysis 1of4

P932-94 E Phase A Swept Path Analysis 2of4

P932-95 E Phase A Swept Path Analysis 3of4

P932-04 O Proposed Surface Water Drainage Strategy

P932-20 K Proposed Foul Water Drainage Strategy

P932-32 A Detention Basin Cross Sections

P932-37 Non-Motorised Access Arrangements

P932-81 H Phase A General Arrangement Plan 1of4

P932-82 H Phase A General Arrangement Plan 2of4

Received 11 June 2026:

2602-02-HT-Al(end)-1Wb Alnmouth (end) plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Al(end)-2R Alnmouth (end) plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Al(end)-2S Alnmouth (end) plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Al(end)-3S Alnmouth (end) plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Al(mid)-2R Alnmouth (mid) plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Al(mid)-2S Alnmouth (mid) plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Be-2R+C Barndale plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Be-2Wb+C Barndale plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Bi-2R Birkdale plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Bi-2Wb Birkdale plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Br-2R Brampton plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Br-2Wb+C Brampton plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Ct-1Wb b Chiltern plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Ct-2Wb Chiltern plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Da(end)-2R Danbury (end) plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Da(end)-2Wb Danbury (end) plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Da(mid)-2R Danbury (mid) plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Gar(d+t) b Garage (double/twin) plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Gar(single) b Garage (single) plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Ha(mid)-1Wb Haldon (mid) plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Kn-2R Knebworth plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Lb-2Wb Lambridge plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Re(mid)-2Wb Rendlesham (mid) plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Rk-2Wb Rockcliffe plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Sh-3Br b Sherwood plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Al(end)-1Br Alnmouth (end) plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-Al(end)-1S Alnmouth (end) plans & elevations

2602-02-DD(A1) b Dwelling Distribution Plan_Phase A1

2602-02-DD(A2) b Dwelling Distribution Plan_Phase A2

2602-02-FG b Figure-Ground Diagram

2602-02-MAT(A1) b Character Areas & Materials Plan_Phase A1

2602-02-MAT(A2) b Character Areas & Materials Plan_Phase A2

2602-02-PH b Phasing Plan

2602-02-PRoW b Public Rights of Way Diversion Plan_Phase A

2602-02-RSBS(A1) b Refuse Strategy + Bicycle Storage Plan_Phase A1

2602-02-RSBS(A2) b Refuse Strategy + Bicycle Storage Plan_Phase A2

2602-02-SH(A1) b Storey Heights Plan_Phase A1

2602-02-SH(A2) b Storey Heights Plan_Phase A2

2602-02-SP(A1) b Sustainability Plan_Phase A1

2602-02-SP(A2) b Sustainability Plan_Phase A2

2602-02-SS b Proposed Street Scenes_Phase A

2602-02-SS_2 b Proposed Street Scenes_2_Phase A

2602-02-SS_3 a Proposed Street Scenes_3_Phase A

2602-02-SSec_2 Proposed Site Sections_2

2602-02-TP(A1) b Tenure Plan_Phase A1

2602-02-TP(A2) b Tenure Plan_Phase A2

2602-02-BT(A1) c Boundary Treatment Plan_Phase A1

2602-02-BT(A2) c Boundary Treatment Plan_Phase A2

Received 17 June 2026:

2602-02-HT-FB(37-42)-2R a Flat block 37-42 - plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-FB(63-66)-1Wb b Flat block 63-66 - Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-FB(96-99)-2Wb a Flat block 96-99 - Plans & elevations

2602-02-HT-FB(106-114)-1Wb b Flat block 106-114 - Plans & elevations

P18-2525_42 C Dark Zone, Ecological Buffer - Interconnectivity

2602-02-HP(A1) a Hybrid Plan_Phase A1

2602-02-HP(A2) a Hybrid Plan_Phase A2

2602-02-MP(+B+C) b Masterplan -Whole site inc Phases B+C

2602-02-SSec c Proposed Site Sections

2602-02-SSec_3 Proposed Site Sections_3

P18-2525_29 P Strategic Landscape Masterplan

P18-2525_37_1 M Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals 1 of 4

P18-2525_37_2 M Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals 2 of 4

P18-2525_37_3 M Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals 3 of 4

P18-2525_37_4 N Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals 4 of 4

P18-2525_57 B Concept On Plot

Received 26 June 2026:

2602-02-HT-Sh-2Wb Sherwood plans & elevations

Received 29 June 2026

P932/116 Pond Sections

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

Commencement – Detailed element

2. The detailed element of this development to which this hybrid permission relates, as identified on drawing 2602-02-FMOB and referred to as phase A and D on drawing 2602-02-PH, 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).

Commencement – Outline element

3. Approval of the details of the access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping (hereinafter called the Reserved Matters) of the relevant phase of the development outside of the full permission (granted for Phase A and D of this hybrid permission and as identified on drawing 2602-02-FMOB) shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development of the relevant phase is commenced other than on Phase A and D of the development.

   Reason: To ensure the satisfactory development of the site.

4. An application for approval of any 'reserved matter' must be made not later than the expiration of five years beginning with the date of this permission.

   Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

5. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

   Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

6. Not more than 185 dwellings in total shall be constructed under the outline element of the permission.

   Reason: The assessment of the impacts of the scheme are based on a maximum of 328 dwellings across the whole site and additional dwellings would require further assessments of impacts.

Phasing Plan

7. No application for Reserved Matters shall be approved until a Phasing Plan for the development has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The Phasing Plan shall generally accord with drawing 2602-02-PH b Phasing Plan but shall include anticipated delivery timescales, including timescales for the delivery of the school. Thereafter, development shall be brought forward in accordance with the Phasing Plan.

REASON: To allow the development to proceed on a phased basis.

Design Code – phases B and C

8. No application for reserved matters shall be approved until a Design Code has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for phase B and C. Each subsequent reserved matters application for development within phase B and C should be accompanied by a written statement which sets out how proposed development in that phase has complied with the principles set out in the approved Design Code. The Design Code shall include details of the following in respect of each Character Area:

   - Minimum and maximum residential densities;
   - a palette of materials to be used in the construction of external surfaces;
   - a palette of architectural features to be incorporated into the design of buildings;
   - a palette of means of enclosure;
   - how affordable housing will be dispersed throughout each character area;
   - typical street scenes;
   - information of how level changes will be addressed;
   - parking design;
   - the location of and minimum amounts of landscaped areas within and between development parcels;

   All subsequent applications for the approval of reserved matters shall be in conformity with the approved Design Code unless justification is provided and an alternative is agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

   REASON: To ensure the provision of a high quality development in accordance with the provisions of Policies ENV1, ENV10, ENV11, ENV12 and ENV15 of the West Dorset Weymouth and Portland Local Plan.

Design Code – School phase

9. No application for reserved matters for the school shall be approved until a Design Code has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for the 'school phase', as identified on drawing 2602-02-PH b 'Phasing Plan'. The subsequent reserved matters application for development within the 'school phase' should be accompanied by a written statement which sets out how proposed development in that phase has complied with the principles set out in the approved Design Code. The Design Code shall include details of the following:

   - proposed massing and height, with consideration given to the massing of the school from the valley (from the north)
   - a palette of materials to be used in the construction of external surfaces;
   - a palette of architectural features to be incorporated into the design;
   - a palette of means of enclosure;
   - information of how level changes will be addressed;
   - the design of parking and access, which focusses on prioritising pedestrians and cyclists, and which seeks to avoid the dominance of parking from the street scene. Details shall include entrances for children/visitors (accessible from the public street/public area), and shall take account of school drop off/collection and the transition from the street into the managed space of the school;
   - the location of and minimum amounts of landscaped areas;
   - information on how the school will respond to public spaces and contribute to wider placemaking having regard to building lines and frontages;
   - how the design responds to Secure By Design Guide for Schools (2014)

All subsequent applications for the approval of reserved matters shall be in conformity with the approved Design Code unless justification is provided and an alternative is agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure the provision of a high quality development in accordance with the provisions of Policies ENV1, ENV10, ENV11, ENV12 and ENV15 of the West Dorset Weymouth and Portland Local Plan.

Materials

10. Prior to development above damp proof course of each phase, details and samples of all external facing materials for the walls and roofs for that phase shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development of each phase shall proceed in accordance with such materials as have been agreed.

    Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual appearance of the development.

Strategic Landscape Phasing Plan

11. Notwithstanding the submitted Landscape Plans (drawing numbers P18-2525_29 P Strategic Landscape Masterplan; P18-2525_37_1 M Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals 1 of 4; P18-2525_37_2 M Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals 2 of 4, P18-2525_37_3 M Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals 3 of 4, P18-2525_37_4 N Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals 4 of 4' received 17 June 2026), prior to commencement of development hereby approved, a Strategic Landscape Phasing Plan shall first be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The Strategic Landscape Phasing Plan shall identify strategic planting in and around the site, including along the northern and eastern boundaries, and shall include an implementation timetable making provision for strategic planting to be carried out in advance of the development. Thereafter after all strategic planting shall be carried out in accordance with the phasing and timetables agreed within the Strategic Landscape Phasing Plan.

    Reason: To ensure the provision and establishment of strategic planting to a reasonable standard of landscape to reduce the impact of the development on longer views, in accordance with Local Plan policy CHIC2.

Strategic Soft Landscaping and Planting Scheme

12. Notwithstanding the submitted Landscape Plans (drawing numbers P18-2525_29 P Strategic Landscape Masterplan; P18-2525_37_1 M Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals 1 of 4; P18-2525_37_2 M Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals 2 of 4, P18-2525_37_3 M Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals 3 of 4, P18-2525_37_4 N Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals 4 of 4' received 17 June 2026), prior to the commencement of development, a Strategic Soft Landscaping and Planting Scheme for that phase shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The Strategic Soft Landscaping and Planting Scheme shall include:

    - identification of all strategic planting in and around the site, including along the northern and eastern boundaries;
    - planting plans, written specifications and schedules of all strategic planting (including hedge, shrubs and trees), noting species, planting sizes, position and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate together with implementation timetables (which shall accord with the Strategic Landscape Phasing Plan agreed under condition 11).

- no fewer trees, shrubs and hedges than those shown on the submitted Landscape Plans (drawing numbers P18-2525_29 P Strategic Landscape Masterplan; P18-2525_37_1 M Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals 1 of 4; P18-2525_37_2 M Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals 2 of 4, P18-2525_37_3 M Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals 3 of 4, P18-2525_37_4 N Detailed Public Open Space Landscape Proposals 4 of 4' received 17 June 2026);
- the retention of all trees/hedges proposed to be retained as identified on the Tree Retention and Removal Plan, drawing no. BHA_506_01 and BHA_506_02, submitted within the Arboricultural Method Statement, and as shown on the Strategic Landscape Masterplan, drawing no. P18-2525_29 P.
- tree pit designs where applicable;
- stock proof fence protection installed to woodland buffer and native shrub planting within open space areas until established
- underground modular support systems where applicable;
- earthworks showing existing and proposed finished levels or contours;
- means of enclosure and retaining structures;
- proposed and existing functional services above and below ground infrastructure and services;
- the location of streetlighting;
- precise tree locations and indication of mature canopy spread;
- visibility splays.
- provision for the maintenance and replacement as necessary of the trees and shrubs for a period of not less than 10 years.
- implementation timetable

The Strategic Soft Landscaping and Planting Scheme, as has been agreed, shall be implemented in full in accordance with the agreed implementation timetable within the Strategic Landscape Phasing Plan (agreed under condition 11).

Reason: To ensure the provision and establishment of strategic planting to a reasonable standard of landscape in the interest of visual amenity.

<u>Internal Soft Landscaping and Planting Scheme</u>

13. Notwithstanding the submitted Landscape Plans (P18-2525_29 P Strategic Landscape Masterplan; P18-2525_57 B Concept On Plot), prior to the commencement of development within each phase hereby approved, a Soft Landscaping and Planting Scheme for that phase shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The Internal Soft Landscaping and Planting Scheme shall include:
    - planting plans, written specifications and schedules of all planting within that phase (including hedge, shrubs, trees, ornamental on plot planting and planting for the crib walls), noting species, planting sizes, position and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate together with implementation timetables (which, in relation to any strategic planting, shall accord with the Strategic Landscape Phasing Plan agreed under condition 11).
    - no fewer street trees than those shown on the submitted landscape drawings: P18-2525_29 P Strategic Landscape Masterplan; P18-2525_57 B Concept On Plot;
    - tree pit designs where applicable;

- underground modular support systems where applicable;
- earthworks showing existing and proposed finished levels or contours;
- means of enclosure and retaining structures;
- proposed and existing functional services above and below ground infrastructure and services;
- the location of streetlighting;
- precise tree locations and indication of mature canopy spread;
- visibility splays
- provision for the maintenance and replacement as necessary of the trees and shrubs for a period of not less than 10 years.
- implementation table

The Internal Soft Landscaping and Planting Scheme for each phase, as has been agreed, shall be implemented in full in accordance with the agreed implementation timetable.

Reason: To ensure the provision and establishment of planting to a reasonable standard of landscape in the interest of visual amenity.

Landscapes Management and Replacement

14. The planting and landscaping shown within the Strategic Soft Landscaping and Planting Scheme and Internal Soft Landscaping and Planting Scheme for each phase (agreed under condition 12 and 13) shall be carried out in full in accordance with the implementation timescales agreed; and in any case not later than the termination of the first planting season following the commencement of that particular phase of the development. In the ten year period following the completion of the strategic soft landscaping and planting scheme of that particular phase of the development any trees or plants that are removed without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority or which die or become (in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority) seriously diseased or damaged, shall be replaced as soon as reasonably practical and not later than the end of the first available planting season, with specimens of such size and species and in such positions as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

    Reason: To ensure the provision and establishment of strategic planting to a reasonable standard of landscape in the interests of visual amenity.

Rights of Way Management Plan

15. No development within any phase of development shall commence until a Rights of Way Management Plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Rights of Way Management Plan should be prepared in conjunction with the Public Open Space Management Plan required under condition 16 and shall include:
    - detailed design of the access and public rights of way routes, including details of their surfacing, widths, gradients, landscaping, and structures;
    - any proposals for diversion and closures of public rights of way and alternative route provision; and
    - provisions taking on board advice contained within the Rights of Way informatives listed on the decision notice.

    Thereafter the development shall proceed in strict accordance with the Rights of Way Management Plan as has been agreed. Any subsequent changes to the Rights of Way

Management Plan, owing to the outcome of the Footpath Diversion Order(s), must be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring public rights of way are retained at an appropriate standard.

Public Open Space Management Plan

16. Prior to commencement of development of each phase a Public Open Space Management Plan for that phase shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Public Open Space Management Plan shall cover details of hard landscaping and should be prepared in conjunction with the Rights of Way Management Plan required under condition 15. It shall have regard to the 'Advice Note for Practical Design and Management of Greenspace' and recommendations set out in 'Secure by Design', and it shall include:
    - detailed design of all other footways/cycleways not considered under the Rights of Way Management Plan, including details of their surfacing, widths, gradients, landscaping, and structures. The footway proposed along the western corridor of the site shall be surfaced using bound material;
    - details of access and crossing points (in accordance with the Active Travel Movement Plan required under condition 27 and details of crossing points required under condition 32)

3.1. minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, bollards, cycle facilities, refuse, signage/wayfinding);
    - details of a viewing area to be provided within the northern public open space;

3.2. proposed and existing functional services above and below ground and location of inspection areas (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines, etc indicating lines, manholes, supports, etc);
    - details of how surveillance of public areas shall be maximised having regard to the siting of landscaping;
    - details of lighting of public areas;
    - access and management arrangements;

Thereafter the development of each phase shall proceed in strict accordance with the Public Open Space Management Plan as has been agreed. Any subsequent changes to the Public Open Space Management Plan, must be agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring public open space is provided to an appropriate standard.

Play spaces

17. Prior to the development of areas of play, a comprehensive Play Strategy shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Play Strategy shall have been prepared having regard to 'Secure by Design' principles and 'Design for Play' Guidance and shall have had regard to recommendations by Fields in Trust and the Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide. The Play Strategy shall include:

details, including to scale plans and elevations, of proposed play experiences/equipment at each area of play;
a detailed specification and plans for each area of play, including details of surfacing, impact absorbing surfaces beneath and around play equipment, boundary treatment, location of entry/exit points;
minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, refuse, signage/wayfinding);

The Local Area for Play shall include a minimum of 12 play experiences/equipment, including a minimum of 2 inclusive play experiences/equipment and features that

support contact with nature and natural play. Signage shall be incorporated at each formal play space indicating that the area is for children's play and dogs are not welcome.

Thereafter, development shall proceed in strict accordance with such details as have been agreed within the Play Strategy.

Reason: In the interests of safety by design and in the interests of ensuring meaningful play spaces are created to serve the proposed development.

A Landscape and Ecological Management Plan

18. Notwithstanding the submitted Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), prior to commencement of development of each phase, a revised/updated LEMP for that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and shall include:
    - long term design objectives, management responsibilities, and maintenance schedules;
    - for all landscaped areas (other than small, privately owned domestic gardens), a Strategic Soft Landscape Scheme (as per condition 12) and an Internal Soft Landscape Scheme (as required by condition 13) for each phase, to include where practicable planting of large canopy trees at E-W ecological corridors;
    - the mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures detailed in the Ecology and Nature Conservation Chapter (chapter 7) of the Environmental Statement, together with a timetable for their implementation and/or phasing (implementation of landscaping to align with the details submitted in relation to condition 11 and 13);
    - identification of east-west 'wildlife corridors' to support ecological connectivity;
    - evidence of compliance for each phase of development including photographic evidence, to be supplied to the Local Planning Authority prior to the substantial completion of each phase of development;
    - a timetable for implementation and/or phasing (implementation of landscaping to align with the details submitted in relation to condition 11 and 13).

    Each phase of development shall subsequently be implemented entirely in accordance with the approved LEMP and agreed implementation timetables, unless any modifications to the approved LEMP as a result of the requirements of a European Protected Species Licence has first been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved mitigation, compensation and enhancement/net gain measures must be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.

    Reason: To ensure that due regard is paid to the continuing enhancement and maintenance of amenity afforded by landscape features of communal, public, nature conservation significance and to mitigate and compensate for impacts on ecological receptors, and to provide biodiversity gains.

Protection of trees

19. The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) by Barton Hyett Associates, dated Mar 2026 and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) drawing no. BHA_506_03 Rev A sheet 1 and 2, which also shows protected hedgerows to be retained. The tree and hedgerow protection measures for each phase shall be installed prior to commencement of development of that phase, and shall be retained until the development of that phase is complete. Dated photographic evidence of the erected tree/hedge protective measures fencing must be supplied to the Local Planning Authority at least 5 days prior to the commencement of works and nothing shall be placed within the fencing, nor shall any

ground levels be altered or excavations made without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding and enhancing the character and amenity of the site and locality and to avoid any irreversible damage to retained trees and hedgerows.

Services near trees and hedges

20. Prior to commencement of works (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) a plan showing final service routes, including the position of soakaways and a method for installation near trees and hedges shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The development thereafter shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details.

    Reason: To safeguard trees and natural features which are important to the visual amenities of the area.

Construction Environmental Management Plan

21. Prior to the commencement of development on each phase, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for that phase must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority. The CEMP must include the following:
    Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities. This should relate to impacts on ecology as well as impacts upon amenity through matters relating to noise, air quality and other construction related activities;
    detail construction hours in respect of various activities;
    the public display of site contacts;
    details of waste management plans;

    - Identification of “biodiversity protection zones”;
    - Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements);
    - The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features and the amenity of the area;
    - The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works;
    - Responsible persons and lines of communication;
    - The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person;
    - Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs to safeguard both biodiversity and amenity; and
    - protocols in the event unexpected land contamination is found on site.

    Thereafter, the development of each phase shall take place strictly in accordance with the approved CEMP.

    Reason: To protect biodiversity and amenity during the construction phase.

Dormouse Mitigation Strategy

22. Prior to commencement of development or any clearance of habitat capable of supporting dormice on the site, as identified on p14 of The Hazel Dormouse Mitigation Handbook (Wells, D., Chanin, P. & Gubert, L., The Mammal Society, 2025) a dormouse mitigation strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. As a minimum, the Strategy shall include:
    - the provision of a dormouse bridge to be positioned within the wildlife corridor to the south of the site;
    - stock fencing of dormouse habitat, in accordance with details to be submitted;
    - a methodology statement for the dormouse bridge; and
    - implementation timetables, a management plan and monitoring schedule.

    The development shall thereafter take place fully in accordance with the approved details and the mitigation shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details for the lifetime of the development.

    Reason: In the interests of securing appropriate biodiversity mitigation.

Dormouse Bridge

23. Prior to commencement of development or any clearance of habitat capable of supporting dormice on the site, as identified on p14 of The Hazel Dormouse Mitigation Handbook (Wells, D., Chanin, P. & Gubert, L., The Mammal Society, 2025), details of the dormouse bridge (as required as part of the Dormouse Mitigation Strategy (condition 22)) including to scale plans, and details of its positioning (which shall take into account the position of street lighting) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the dormouse bridge shall be installed and maintained in line with the details within the Dormouse Mitigation Strategy agreed under condition 22.

    Reason: In the interests of securing appropriate biodiversity mitigation and in the interests of highway safety.

Small Mammal/amphibian Mitigation Strategy

24. Prior to commencement of development or any clearance of habitat capable of supporting small mammals or amphibians on the site, a Small Mammal and Amphibian Mitigation Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Strategy shall include provision for a minimum of 7 tunnels running under the north-south central avenue, and shall provide details of their siting and design together with a methodology statement, implementation timetable, management plan and monitoring schedule. It shall also make provision for hedgehog holes within boundary fences. The development shall thereafter take place fully in accordance with the approved details and the mitigation shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details for the lifetime of the development.

    Reason: In the interests of securing appropriate biodiversity mitigation and in the interests of highway safety.

Lighting Strategy

25. Prior to the commencement of development on each phase, a Lighting Strategy for that phase shall first be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Lighting Strategy will seek to, wherever practicable:
    - keep lighting to less than 0.5 lux within the Wildlife Corridors (as identified within the submitted Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (condition 18)):
    - avoid all-night lighting;
    - have regard to siting street lighting columns at the greatest distance possible from the dormouse bridge (as required by condition 23) and wildlife corridors; and

- include details of any lighting within areas of public open space.

The Strategy shall include:

- details of the design of the columns and their height, position, direction of lighting, use of accessories such as cowls or hoods and details of the lights;
- the proposed locations of all street trees and their mature canopy spread;
- the hours the lights will be turned off

Thereafter, each phase shall proceed in strict accordance with such details as have been agreed.

Reason: In the interests of securing appropriate biodiversity mitigation and in the interests of highway safety.

Badgers

26. Prior to the commencement of development on each phase a badger sett survey of the development site for that phase and immediately adjacent areas shall be undertaken. A report detailing the results of the survey shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. If surveys show that specific relevant works require a licence to disturb a badger sett, a copy of a valid licence is to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the relevant works within that phase.

Reason: In the interests of securing appropriate biodiversity mitigation.

Active Travel Movement Plan

27. Notwithstanding the submitted plans (drawing numbers P932-81 H Phase A General Arrangement Plan 1 of 4, P932-82 H Phase A General Arrangement Plan 2 of 4, P932-83 H Phase A General Arrangement Plan 3 of 4, received 9th June 2026; and P932-84 E Phase A General Arrangement Plan 4 of 4, received 1st April 2026), prior to commencement of development of each phase, an Active Travel Movement Plan for that phase shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Active Travel Movement Plan shall include:
    - a plan indicating desire lines throughout the site;
    - details of the position of footway and cycle links within that phase having regard to desire lines;
    - details of crossing points (including type and colour of hard surfacing proposed) within the phase, which shall, as far as practicable, avoid the use of raised tables or other highway features that require all-night lighting;

3.3. details of the position of crossing points, having regard to desire lines/footway/cycle links. This shall include appropriately located crossing points connecting any public open space (i.e.. either side of the central avenue); and

- provision of an east-west cycle route linking the central avenue with Lower Putton lane.

Thereafter, the development of each phase shall take place strictly in accordance with the details as have been agreed.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety

Access Arrangements

28. No part of the development shall be occupied until the access onto School Hill, including a 6.5m wide vehicle carriageway access with shared use paths on either side, as indicated on Phase A General Arrangement Plan sheet 1 of 4 (Drawing P932/81 Rev H) has been provided in accordance with details to be first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that sustainable modes are prioritised and safe and suitable access to the site is provided for all users, in accordance with Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

29. No more than 50 dwellings shall be occupied until the connection for pedestrians and cycles to the western boundary of the site in vicinity of School Close and Mariners Way has been provided and open for use to a specification which shall have first been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

    REASON: To prioritise sustainable transport modes and ensure that safe and suitable access to the site is provided for all users, in accordance with Paragraph 115 and 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

30. No more than 100 dwellings shall be occupied until the upper connection to Lower Putton Lane, as indicated in the Non-motorised Users Access arrangements (Drawing P932/37 Rev #) and Phase A general Arrangement sheet 2 (Drawing P932/82 Rev H) has been provided and open for use in accordance with a specification to be first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

    REASON: To prioritise sustainable transport modes and ensure that safe and suitable access to the site is provided for all users, in accordance with Paragraph 115 and 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

31. No more than 300 dwellings shall be occupied until the lower connection to Lower Putton Lane, as indicated in the Non-motorised Users Access arrangements (Drawing P932/37 Rev #) and Phase A general Arrangement sheet 2 (Drawing P932/82 Rev H), has been provided and open for use in accordance with a specification to be first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

    REASON: To prioritise sustainable transport modes in accordance with Paragraph 115 and 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Crossing points

32. Notwithstanding the submitted plans (drawing numbers P932-81 H Phase A General Arrangement Plan 1 of 4, P932-82 H Phase A General Arrangement Plan 2 of 4, P932-83 H Phase A General Arrangement Plan 3 of 4, received 9th June 2026; and P932-84 E Phase A General Arrangement Plan 4 of 4, received 1st April 2026), prior to commencement of development of each phase, details of crossing points (including type and colour of hard surfacing proposed) within that phase shall have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall, as far as practicable, avoid the use of raised tables or other highway features that require all-night lighting, respond positively to placemaking, and ensure pedestrian and cycle priority at junctions. Thereafter, the development of each phase shall proceed in strict accordance with such details as have been agreed.

    Reason: In the interests of highway safety, placemaking and biodiversity.

Phase A

33. Notwithstanding the submitted plans (drawing numbers P932-81 H Phase A General Arrangement Plan 1 of 4, P932-82 H Phase A General Arrangement Plan 2 of 4, P932-83 H Phase A General Arrangement Plan 3 of 4, received 9th June 2026; and P932-84 E Phase A General Arrangement Plan 4 of 4, received 1st April 2026), prior to

commencement of development for phase A, plans showing the proposed estate roads, footways, footpaths, tactile paving, cycleways, verges, junctions, including revised layout of junction of Central Avenue with road 5), street lighting, sewers, drains, retaining walls, service routes, surface water outfall, vehicle overhang margins, embankments, visibility splays, accesses, carriageway gradients, drive gradients, car parking, and street furniture shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the estate roads and parking areas in Phase A shall be laid out in accordance with the details as have been agreed.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety, residential amenity and to provide safe and suitable access.

Bus stops

34. Prior to commencement of development, details of bus stop location and layout shall have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include details of the siting of the stops, appropriate passenger waiting facilities, hard surfacing and proposed infrastructure (including to scale plans of the bus shelters and poles, lighting and display information), and a timetable for implementation. Thereafter, the development shall proceed in strict accordance with such details as have been agreed.

    Reason: In the interest of highway safety and ensuring appropriate provision is made to support the use of the route as a bus route.

Visitor Parking

35. Notwithstanding the submitted plans (drawing numbers P932-81 H Phase A General Arrangement Plan 1 of 4, P932-82 H Phase A General Arrangement Plan 2 of 4, P932-83 H Phase A General Arrangement Plan 3 of 4, received 9th June 2026; and P932-84 E Phase A General Arrangement Plan 4 of 4, received 1st April 2026), prior to commencement of development for phase A, amended plans showing enhancement of the visitor parking layout shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, development shall proceed in strict accordance with such details as have been agreed.

    Reason: To ensure provision of adequate visitor parking

Cycle Parking

36. Prior to first use or occupation of each phase of development hereby approved, a scheme showing details of the proposed cycle parking facilities for that phase shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include details, including to scale plans, of on-plot bike storage facilities and cycle facilities to be provided within public areas of open space. Thereafter the development shall proceed in strict accordance with such details as have been agreed and cycle facilities serving public spaces shall be maintained and kept free for the purpose specified.

    Reason: To ensure provision of adequate cycle parking to support sustainable transport; in the interests of highway safety and residential amenity.

Turning and Parking

37. Before development within each phase is first occupied or utilised the estate road details, including geometric requirements, turning and vehicular parking areas shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, these

areas must be provided on site, permanently maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

Reason: To ensure the proper and appropriate development of the site in the interest of highway safety.

Construction Traffic Management Plan

38. Prior to commencement of each phase of development hereby approved a Construction Traffic Management Plan and programme of works relating to that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include
    - construction vehicle details (number, size, type and frequency of movement)
    - a programme of construction works and anticipated deliveries
    - timings of deliveries so as to avoid, where possible, peak traffic periods
    - a framework for managing abnormal loads
    - location of construction site access
    - contractors' arrangements (compound, storage, parking, turning, surfacing and drainage)
    - wheel cleaning facilities
    - vehicle cleaning facilities
    - inspection of the highways serving the site (by the developer (or his contractor) and Dorset Highways) prior to work commencing and at regular, agreed intervals during the construction phase
    - a scheme of appropriate signing of vehicle route to the site
    - a route plan for all contractors and suppliers to be advised on
    - temporary traffic management measures where necessary

    The development of each phase shall thereafter be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved Construction Traffic Management Plan for that phase.

    Reason: In the interests of road safety.

Travel Plan

39. Notwithstanding the submitted Residential Travel Plan, no part of the development shall be occupied until an updated Travel Plan, details of travel plan co-ordinator and timetable of implementing measures, broadly reflecting the details in the March 2026 Residential Travel Plan prepared by PFA Consulting dated Mar 2026, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details.

    REASON: To ensure that opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport in accordance with paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Surface water scheme prior to commencement

40. Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed surface water management scheme for the site, based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Surface Water Scheme shall provide clarification of how drainage is to be managed during construction, shall include a timetable for implementation of the scheme, and a methodology for pond reconfiguration of the Highway Authority drainage features at the south of the site. The design should generally be in accordance with the recommendations and designs within the report 'Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, by PFA Consulting, Ref P930, Issue 4 and dated June 2026' and the design

shown on drawing 'Proposed Surface Water Drainage Strategy, by PFA Consulting, ref P932/04, rev O and dated 5 June 2026'. The scheme should have regard to the guidance set out in the current DEFRA national standards Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). The surface water scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details including the timetable for implementation.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to protect water quality and to take into account current national standards for SuDS.

Maintenance and management of the surface water scheme

41. Prior to the occupation of the development, details of maintenance and management of the surface water sustainable drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme should have regard to the guidance set out in the current DEFRA national standards Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). 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 the future maintenance of the surface water drainage system, and to prevent the increased risk of flooding and to take into account current national standards for SuDS.

Amenity

42. Prior to first occupation of each phase of development hereby approved, details of retaining structures, including to scale plans of the crib walls and details of how they abut the street scene, shall have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development of each phase shall procced in accordance with such details as have been agreed.

    Reason: In the interests of the amenity of occupiers and visual amenity of the area.

43. No dwelling shall be occupied until the boundary treatment for that plot, as shown on the approved drawings shall have been erected. Thereafter, the boundary treatment, where shown to be at a height of 1.8m on the approved plans shall be retained at that height and no lower.

    Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, particularly given the difference in levels between plots.

44. Notwithstanding the submitted plans 2602-02-HT-SH-2Wb and 2602-02-HT-Ga(end)-3Br a, no development above damp proof course shall commence until revised plans and elevations showing a side facing window within the dwellinghouses at plots 46 and 115 shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, development shall proceed in strict accordance with the details as have been agreed.

    Reason: In the interests of safety by design and to ensure improved surveillance of car parking court yards.

Garden Gate Design

45. Garden gates providing side or rear access to property gardens shall be a minimum height of 1.8m and capable of being securely locked with key operated access from both sides.

    Reason: In the interests of safety by design.

Earthworks

46. Prior to the commencement of each phase of development, full details of earthworks for that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall be based on a site survey showing the existing ground levels including at the boundaries at the adjoining properties and shall include proposed grading and mounding of land including the levels and contours to be formed (in both private and public spaces, including property gardens, roads, footpaths and open space) and showing the relationship of the proposed mounding to the existing vegetation, surrounding landforms and built development. In addition, the heights of all retaining structures will be confirmed. No part of each phase of development shall be occupied until the works are completed in accordance with the approved details.

    Reason: In the interests of maintaining the amenity value of the area.

Finished floor levels

47. Prior to commencement of each phase of development, full details of the finished floor level(s) of all the building(s) within that phase shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such levels shall be relative to an ordnance datum or such other fixed feature as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development of each phase shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details for that phase.

    Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

Air Source Heat Pumps

48. Prior to occupation of each phase, details (including design, scale, positioning, noise output and mitigation measures where necessary, and an assessment against the Microgeneration Installations Standards: MCS-20) of any air source heat pumps shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the air source heat pumps shall be installed in accordance with the details as have been agreed and any mitigation measures permanently retained.

    Reason: In the interests of the residential amenity.

Land Contamination

49. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved the following information shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:
    1) a 'desk study' report documenting the site history.

    2) a site investigation report detailing ground conditions, a 'conceptual model' of all potential pollutant linkages, and incorporating risk assessment.

    3) a detailed scheme for remedial works and measures to be taken to avoid risk from contaminants/or gases when this developed.

    4) a detailed phasing scheme for the development and remedial works (including a time scale).

5) a monitoring and maintenance scheme to include monitoring the long-term effectiveness of the proposed remediation over a period of time.

The Remediation Scheme as agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved detailed phasing scheme for the development and remedial works and before the development within any phase first comes in to use or is occupied. A written confirmation that all works were completed in accordance with the agreed details and phasing scheme shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure potential land contamination is addressed.

Verification

50. If contamination remediation is required, prior to the first occupation or use of each phase of development hereby permitted as set out in the detailed phasing scheme approved under condition 49 a verification certificate to confirm that the land subject to that phase is fit for purpose following remediation shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure potential land contamination is addressed.

Unexpected Land contamination

51. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority and an investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with requirements of BS10175 (as amended). Should any contamination be found requiring remediation, a remediation scheme, including a time scale, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. On completion of the approved remediation scheme a verification report shall be prepared and submitted within two weeks of completion and submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure risks from contamination are minimised.

Archaeology

3.4. No works shall take place within each phase until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work for that phase has first been secured, in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall cover additional archaeological fieldwork to the trial trench evaluation reported within the Archaeological Evaluation Report dated 2016 together with post-excavation work and publication of the results and shall include a timetable for implementation. Thereafter, works for that phase shall proceed in accordance with the programme of archaeological work and agreed implementation timetable.

Reason: In the interests of securing and recording archaeological evidence.

Golf strike zone

52. Prior to occupation of any dwelling, a Strategy for addressing risk from golf strike shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include a plan clearly identifying the golf course to the east of the site and the golf strike risk zones within the development site. Within the golf strike risk zones, there shall be no residential development, and the Strategy shall set out the detailed design and landscaping proposed for this area, aimed to deter public access, and including the

provision of fencing and the provision for signage to be installed indicating risk from ball strike. The details as have been agreed shall be implemented prior to occupation of any dwelling. Thereafter, the mitigation measures set out in the Strategy shall be retained.

Reason: To ensure risks from ball strike are minimised.

Informatives

1. S106
   This permission is subject to an agreement made pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 dated ## ## relating to [Insert key matters covered in the agreement].

2. National Planning Policy Framework Statement
   In accordance with paragraph 39 of the NPPF the council, as local planning authority, takes a positive approach to development proposals and is focused on providing sustainable development.
   The council works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:
   - offering a pre-application advice service, and
   - as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.
   In this case, a Planning Performance Agreement was made which facilitated design workshops and regular reviews. The applicant/agent was consequently updated of any issues and provided with the opportunity to address issues identified by the case officer.

3. Electric vehicle charging points
   The applicant is advised that prior to the development being brought into use, it must comply with the requirements of Building Regulations Approved Document S: Infrastructure for the charging of electric vehicles.

4. Street Naming and Numbering
   The Council is responsible for street naming and numbering within our area. This helps to effectively locate property to deliver post and for access by emergency services. New or changed addresses must be registered with the Council. This link has more information. https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/planning-buildings-land/street-naming-and-numbering/street-naming-and-numbering.

5. Water Supplies for Fire Fighting
   The proposed development should be served by the necessary water supply and fire hydrants for use in the event of a fire. It is recommended that these requirements are established prior to commencement of development. This ensures a firefighting water supply is in place during the construction phase, hydrants are connected at the right locations, and at the right time.

6. Sprinkler systems
   The Dorset and Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service would recommend that the developer looks to provide at least a 32mm minimum diameter water main which would enable the installation of sprinkler systems within the approved dwelling(s). Further, Dorset and Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service would recommend that the proposed school is also fitted with a sprinkler system. The Council considers this to be a key element in reducing the impact of fires. The Council believes there is compelling evidence that sprinklers systems are a cost effective way of not only reducing the number of fire deaths and injuries, but also reducing the economic, social and environmental impact of fires.

7. Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition (biodiversity gain condition) that development may not begin unless:
(a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
(b) the planning authority has approved the plan.
The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan, if one is required in respect of this permission would be Dorset Council.
There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. These are listed in full in a subsequent informative below.
Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements are considered to apply.

- The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

Read more about Biodiversity Net Gain at
https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/biodiversity-net-gain

8. Biodiversity Net Gain exemptions
Statutory Exemptions and Transitional Arrangements in respect of the Biodiversity Gain Plan
1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.
2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.
3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and
(i)the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or
(ii)the application for the original planning permission* to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.
4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:
4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:
i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;
ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or
iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).
4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:
i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and
ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).
4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).
4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:
i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;
ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and
iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).
4.6 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.
* "original planning permission means the permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

9. Hazel dormice
The applicant is advised that Hazel dormice are protected in the UK by Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and Part 3 of the Conservation of Natural Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (2019 EU exit) and they are a European Protected Species. Work should proceed with caution and if any Hazel dormice are found, all work should cease, the area in which the Hazel dormouse/dormice have been found should be made secure and advice sought from Natural England (tel: 0300 060 3900), website www.naturalengland.org.uk before proceeding. More information on development planning and Hazel dormice is available here https://www.gov.uk/guidance/hazel-or-common-dormice-surveys-and-mitigation-for-development-projects

10. Nesting Birds
The applicant is reminded that, under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended (section 1), it is an offence to remove, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or being built. Planning consent for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this act.

The Natural Environment Team, Dorset Council recommends that vegetation, hedge, shrubs and tree removal; translocation or cutting back avoids the bird nesting season which runs from mid-February to 31st August. This is in order to avoid impacts to nesting birds and infringement of the legislation.

Vegetation or site clearance as a result of this development should be undertaken outside of the nesting season specified above. In some seasons the nesting period may start before or extend beyond these dates, so the applicant should be aware that the dates are a guide only.

If clearance work has to be undertaken during the nesting season, a breeding bird survey needs to be carried out by a suitably qualified person no more than 48 hours before clearance /cutting works commence. Any active nests identified should be protected by a 5m exclusion zone until the young have left the nest.

As a general rule, it should be assumed that birds will be nesting in trees, scrub, reeds or substantial ditch side vegetation during the core breeding period, unless a survey had shown this not to be the case. In addition, some species are ground nesting, such as the

skylark and lapwing, both of which can occur on grassland areas and cleared sites where there is a time lapse between demolition and development.

11. Badgers
Badgers are protected under the Badger Act 1992. Section 3 of the Act states:
"A person is guilty of an offence… by doing any of the following things… -
a) damaging a badger sett or any part of it;
b) destroying a badger sett;
c) obstructing access to, or any entrance of, a badger sett;
d) causing a dog to enter a badger sett; or
e) disturbing a badger when it is occupying a badger sett,
intending to do any of these things or being reckless as to whether his actions would have any of those consequences" If a badger(s) or badger sett is discovered during works; all work should stop and advice sought from Natural England by calling 0300 060 3900 or Dorset Council Natural Environment Team by calling 01305 221697 / net@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, before proceeding.

12. Rights of Way (PRoW)
The footpaths running across the site (footpaths S16/21, S16/22 and s1623) must be diverted by legal order and that order must be confirmed before any works obstructing the path are commenced. Obstruction of the PROW by the developer before the confirmation and certification of an Order for the diversion or extinguishment of the PROW, or in the absence of such an order will in normal circumstances result in the Council using the powers available to it under the Highways Act 1980 to act to remove the obstruction and return the PRoW to a satisfactory condition.

13. Rights of Way (PRoW)
Prior to the occupation of those units to be constructed on the original line of the PRoW, the new route of the PRoW will have to be provided to a certifiable standard, certified by the appropriate officer and the Definitive Map and Statement amended to reflect the new alignment.

14. Rights of Way (PRoW)
The site access and any public rights of way crossed by vehicles shall be maintained in a good state of repair and kept clean and free of mud and debris and all times.

15. Rights of Way (PRoW)
Provision shall be made for the installation and maintenance of a drainage system to ensure that no slurry or water from the development area flows onto the PRoW.

16. Rights of Way (PRoW)
Prior to the commencement of the development, the developer is advised that the definitive line of the RoW should be marked out on site, along with proposed new alignments and temporary alternative routes constructed with appropriate safety fencing at an appropriate unobstructed width.

17. Rights of Way (PRoW)
No excavating or tipping of or storage of material shall occur within 2m of the RoW or temporary routes.

18. Rights of Way (PRoW)
Landscaping and or planting schemes will consider the proximity of the PRoW, including the required width when mature so as not to obstruct free passage and prevent light and air reaching the PRoW surface.

19. Rights of Way (PRoW)

Investigations such as for utilities, archaeological, ecological, geological, etc should be conducted away from the line of the PRoW or temporary route, follow safe working practices, and include appropriate safety fencing. A temporary closure of the PRoW or temporary route may be needed.

20. Rights of Way (PRoW)
Tree works or vegetation removal close to or within falling distance of a PRoW may require a temporary closure whilst the works takes place.

21. Rights of Way (PRoW)
Site occupation by construction staff, i.e. site compounds, should be segregated from the PRoW or temporary route.

22. Rights of Way (PRoW)
'Construction nuisances' should be avoided or mitigated prior to commencement.

23. Rights of Way (PRoW)
As the development will result in the irreversible obstruction of the PRoW and therefore requires the PRoW to be diverted before development may lawfully proceed, we will not make an order to temporarily close the PRoW until an order to divert or extinguish has been confirmed. The application for a temporary closure should be made at least 13 weeks prior to when the closure is required via this link Temporary traffic restrictions for works and activities - Dorset Council. The initial closure period can be 6 months and extension can be applied for via the Secretary of State. A fee is applicable to this application.

24. Rights of Way (PRoW)
Any new infrastructure will adhere to the British Standard BS5709:2018, minimum widths and surfacing specifications as given by Dorset Council.

25. Rights of Way (PRoW)
Structures known as 'limitations' cannot be certified within the development area on a Public Right of Way.

26. Rights of Way (PRoW)
A specification may be provided for simple structures by the PRoW Officer. The structure required will be subject to the County Council's technical approval process the cost of which is to be met by the developer.

27. Rights of Way (PRoW)
For any new structure, it is expected that the responsibility for the maintenance of the structure will rest with the management company who will put in place appropriate measures for its inspection and maintenance. The Council will not contribute to the costs of maintaining or inspecting the structure but requires that records of inspection and maintenance are made available on request.

Recommendation B:

Refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below if the S106 agreement is not completed within 6 months from the committee resolution or such extended time as agreed by the Corporate Director for Planning, the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manage within 6 months from the committee resolution. The reasons for refusal for failure to secure the necessary obligations are set out below:

1. In the absence of a mechanism to secure 35% affordable housing provision on site, the proposed development would fail to provide an appropriate level of affordable housing contrary to policy HOUS1 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2015).

2. In the absence of a mechanism to secure financial contributions towards mitigating the likely significant impacts of development on the European Protected Habitat: Chesil and the Fleet, designated as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and a Ramsar site in recognition of its exceptional ecological importance, the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm arising from recreational pressures, contrary to the provisions of policy ENV2 and COM1 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2015) and paragraph 193 of the NPPF .

3. In the absence of a mechanism to secure and facilitate the provision of on-site infrastructure (including land for a school; public open space and play facilities; and a connecting central avenue); and in the absence of a mechanism to secure off-site infrastructure contributions (including contributions towards NHS; education; sports provision; play provision and maintenance; open space maintenance; improvements to Willowbed Hall, bus infrastructure and the upgrading of footpaths), the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm to existing and future residents, and place unacceptable pressure on local infrastructure, contrary to the provisions of policy COM1 and COM7 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2015) and paragraphs 96, 100, 105, 115 and 135.

Application Number:	P/FUL/2025/04039
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/
Site address:	Weymouth Bay Holiday Park Preston Road Weymouth DT3 6BQ
Proposal:	Removal of a telecommunications mast and associated structures and installation of bases for the siting of static holiday caravans with decking and associated access, landscaping, drainage and other related infrastructure works.
Applicant name:	Haven Leisure Limited
Case Officer:	James Lytton-Trevers
Ward Member(s):	Cllr O'leary and Cllr Dickenson

1. Reason application is going to committee:

A representation contrary to the officer recommendation has been received from a ward member and as the application is a “major” application in accordance with the scheme of delegation it is to be determined by the planning committee.

2. Summary of recommendation:

A) To delegate authority to the Service Manager for Development Management & Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager Southern & Western Team to grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report and the completion of a legal agreement under Section106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (S106 agreement) to secure:

- A contribution of £43,500 towards enhanced facilities at westbound and eastbound bus stops on the A373 by Weymouth Bay access and at Fisher Bridge;
- A contribution of £10,900 towards a Beryl bike bay and the purchase of 4 new bikes;
- The additional recreational enhancement measures as set out in paragraph 4.7 of the submitted document ref 31473/04/JFB/HAR and the annotated drawing of the proposed Footpath and Dog Walking Routes (Ref 106/09 February 2026) including footpath signage, 12 information boards, welcome pack and 5 rubbish bins (including dog waste);
- A Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan to secure the maintenance and monitoring of the BNG for 30 years;
- Advance planting (at least 2 years in advance) Mixed species native advance stock and feathered trees planted between caravans and at the edges of development and areas of native scrub around the edges of area G and south of area E shown on plans AP01D, AP02D & AP03E;

B) Refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below if the S106 agreement is not completed by 17 December 2026 or such extended time as agreed by the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Development Management Area

Manager Southern & Western Team. The reasons for refusal relating to the failure to secure the necessary obligations are set out in full at the end of this report.

3. Key planning issues

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	The proposal would comply with local plan Policy ECON7, Neighbourhood Plan (NP) policy W41 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This is subject to site specific consideration.
Landscape and appearance – Dorset National Landscape	The proposals are considered to partially comply with local plan policies ENV1, ENV3, ECON7, DNLP Policies A1d, Policy A2a and the NPPF. These are considerations in the planning balance at the end of the report.
Landscape and appearance – World Heritage Site (WHS)	The proposal is considered to partially comply with local plan policy ENV1 and NPPF para 213. These are considerations in the planning balance at the end of the report.
Heritage assets	The proposal would not fully comply with local plan Policy ENV4 or Neighbourhood Plan Policy W45, as it would not conserve the significance of heritage assets. However, the identified level of harm is limited and, subject to the consideration of public benefits, may be capable of being justified in accordance with paragraph 215 of the NPPF.
Biodiversity	The proposal is considered to partially comply with local plan policy ENV2, ENV3, NP policies W02, W03, W04, W05 & W07 and the NPPF. These are considerations in the planning balance at the end of the report.
Flood risk & drainage	Subject to conditions and detailed design of the swales and attenuation basin the proposal is considered to comply with local plan policy ENV5 and the NPPF in respect of surface water drainage. Whilst the sequential test has not been passed the proposal is considered to pass the exceptions test and subject to conditions would not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere and safe access and egress can be achieved in the event of a flood.
Trees and hedgerows	The proposal is considered to avoid damage or significant loss of trees, woodland, orchards or

Issue	Conclusion
	hedgerow and will be replaced with new planting. It would comply with local plan policy ENV5, NP Policy W06 and the NPPF.
Highway safety	The proposal is considered to not lead to an unacceptable impact on highway safety and would comply with local plan policy COM7, NP policies W41, W46 and W47 and the NPPF.
Amenity	The proposal is considered to safeguard amenity. The proposal would comply with local plan policy ENV16 and the NPPF.
Economic consideration	In light of local plan policy ECON7 and NPPF paragraph 85 support, there would be economic benefits which are considerations to be weighed in the planning balance.
Environmental Implications	It is considered that the proposal would go some way towards meeting the aims of NP policy W000 in so far as a development of this type for caravans.

4. Description of site

4.1 The proposed development site occupies a group of pastoral fields to the south and east of the existing Weymouth Bay and Seaview holiday parks and the north and west of Waterside Holiday Park. The settlement of Overcombe lies to its west, Preston and Sutton Poyntz to its north, Osmington further to its east and the town of Weymouth further to its southwest.

4.2 Access to the Site is provided from Preston Road (A353) to the north. This provides the singular vehicular guest access to the existing Park. Gated service access to the Park is provided from Church Road.

4.3 Informal pedestrian access at the southwest of the Site, is available from Forehill Close. This gated access also provides vehicular access for maintenance operators to a telephone mast within the existing Park.

4.4 The River Jordan runs through the centre of the site marking its low point at approximately 10m AOD with ground levels then rising within the site to 50m AOD in the southwest and northeast. Some parts of the site are within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and some parts of the site are at high risk of flooding from surface water.

4.5 The fields which make up the site are mainly bounded by hedgerows with occasional hedgerow trees though there are some larger trees and shelter belts around the fields in the central portion of the site and within the neighbouring holiday parks.

4.6 The site lies in the Dorset Ridge and Vale Landscape Character Type (LCT) and the Weymouth and Portland Osmington Ridge and Vale Landscape Character Area (LCA).

4.7 The site lies within an area of identified as Land of Local Landscape Importance within the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan.

4.8 The boundary of the Dorset National Landscape (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, AONB) lies just to the north and east of the site. The coastal strip to its south is within the Dorset and Northeast Devon World Heritage Site (WHS), and also within the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs Special Area of Conservation (SAC), and the South Dorset Coast Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

4.9 Two Scheduled (Ancient) Monuments (SAM), the remains of a Roman Temple and a Roman Villa, lie just to the south and north of the site respectively and there are a cluster of listed buildings including the Grade II* Church of St Andrew just to the north of the site within the Sutton Poynz Conservation Area. Chalbury Hillfort SAM lies to the northwest of the site on higher ground and there are numerous SAMs along the chalk ridge/escarpment to the site's north including the Osmington White Horse.

4.10 There are a number of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) within the site and on its boundaries and a network of PRoW on the higher ground to its north and along the Coastal Strip to its south. The Hardy Way runs through the centre of the site and the South West Coast Path and The Monarch's Way King Charles III footpath run to its north along the chalk ridge/escarpment and both to its south along the coastal strip respectively. The public footpaths are S1/19, S1/18, S1/87 (leading to S1/86); and S1/26 (leading to S1/20). There are further informal footways within the site, for example to the southern boundary of the existing Park. Local residents have been allowed to use some of the connections from the adjacent residential areas to the public rights of way on a permissive basis.

4.11 The site contains associated services and entertainment facilities which include:

750 static caravans, of which c.60% are owned and 40% are retained by Haven as part of its rental fleet;

Adventure Village, including high ropes course and climbing wall;

Adventure golf;

Indoor pool, outdoor pool and lazy river;

Three distinct food and beverage facilities;

Entertainment venue and Show Bar;

Outdoor play area; and,

Creative studio, including pottery.

4.12 The Park employs c.100 full-time staff all year round. It employs an additional 100 part-time staff during the low season and a total of 330 part-time staff in the high season. All staff live in Weymouth and the surrounding area.

5. Description of development

5.1 This is a full planning application proposing the installation of 241 no. static caravans and associated decking, the relocation of 5 No. static caravans, and associated infrastructure including Sustainable Urban Drainage (SuDs), an attenuation basin, foul water drainage, internal access roads and car parking spaces, footpaths and hard and soft landscaping as well as the removal of an existing telecommunications mast and associated infrastructure.

5.2 The proposed development comprises:

Installation of bases for the siting of 241 static caravans, with associated decking, located at:

Area B (to the southeast of Weymouth Holiday Park): 56 bases;

Area D (between Weymouth and Seaview Holiday Parks): 31 bases;

Area E (to the south of Seaview Holiday Park): 99 bases; and,

Area G (to the southwest of Weymouth Holiday Park): 55 bases.

Relocation of bases for the siting of static caravans to elsewhere in the existing park:

3 from the west of St Andrew's church;

1 from the west of Area D;

1 static caravan from the north of Area E;

Associated infrastructure, to include but not limited to:

Level for level flood compensation;

Attenuation basin and related sustainable drainage systems;

Foul drainage system;

Internal access roads and car parking spaces;

Formal and informal footpath routes; and,

Hard and soft landscaping.

Removal of a telecommunications mast and associated infrastructure from Area G.

5.3 In line with the existing site licence for the Park, it is intended that the scheme will provide holiday accommodation between 1 March in any one year and 14 January in the following year.

5.4 The development is "EIA development" for the purposes of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES).

5.5 The application is supported by the following documents:

The ES & Addendum, which includes sections on:

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA);

Ecology;

Heritage;

Transport;

Drainage;

Cumulative Assessment; and,

Mitigation & Monitoring.

5.6 Other supporting documents, including:

Plans;

Socio-economic Assessment;

Planning Statement & Addendum;

Statement of Community Involvement;

Design & Access Statement;

Exterior Lighting Design Proposals;

Biodiversity Statement;

Tree Survey & Impact Assessment;

Biodiversity Net Gain Statement;

Transport Assessment;

Geophysical Archaeology Report; and,

Archaeological trenching.

5.7 The applicant, Haven Leisure Ltd, part of the Bourne Leisure Group, owns and operates Weymouth Bay Holiday Park under the “Haven” brand. Established in 1964, Bourne Leisure operates a total of more than 50 holiday sites. Bourne Leisure is the largest owner/operator of holiday parks in the UK and employs some 3,500 full time staff and 8,700 seasonal/part time staff. The business now generates some £1 billion turnover and has a leisure asset base in excess of £2.5 billion. Nationally, Bourne Leisure’s parks attract over 3.5 million visitors per year.

6. Relevant planning history

94/00233/FUL - Decision: REFUSED - Decision Date: 29/06/1994

Extension to caravan park and provision of sports field and sports pitch.

Reasons: Loss of important greenspace, archaeology, flood plain and expansion which were restricted under the local policy at the time.

06/00018/FUL- Decision: REFUSED & APPEAL DISMISSED- Decision Date: 01/03/2006

New static caravan community comprising 30 bases

Reason: Harm to character and appearance of the area on account of the lack of screening at the time, reasons which were upheld on appeal.

WP/20/00570/PRE - Decision: RESPONDED - Decision Date: 02/02/2021

Pre Application consultation: Proposed Masterplan development at Weymouth Bay and Seaview Holiday Parks. Site meeting (Covid-19 restrictions permitting) and write up.

P/PAP/2023/00379 - Decision: RESPONDED -Decision Date: 22/09/2023

Masterplan for expansion of Weymouth Bay and Seaview Holiday Parks

P/ESC/2024/07573 - Decision: RESPONDED & EIA required -Decision Date: 09/01/2025

Request for EIA screening opinion

P/ESC/2025/01127 - Decision: RESPONDED & EIA required -Decision Date: 06/03/2025

Request for EIA Screening Opinion under Regulation 6 (The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended)) for installation of 240 bases for the siting of static caravans, relocation of 5 static caravans and associated infrastructure.

7. List of constraints

Grade: II Listed Building: GROUP OF 4 MONUMENTS APPROXIMATELY 4 METRES NORTH WEST OF TOWER OF CHURCH OF ST ANDREW List Entry: 1135149;

Grade: II Listed Building: LYCH GATE TO CHURCH OF ST ANDREW List Entry: 1135142;

Grade: II Listed Building: NORTHERN SECTION OF CHURCHYARD WALL CHURCH OF ST ANDREW List Entry: 1135145;

Grade: II Listed Building: ROOKE MONUMENT APPROXIMATELY 3 METRES NORTH OF THE VESTRY CHURCH OF ST ANDREW List Entry: 1135153;

Grade: II* Listed Building: CHURCH OF ST ANDREW List Entry: 1135140;

Grade: II Listed Building: TWO MONUMENTS APPROXIMATELY 5 METRES SOUTH OF SOUTH DOOR TO AISLE OF CHURCH OF ST ANDREW List Entry: 1135156;

Grade: II Listed Building: TWO MONUMENTS APPROXIMATELY 1.5 METRES SOUTH OF SOUTH AISLE DOOR TO CHURCH OF ST ANDREW List Entry: 1135154;

Grade: II Listed Building: GROUP OF 5 MONUMENTS APPROXIMATELY 10 METRES SOUTH OF AISLE WINDOW TO CHURCH OF ST ANDREW List Entry: 1135151;

Article 4 Directions

S106

Wessex Water Treatment Works Catchment

Rights of Way: Footpaths S1/19, S1/18, S1/87, S1/86, S1/26, S1/28, S1/20, S1/25 & S1/143

Medium pressure gas pipeline 12.5m or less from 12.5m Buffer on Regional Medium Pressure Pipelines (75 mbar – 2 bar)

Existing ecological network

Higher Potential ecological network

National Landscape (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty AONB): Dorset;

Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (5km buffer): Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs (UK0019861)

Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) impact risk zone;

Scheduled Monument: Preston Roman villa (List Entry: 1002704);

Scheduled Monument: Romano-Celtic temple and associated remains at Jordan Hill (List Entry: 1013371);

Scheduled Monument: Multi-period archaeological landscape centred on and including a slight univallate hillfort called Chalbury, two bowl barrows, part of a Bronze Age urnfield and a series of medieval strip fields (List Entry: 1002711);

Main River Consultation Zone

Flood Zones 2, 3, 3a & 3b

Risk of Surface Water Flooding Extent 1 in 30. 1 in 100 & 1 in 1000

Spatial Flood Defences

8. Consultations

All consultee responses can be viewed in full on the website. Following receipt of the ES Addendum there has been full re-consultation.

Consultees

Statutory:

- **Active Travel England –** No reply
- **Environment Agency –** No objection subject to condition.

  The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) adequately demonstrates the level-for-level floodplain compensation scheme. The Technical Note addresses the matter of finished site and floor levels.

  Condition requiring:

  The development in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment.

- **Historic England –** No objection

  The proposals affect the setting of several designated heritage assets: Preston Roman Villa, The Romano-Celtic temple and associated remains at Jordan Hill and the Grade II* Church of St Andrew.

  Preston Roman Villa & the Romano Celtic Temple benefit from far reaching views in almost every direction. A general sense of an isolated, coastal, rolling, rural landscape can still be appreciated. The current application would contribute to that gradual erosion of isolation and rurality, extending the caravan park in a southerly direction and bringing development closer to the monument and will be seen in the context of the existing park.

  The views out from the church and back towards the church tower from within open countryside contributes to the appreciation and understanding of the origins of the church as a rural parish church and its close connection with the landscape. Whilst the proposals will contribute to the erosion of the surrounding rurality and connection with the agricultural landscape, visibility to the application site is limited.

  There will be a low level of less than substantial harm to the significance (as contributed by their setting) of the Roman Temple and Church of St Andrew. That harm is drawn from the piecemeal erosion of their rural setting and, in the case of the temple - sense of isolation.

- **Natural England –** No objection subject to conditions/obligations.

  The revised scheme provides for significant new permitted footpath routes along with additional recreational enhancement measures which would avoid adverse impacts through additional recreational use of land within the Isle of Portland to Studland Bay SAC to be secured by planning obligation.

  The additional information provided includes a comprehensive invertebrate survey of the land holding to be secured for the duration of the scheme through a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP).

  Loss of 5% of the existing reedbed would be enhanced to a higher ecological condition through targeted enhancement measures and new areas created to be secured by a LEMP and HMMP.

  The enhanced habitat mitigation measures proposed would help to mitigate the loss of the extent of the natural habitats within the Bowleaze Gap ecological corridor which is well used by foraging bats and is likely to be used by migratory birds.

  The proposals would benefit from significantly increased tree planting within both the existing Holiday Park as well as throughout the proposed extension to be secured by condition.

- **Jurassic Coast World Heritage –** Comments.

  Taken in isolation the proposed development would not necessarily represent significant impacts to the setting of the World Heritage Site (WHS). However, concerned about the overall cumulative impact in this area following a number of changes and developments since 2001. This trajectory of development around Bowleaze is having the following effects;

  Disrupting the visual connectivity between the coast and the ridge and vale character of the landscape;

  Diminishing the transition from urban to undeveloped coast by increased urbanisation, changes in land use, and encroachment onto the WHS itself;

  The proposed extension to Weymouth Bay Holiday Park introduces further loss of open, undeveloped land, reduces the important fragmented character of the urban fringe and impacts the transition to undeveloped open coastline and rural setting for the WHS.

- **Wessex Water –** No reply

External:

- **Dorset Fire & Rescue Service –** No reply
- **Dorset Police Architectural Liaison Officer –** No reply.
- **Dorset Wildlife Trust –** No reply.
- **Public Health Dorset –** No reply.
- **Ramblers Association –** Comment:

  Concerned about the cumulative effect on the settings of the World Heritage Site and Dorset National Landscape;

  Impact on local infrastructure, in particular local roads.

Internal (Dorset Council):

- **Arboricultural Team –** No reply.

- **Archaeology -** No objection subject to condition.
  Remains that would be affected by the development should be recorded by condition.
- **Building Control West Team –** No comment.
- **Caravan, camping and park home sites –** No reply.
- **Conservation –** No objection
  The scheme has been assessed on its effect toward identified designations.
- **Coastal Risk Management -** No comment.
- **Dorset National Landscape (AONB) –** No objection subject to conditions.

  In consideration of the mitigation that is proposed the visual impacts within the National Landscape are not expected to be 'significant' from the outset and are expected to materially reduce in the medium-long term.

  Conditions are recommended for:

  Provision of the majority of planting;

  Planting proposals close to and within the caravans;

  Ongoing management of the proposed landscaping, i.e. a LEMP;

  The scale and appearance of the caravans;

  Control over the location and type of lighting for all external spaces, as well as any external fitting for the caravans.

  The officer says they have not identified overriding harm and consider that the development's effects on Dorset National Landscape would not be significant at the outset and should reduce to relatively low levels in the long term, as proposed planting matures.

- **Economic development & Tourism** – No objection

  The provision of additional accommodation in this location would be appropriate and beneficial to the local economy, plus supporting the council's ambition to increase visitor spend to Dorset by 5% by 2029.

- **Emergency Planning –** No reply

- **Environmental Assessment –** Comment:

  Habitat Regulations Assessment prepared which concluded that adverse effects on the integrity of the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC designated site can be mitigated.

  The application has not assessed alternative sites, an estimate, by type and quantity, of expected residues and emissions (such as water, air, soil and subsoil pollution, noise, vibration, light, heat, radiation and quantities and types of waste produced during the construction and operation phases).

- **Environmental Services – Protection –** No reply

- **Flood Risk Management –** No objection subject to conditions.

  The information provided is adequate to address a surface water strategy based upon an assessment of site characteristics.

  Recommend conditions:

  A detailed surface water management scheme and,

Details of maintenance & management of both the surface water sustainable drainage scheme and any receiving system.

- **Highways –** No objection subject to conditions/obligations

  The new connection to Forehill Close;

  Cycle parking; and,

  Construction Traffic Method Statement.

  A financial contribution of £43,500 towards enhanced facilities at westbound and eastbound bus stops on the A373 by Weymouth Bay access and at Fisher Bridge and £10,900 towards a Beryl bike bay and the purchase of 4 new bikes.

- **Housing Standards, Caravan Licensing Team –** Comment subject to conditions.

  Planning and site licence (Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 & s5 Model standards 1989 Holiday Caravan sites) is for caravans to be for holiday use only with restricted occupancy between 1st March and 14th January.

  If EV charging points are to be provided between units, consideration needs to be given in terms of fire risk.

  Condition restricting use and occupation of the units to holiday use only.

- **Landscape –** No objection

  Initially the proposed development would clearly have an adverse landscape and visual impact related to the caravans, but the coloured materials would mitigate this impact to some extent. Subject to establishment and with time, the proposed mitigatory planting would likely become the dominant landscape and visual feature and have a significant beneficial effect on the landscape and visual impact of existing development. The existing holiday related development surrounding the proposed development harms the character, special qualities, and natural beauty of the Dorset National Landscape and the heritage coast. In the context of this existing harm the development, as currently proposed, would be unlikely to result in additional harm to landscape character or visual quality of a great enough significance to warrant an objection.

- **Natural Environment Team/BNG –** No objection subject to conditions/obligation.

  Implementation of the habitat creation;

  Implementation of interior and external lighting;

  Submission of a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEMP);

  Submission of a Precautionary Working Method Statement (PWMS) for reptiles;

  Submission of a Landscape and Ecological Management (LEMP).

  Submission of a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan and Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP); and,

  s106 to secure the maintenance and monitoring of the BNG for 30 years.

- **Policy - Urban Design** – No comment

- **Public Health Doret –** No reply

- **Rights of Way Officer –** No reply
- **Trees –** No objection subject to conditions.

  Conditions for arboricultural Method Statement and tree protection.

  Town & Parish councils:

- **Bincombe Parish Council -** No reply
- **Crossways Parish Council –** No reply
- **Osmington Parish Council –** Initial objection on following grounds (no comment following re-consultation):

  Size;

  Impact on local services especially during peak tourism dates.
- **Weymouth Town Council –** Initial objection on following grounds (responded to say they supported the application following re-consultation):

  Traffic generation;

  Previous planning and appeal decisions;

  In a [National Landscape] Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

  Amenity (overshadowing, loss of privacy, noise disturbance and loss of outlook for residents);

  Loss of wildlife corridor;

  Encroachment onto the historic landscape;

  Density and layout.
- **Ward member Cllr O'Leary Littlemoor & Preston –** Objection:

  Overlooking, noise, overshadowing and loss of privacy from Area G;

  Loss of open green space enjoyed by local residents, tourists and deer;

  Access and parking for an extra 400 vehicle journeys a day on this stretch of road along with a 3% increase in local traffic. There is already issues with parking on Halstock close and Cedar Drive from the park. No extra parking provision for the employees (the 100 extra jobs);

  Drainage, sewage and flooding;

  There is no plan for extra facilities to be built as part of this site;

  Litter;

  A 33% increase in the size of the camp that will greatly change the very character of the area affecting the visual appearance of the area which will have a negative impact on the tourism trade;

  The economic benefits of this plan are far outweighed by the impact it will have on the natural environment, the landscape, and lives of the local residents nearest.

Representations received

Total - objections	Total - No objections	Total - comments
116	**1**	**4**

Petitions objecting	Petitions supporting
0	**0**

Summary of comments of objections:

The representations are nearly all from the local neighbourhood. Numbers in brackets represent the number of representations on each issue.

Main

Additional traffic/queues at entrance/danger to road users/use of Church Road (80)

Harm to wildlife (63)

Noise (from traffic, music, people, pets, car doors, gardeners, ‘fairground’ type attractions, construction work, etc) (58)

Loss of open space for recreation/dog walking/ambience (42)

Harm to character and appearance (and National Landscape) (40)

Excessive/overdevelopment/enough caravans/developer profiteering/community pays (33)

Flooding (surface water drainage impeded and collecting on proposed sites) (32)

Insufficient local infrastructure (GP surgeries, emergency services) (31)

Sewerage (unable to cope/overflows) (29)

Pollution (mainly light) (29)

Bus service unable to cope (18)

Overlooking (18)

Harm to heritage assets (15)

Antisocial behaviour (12)

Facilities on site insufficient (10)

Other

Litter (9)

Employment seasonal only (8)

No community/Weymouth benefits (8)

Overshadowing (5)

Insufficient parking (including for staff) (5)

Waste (4)

Water supply adequacy (4)

Access for emergency services (3)

Overbearing (3)

Crime (3)

Effect (negative) on house prices (3)

Gas pipeline (3)

Previous refusals (3)

Competition with other businesses (3)

The use of the gate via Cedar Drive and Forehill for works and access vehicles (3)

Foot traffic down Cedar Drive & Maple Close (2)

Dog fouling (2)

Telecom mast loss of phone signals (2)

Further precedent (1)

No cycle routes (1)

Need for higher quality accommodation not justified (1)

Safety from Calor gas tanks (1)

Trees inappropriate in this open landscape (1)

Wildfires (1)

Carbon footprint/sustainability (1)

Land reprofiling (1)

Loss of view (1)

Proximity of Area G & proposed footpath to Forehill Close (1)

Summary of comments of support:

Useful for visitors (1)

Additional planting (1)

9. Duties

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.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that when considering whether to grant planning permission for a development which affects a listed building or its setting, there is a general duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000) requires Local Planning Authorities to seek to further the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of National Landscape (formerly known as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) when making any decision which affects such land.

10. Relevant policies

Development plan

In this case the development plan comprises:

Local Plan Adopted West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland Local Plan:

The following policies are considered to be relevant to this proposal:

- INT 1. PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
- ENV 1. LANDSCAPE, SEASCAPE AND SITES OF GEOLOGICAL INTEREST
- ENV 2. WILDLIFE AND HABITATS
- ENV 3. GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK
- ENV 4. HERITAGE ASSETS
- ENV 5. FLOOD RISK
- ENV 10. THE LANDSCAPE AND TOWNSCAPE SETTING
- ENV 15. EFFICIENT AND APPROPRIATE USE OF LAND
- ENV 16. AMENITY
- SUS 2. DISTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPMENT
- ECON 7. CARAVAN AND CAMPING SITES
- COM 7. CREATING A SAFE AND EFFICIENT TRANSPORT NETWORK
- COM 9. PARKING STANDARDS IN NEW DEVELOPMENT

Made Neighbourhood Plans

Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan 2021 to 2039 (made 29/01/2026)

- Policy W00: Environmental Objectives
- Policy W02: Conservation of the Natural Environment
- Policy W03: Wildlife Habitats and Areas 1.
- Policy W04: Wildlife Corridors
- Policy W05: Ecological Impact of Development
- Policy W06: Trees, Woodlands, and Hedgerows
- Policy W07: Rights of Way and Access to the Countryside
- Policy W14: Development Boundaries
- Policy W34: Sustainable Development
- Policy W41: Sustainable Tourism Development
- Policy W44: Design
- Policy W45: Heritage Assets

- Policy W46 Transport and Travel
- Policy W47: Public Transport
- Policy W48: Off-Street Parking
- Policy W49: Vehicle Charging Facilities
- Policy W50: Cycle Routes

Material considerations

Emerging local plans:

Paragraph 49 of the NPPF provides that local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant plan policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan are to the policies of the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

The Dorset Council Local Plan

The Dorset Council Local Plan Options consultation took place between January and March 2021, with further consultation between 18 Aug – 13 October 2025. Being at a very early stage of preparation, the relevant policies in the draft plan should be accorded very limited weight in decision making.

Local Nature Recovery Strategy

The Dorset Local Nature Recovery Strategy identifies local priorities for nature recovery and maps areas where action would be most beneficial. In planning decisions it is a material consideration, helping to ensure that development supports biodiversity enhancement and aligns with Dorset's agreed priorities for nature recovery.

National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (as amended 2025)

Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date then permission should be granted unless specific NPPF policies protecting areas or assets provide a strong reason for refusal and/or any adverse impacts of approval would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole, with particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places and providing affordable homes.

Other relevant NPPF sections include:

- Section 4 'Decision making': Para 39 - Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available…and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will

improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

- Section 6 ‘Building a strong, competitive economy’, paragraphs 88 and 89 ‘Supporting a prosperous rural economy' promotes the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, through conversion of existing buildings, the erection of well-designed new buildings, and supports sustainable tourism and leisure developments where identified needs are not met by existing rural service centres.
- Section 11 ‘Making effective use of land’
- Section 12 ‘Achieving well designed places’ This indicates that all development to be of a high quality in design, and the relationship and visual impact of it to be compatible with the surroundings. In particular, and amongst other things, Paragraphs 131 – 141 advise that:

The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.

- Section 14 ‘Meeting the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change’
- Section 15 ‘Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment’- In National Landscapes (formerly known as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty), paragraph 189 requires great weight to be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty. Decisions in Heritage Coast areas should be consistent with the special character of the area and the importance of its conservation (para 191). Paragraphs 192-195 set out how biodiversity is to be protected and encourage net gains for biodiversity.
- Section 16 ‘Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment’- Paragraph 212 says that when considering designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. The effect of an application on the significance of non-designated heritage assets should also be taken into account (para 216).

Other material considerations

National Planning Practice Guidance

All of Dorset:
Dorset AONB Landscape Character Assessment
The Dorset National Landscape Management Plan 2026-31 (DNLP)

Policy A1a Deliver landscape-scale nature recovery and habitat connectivity
Policy A1c Enhance coastal, river and wetland ecosystems for biodiversity and resilience
Policy A1d Expand sustainably managed woodlands and greater numbers of trees outside woodlands
Policy A2a Conserve and celebrate Dorset’s historic environment
Policy A3a Implement nature-based solutions for climate adaptation and resilience

Dorset Council Interim Guidance and Position Statement Appendix B: Adopted Local Plan policies and objectives relating to climate change, renewable energy, and sustainable design and construction. December 2023.

Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance for the Weymouth and Portland area:
Weymouth & Portland Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (2002)
Landscape Character Assessment (Weymouth & Portland)

Other relevant statute
The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention
Paragraph 112 describes the essential role that effective management of Setting plays in supporting a Site's Outstanding Universal Value.
"112. Effective management involves a cycle of short, medium and long-term actions to protect, conserve and present the nominated property. An integrated approach to planning and management is essential to guide the evolution of properties over time and to ensure maintenance of all aspects of their Outstanding Universal Value. This approach goes beyond the property to include any buffer zone(s), as well as the wider setting. The wider setting may relate to the property's topography, natural and built environment, and other elements such as infrastructure, land use patterns, spatial organization, and visual relationships.
It may also include related social and cultural practices, economic processes and other intangible dimensions of heritage such as perceptions and associations. Management of the wider setting is related to its role in supporting the Outstanding Universal Value. Its effective management may also contribute to sustainable development, through harnessing the reciprocal benefits for heritage and society."

11. 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. 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 Public Sector Equalities Duty.

In considering this application, the potential impacts on groups with protected characteristics have been identified as follows:

Disability and Mobility Impairment

The development includes the provision of accessible holiday accommodation, specifically two adapted caravans designed for people with mobility impairments. The internal layout, accessible bathroom facilities and potential use of assistive features (such as trapeze lift handles) within these units would contribute positively to inclusive access. There are 7 ‘accessible’ caravans at Weymouth Bay.
The layout of the development includes footpaths and routes, which subject to detailed design are intended to accord with inclusivity mobility principles, including gradients and rest areas. However, the site is relatively expansive and located on undulating land, which may present practical accessibility challenges for some users, particularly those with limited mobility or visual impairments. The degree to which accessibility is achieved will therefore depend on the detailed delivery of pathways, gradients, surfacing and internal transport arrangements.

Older Persons

Older Persons may benefit from increased availability of holiday accommodation and accessible units. However, the reliance on walking routes, gradients and distances within the park, and the wider location relative to services, may affect ease of use for older visitors, particularly those with reduced mobility or health conditions.

Families with young children / pregnancy and maternity

- The provision of safe pedestrian routes, open space and recreational opportunities would support family use.
- The extent to which the development is safely accessible for those with prams or pushchairs will depend on the detailed design and maintenance of footways and gradients across the site.

Access to services and sustainable transport

Some protected groups (including older persons and disabled persons) may be more likely to rely on public transport and local services within walking distance;

The availability and quality of sustainable transport options is therefore an important consideration in advancing equality of opportunity.

The site is served by bus stops on the A353 and has connections to Weymouth town centre and surrounding destinations.

Financial contributions are secured to improve bus stop facilities and real-time information, which may benefit users who rely on public transport.

However, the site remains a car-dependent location, particularly for day-to-day access to services, healthcare and shops, which are located primarily in Weymouth.

This may place those without access to private vehicles — including some disabled persons, younger people and older persons — at a relative disadvantage.

13. Public Benefits

The proposals would provide a number of financial and non-financial benefits, including public benefits. These are summarised in the table below:

What	Amount / value
Material considerations	
Beryl bike bay and purchase of 4 new bikes	£10,900
New planting, permissive paths, signage & dog waste bins.	Not known

What	Amount / value
Enhanced facilities at westbound and eastbound bus stops on the A373.	£43,500
The Park employs c.100 full-time staff all year round. It employs an additional 100 part-time staff during the low season and a total of 330 part-time staff in the high season.	59 new jobs
Contribution to tourism	Increase in visits to other attractions and facilities
Construction	Employment by specialist caravan fabricators and on-site contractors during the construction phase of the development.
Non material considerations	
The applicant, Haven Leisure Ltd, part of the Bourne Leisure Group, owns and operates Weymouth Bay Holiday Park under the "Haven" brand. Established in 1964, Bourne Leisure operates a total of more than 50 holiday sites. Bourne Leisure is the largest owner/operator of holiday parks in the UK.	The business now generates some £1 billion turnover and has a leisure asset base in excess of £2.5 billion. Nationally, Bourne Leisure's parks attract over 3.5 million visitors per year, according to the applicant.
Business rates	Not known

14. Planning Assessment

Environmental statement

14.1 The proposal is Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development for the purposes of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and so this application is supported by an Environmental Statement (ES).

14.2 EIA is governed by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations, and the latest EIA Regulations came into force on 16th May 2017. The ES was prepared in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations).

14.3 The ES assesses the likely significant environmental effects of the development across a range of topic areas including ecology and biodiversity, landscape and visual impact, heritage, transport and drainage.

14.4 The ES identifies a number of potential adverse environmental effects, including:

- Short-term landscape and visual impacts, particularly during the early phases of development before mitigation planting has established.
- Temporary disturbance to ecological receptors and loss of some grassland habitats during construction.
- Archaeological impacts, including the potential loss of below-ground remains of local significance.

- Increased activity and traffic associated with the operation of the extended holiday park.

14.5 The ES also sets a comprehensive package of embedded and additional mitigation measures, including:

- Extensive structural landscaping and advance planting to assimilate development into the landscape over time.
- Habitat retention, enhancement and creation, supported by long term ecological management and Biodiversity Net Gain.
- Construction and operational management plans (including Construction Environmental Management Plan and Framework Travel Plan).
- Archaeological investigation and recording where necessary; and
- Sustainable drainage measures to control runoff and protect water quality.

14.6 Subject to the implementation of these measures the ES concludes that residual environmental effects will not be significant in EIA terms, with some topics (notably biodiversity and landscape) expected to experience long-term beneficial effects as mitigation planting matures and habitat enhancements take effect.

14.7 The ES has neither considered alternative sites for the development, nor has it considered emissions as highlighted by the comments of the Environmental Assessment officer. Whilst these deficiencies are noted, taken as a whole it is considered that the ES is adequate and does not require amendment.

14.8 The conclusions of the ES are an important material consideration and are addressed in detail in relevant sections of this report, including those relating to landscape, heritage, ecology, highways and drainage.

14.9 The Non-Technical Summary and addendum of the Environmental Statement, plus the full Environmental Statement is available to view on the Council's website.

Principle

14.10 This is a full planning application proposing the installation of 241 no. static caravans and associated decking within four new areas immediately adjacent to the existing park known as areas B, D, E and G. A number of ancillary proposals are required to facilitate the development. Namely: the relocation of 5 No. static caravans and Sustainable Urban Drainage (SuDs), an attenuation basin, foul water drainage, internal access roads and car parking spaces, footpaths and hard and soft landscaping as well as the removal of an existing telecommunications mast.

14.11 Local Plan Policy ECON7 (Caravan and Camping Sites) provides in principle support for the proposed development, stating that, proposals for the expansion, intensification or reorganisation of existing sites *"must clearly demonstrate that the development forms part of a long term management plan to improve the quality and appearance of the accommodation and site".* It also states that development proposals must include an appropriate landscape scheme and provision for its ongoing maintenance. NPPF Paragraphs 88 and 89 recognise that planning decisions should enable sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside and that sites to meet local businesses may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements.

14.12 The applicant has made investment in relation to leisure facilities in the last five or so years, but aside from routine maintenance of the site and facilities and replacement of caravans at the end of their useable life, there has been no significant investment. The caravan pitches at the park are generally small and are laid out uniformly and densely usually just surrounded by grass with little other planting. The applicant states that this proposal would deliver 241 high-quality pitches set within landscaping and that this would then allow Haven to reinvest elsewhere across the park. This would form a long-term management plan for the park.

14.13 The proposal would form an expansion and partial reorganisation of an existing site. It includes a comprehensive landscaping scheme, with advanced planting ahead of development proceeding, which would also serve to improve the screening of the existing park. The ongoing maintenance of the landscaping has already been indicated. The site is already in a rural location adjacent to the existing town.

14.14 Therefore, in principle the proposal would comply with policy ECON7, NP policy W41 and the NPPF. This is subject to site specific consideration of other matters below.

Landscape and appearance

14.15 The site lies within an area of identified as Land of Local Landscape Importance within the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan. The boundary of the Dorset National Landscape (formerly known as Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, AONB) lies just to the north and east of the site around 300m away.

14.16 Consideration is therefore given as to whether the proposed development would have a significant impact on or harm to the National Landscape's statutory purpose. Relevant to this is the duty on public bodies to 'seek to further the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the National Landscape when making any decision which affects such land (S85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, CROW, 2000). The Planning Practice Guidance confirms that this duty also applies to proposals outside the designated area but impacting on its natural beauty.

14.17 Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that, 'Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty of National Landscapes and National Parks which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.' In addition, consideration is needed for the landscape policies set out in the National Landscape Management Plan, local plan, and Neighbourhood Plan.

<u>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</u>

14.18 To inform a decision on the impacts on landscape, the application is supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The LVIA has been undertaken by the applicant, including 22 viewpoints, 14 of which are within, or very close to the boundary of the Dorset National Landscape. These viewpoints were agreed with the council in order to be a representative sample.

14.19 Visualizations have been produced for viewpoint (VP) 9, VP13, VP15, VP19 & VP20. Overall, the range of viewpoints and selected photography is sufficient to appraise the development proposals. The viewpoints are taken from all directions around the proposed site, from various distances away, and on high as well as low ground. The viewpoints are

taken from publicly accessible locations. The information provided enables a reasonably good understanding of the likely extent and appearance of the expansion that is proposed, as well as an understanding of the effects of planted mitigation from the outset, at year 8 and at year 15, both in summer and winter seasons.

14.20 Concerning the approach of the LVIA to landscape and visual receptor sensitivity, the 'high' classification for the National Landscape Setting is appropriate. In terms of visual receptors, which are people engaged in various activities that bring them to see and potentially appreciate the landscape, the 'high' sensitivity has been applied to users of promoted walking routes (the South West Coast Path and South Dorset Ridgeway), whereas users of other footpaths and bridleways may have been ascribed a lower sensitivity. Therefore, a 'high' sensitivity has been allocated to receptors at some locations (VPs 2, 3, 4, 5, 8 & 20) and 'medium' at other locations (VPs 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11 & 19).

Mitigation Measures Identified within the LVIA

14.21 The conclusions of the LVIA in relation to the setting of the National Landscape needs to be considered alongside the proposed mitigation measures, as described within section E5.0 of the LVIA, including:

- Comprehensive planted landscaping, as per the Landscape Masterplan and more detailed planting plans, including:
- Mixed species native advanced stock and feathered trees planted between caravans and/or at the edges of development and areas of native scrub around the edges of area G and south of area E; and,
- Areas of wildflower grassland in the two large pastoral fields on the eastern side of the site, to be managed as meadow grassland and areas of wildflower grassland/margins within the areas of proposed caravan development;
- New hedgerows along the route to Bowleaze Cove and also to enclose area G.
- Retention and protection of the majority of existing hedgerows and individual trees and the reinforcement of existing landscape boundaries;
- Utilisation of muted-colour caravans with dark roofs; and,
- Use of dark skies compliant lighting.

These measures are intended to reduce visual prominence and integrate the development into the surrounding landscape over time.

Assessment of Landscape Effects

14.22 The LVIA concludes that the potential effects on landscape receptors within the Dorset National Landscape during construction and initial years of operation would be adverse, reflecting the introduction of built form into currently open land and the extension of the influence of the existing holiday park development.

14.23 These effects are identified as generally 'minor' adverse reducing over time to 'minor to negligible' adverse in the medium term and 'negligible' adverse in the long term, as the proposed mitigation planting establishes which would notably soften the impacts of the development as perceived from locations within the designated area.

14.24 However, it is important to recognise that this assessment is dependent on the successful implementation and maturity of mitigation planting. In landscape terms, the development would result in a permanent change to the baseline character of the site, and the extent to

which the effects are reduced over time relies on the effectiveness of the proposed landscape strategy.

Assessment of Visual Effects

14.25 Concerning visual impacts, the impacts appraised by the LVIA are considered below.

14.26 The LVIA assesses that impacts on longer distance views from the north, in the vicinity of the South Dorset Ridgeway and Osmington White Horse, will not exceed a minor level from the outset, considering the distance, the context of a broader area of mixed residential and leisure development and because only parts of the proposed development would be visible. Furthermore, it is anticipated that the initial impacts will reduce to some degree in the longer-term, due to factors including the maturing of proposed planting.

14.27 VP 9 reflects the view from the A353, outside of the National Landscape, but very close to its boundary. For travellers heading westbound, there is a sweeping coastal view, partly across the development site, toward the coast at Bowleaze and beyond to Portland (these coastal areas being outside of the National Landscape). The LVIA foresees a 'minor-moderate' adverse impact in the short term, reducing to 'minor' adverse in the medium-term and 'negligible' in the long-term.

14.28 VP 10 – 12 reflect a sequence of locations from footpaths within the coastal hinterland, close to the Eweleaze Farm seasonal campsite. The assessment notes that the proposed development is often partially or fully obscured by landform and vegetation, but it would sometimes be visible. The LVIA considers that the effects will not exceed a 'minor' adverse level from the outset, with this reducing in the longer-term, due to the landscaping.

14.29 VPs 19 & 20 reflect footpaths and open access land around Chalbury Hill Fort. The LVIA judges a range of effects in the short-term, ranging from 'negligible to minor' adverse, to 'minor-moderate' adverse, again reducing in the longer-term when landscaping matures.

14.30 These conclusions are broadly accepted. However, it is noted that the LVIA findings are predicated on the effectiveness of mitigation planting over time, and the initial introduction of development in this landscape would give rise to perceptible adverse effects, particularly in views from within and near the national Landscape. Whilst these effects are not assessed as "significant" in EIA terms, these nevertheless represent a change to landscape character and visual amenity which must be considered in the context of the statutory duty under section 85.

Consideration of the Dorset National Landscape

14.31 The proposed development is within the setting of the Dorset National Landscape (AONB). This designation reflects the high value and sensitivity of the landscape including its scenic quality, undeveloped character and cultural significance.

14.32 The site currently contributes to this setting as predominantly open land, albeit influenced by surrounding residential and tourism related development. The proposed development would extend the extent and influence of this built form into presently open land. This would result in a further erosion of the undeveloped character of the site and its contribution to the setting of the Dorset National Landscape.

14.33 It is noted that the Dorset National Landscape Officer has considered the proposed development and concludes that, subject to a number of planning conditions regarding mitigation, they have not identified overriding harm and consider that the development's effects on the Dorset National Landscape would not be significant at the outset and should reduce to relatively low levels in the long term, as proposed planting matures.

Role and Limitations of Mitigation

14.34 The scheme incorporates substantial landscape mitigation, including advance planting, structural woodland belts and long-term habitat management. These measures would:

- Reduce visual prominence of the development;
- Introduce new landscape structure and ecological value; and
- Assist in integrating development into the surrounding landscape over time.

However, these measures are primarily mitigatory in nature and do not avoid the fundamental change arising from the introduction of development into open land.

14.35 The scheme incorporates a range of design measures intended to reduce the visual prominence of the development. In particular, the external appearance of the caravans would utilise a muted and recessive colour palette, including olive grey, medium grey, light grey brown and medium dark grey. This approach would assist in reducing contrast with the surrounding landscape when viewed from within and near the National Landscape.

14.36 Notwithstanding this in the initial stages of the development the visual impact would inevitably be influenced by the presence of static caravans and associated infrastructure and would represent a perceptible change in currently open views. The use of recessive colours would mitigate this impact to some extent but would not remove it.

14.37 Over time, and subject to successful establishment, the proposed structural planting and landscape mitigation would increasingly filter and soften views of the development. It is anticipated that as planting matures, vegetation would become the dominant landscape and visual features, thereby reducing the prominence of built form within the wider landscape.

14.38 Application of Section 85 Duty of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000

14.39 In applying the duty under Section 85, it is necessary to consider whether the proposal would conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the Dorset National Landscape in respect of its setting, given the site’s location outside of the National Landscape

14.40 The proposal would not conserve the existing character of the site. The introduction of additional caravan development would represent a continuation of the pattern of tourism related development and would further alter the landscape from its current pastoral character. Whilst the proposed planting and landscape strategy would, over time, soften the visual effects and introduce ecological and structural benefits, these would arise alongside the permanent change in land use and character, which would impact on the setting of the Dorset National Landscape.

Overall Conclusion on Dorset National Landscape Impacts

14.41 It is therefore concluded that:

- The proposal would result in short to medium term harm to the setting of the Dorset National Landscape. This harm would be characterised as moderate to minor adverse.
- The harm would be reduced over time through mitigation planting but not entirely removed.

14.42 The extent of harm is moderated by the presence of existing development in the surrounding area, which has already altered the landscape baseline. In this context, the additional impact of the proposal is assessed as limited in scale and not significant in EIA terms. It is also noted that neither the Council's Landscape Officer nor the Dorset National Landscape Officer objects to the proposed development. They accept that there will be some impacts but that they would not be so significant as to warrant the refusal of the application.

14.43 The acceptability of this harm, and the degree to which it is outweighed by the benefits of the proposal is a matter to be addressed in the overall planning balance.

Cumulative Effects

14.44 Clearly the proposed development would have a cumulative impact in conjunction with existing development, including recent residential developments. Subject to its establishment and maturing, the proposed planting would mitigate this cumulative impact to a significant degree. However, this does not negate the incremental change in landscape character resulting from the continued expansion of tourism-related development in this location.

14.45 With reference to the year 15 visualisations, the proposed landscaping would have a significant beneficial effect on the landscape and visual impact of existing and proposed development. However, the development would change the landscape and visual character of the wider site from holiday related development within a pastoral landscape setting to holiday related development within a woodland setting. This change would not amount to an enhancement of landscape character and appearance but rather represent a change to landscape character.

14.46 The proposal would introduce development into the Green Infrastructure Network (Land of Local Landscape Importance) designated within the local plan. It was also identified in the document: Urban Wildlife Corridors and Stepping Stones: Weymouth & Portland Borough – Addendum (September 2020). This land was designated for both as an urban key wildlife corridor and nature conservation area, which is given separate consideration later in this report.

Securing mitigation

14.47 As many of the assessments rely upon the efficacy of mitigation measures, it is particularly important that these measures are secured. Conditions and legal agreement on the following would be required:

- Provision of the majority of planting, particularly the strategic landscaping, in advance of the caravan development, by s106. The overall approach to phasing of advanced planting shown within the Landscape Parameters Plan is broadly appropriate.

- Requirements for the indicated planting proposals close to and within the caravans to be implemented in a timely manner, following the construction of each phase of expansion.
- A condition to ensure the satisfactory ongoing management of the proposed landscaping, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP).
- A condition to control the scale and appearance of the accommodation units (including decking). This should extend to materials and colours, which are understood to utilise colours such as olive grey, medium grey, light grey brown, and medium dark grey, as per the colour swatch plan.
- A lighting condition to maintain control over the location and type of lighting for all external spaces, as well as any external fitting for the caravans themselves. Dark skies compliant lighting is expected, i.e. minimising the amount of lighting, eliminating light spill beyond the horizonal axis, using sensors and controlling colour temperature so as not to exceed 3000K.

Summary

14.48 The proposed development would result in changes to the landscape character and visual amenity, including within the setting of the Dorset National Landscape.

14.49 As set out above, the proposal would give rise short to medium term adverse effects on landscape character and would contribute to an incremental erosion of the undeveloped character of the site and its wider setting. Whilst mitigation measures, including extensive landscaping would reduce these effects over time they would not entirely remove the underlying change in character.

14.50 In relation to the Dorset National Landscape, the development would not conserve the existing character of the site, albeit the site is outside of the Dorset National Landscape, and would not amount to an enhancement to the setting of the natural beauty of the National Landscape. The statutory duty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 has been engaged and given due regard in reaching this conclusion.

14.51 The extent of harm is moderated by the presence of existing development in the surrounding area and is not assessed as significant in EIA terms and is considered to be low to negligible harm in the longer term once mitigation planting is established and has grown

14.52 The proposal includes mitigation measures, including extensive planting, design controls and long-term management, which would reduce visual effects and provide some landscape and ecological benefits over time. These benefits do not necessarily outweigh or negate the harm identified, but are relevant to the overall planning assessment.

14.53 The proposal would not fully comply with ENV1(i) & (ii) as it would result in some harm to the character of the National Landscape and while it would detract from the local landscape character, it would relate to a site where existing development is of visually poor quality and provide opportunities to secure visual enhancements through landscaping. The proposal would comply with policy ENV1(iii) as appropriate measures would be taken to moderate the adverse effects of development on the landscape through landscaping.

14.54 The proposal would comply with policy ECON7(i) & (ii) as it would be well located in relation to existing facilities and it would form part of a long-term management plan. It would comply with policy ECON7(iii) as it would not have cumulatively a significant adverse impact on the distinctive characteristics of the area's landscape. The proposal would comply with policy

ECON7(iv) as it would include an appropriate landscape scheme and provision for its ongoing maintenance.

14.55 The proposal would comply with DNLP policy A1d as it would expand sustainably managed woodlands and greater numbers of trees outside woodlands. The proposal would partially comply with DNLP policy A2a as it would conserve and celebrate Dorset's historic environment.

14.56 The proposal would not comply with s85 of the CROW Act which seeks to actively further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of National Landscapes.

14.57 NPPF paragraph 189 affords great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes. The proposal would partially comply with NPPF paragraph 189 as the scale and extent of development would be limited and sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts.

14.58 These matters are to be weighed in the overall planning balance, taking into account the identified harm to the setting of the Dorset National Landscapes, alongside the benefits of the proposal. Therefore, the proposals are considered to either fully or partially comply (as set out above) with policies ENV1, ENV3, ECON7, DNLP Policies A1d, Policy A2a, S85 of the CROW Act 2000 and the NPPF.

Consideration of the World Heritage Site

14.59 The coastal strip to the south of the proposals is within the Dorset and East Devon World Heritage Site (WHS).

14.60 The Dorset and East Devon Coast, known as 'The Jurassic Coast', lies on the South Coast of England. In 2001 the Jurassic Coast was inscribed as a World Heritage Site (WHS) by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) for the Outstanding Universal Value of its rocks, fossils, and landforms. It remains England's only natural World Heritage Site.

14.61 The setting of the Jurassic Coast is described in the Jurassic Coast Partnership Plan (2020 – 2025) and has dual definitions: an experiential setting and a functional setting as set out below:

14.62 The 'Experiential' setting should be regarded as the surrounding landscape and seascape, and concerns the quality of the cultural and sensory experience surrounding the exposed coasts and beaches… … An assessment of landscape and seascape character provides a starting point for evaluation of the impact of change in the setting. The special qualities of the [National Landscapes] AONBs, such as tranquillity and undeveloped character of coast and seascapes, are important for helping to determine how people experience and enjoy the setting of the WHS.

14.63 The 'Functional' setting is in the context of a moving boundary that keeps pace with erosion, the setting is important because development and activity within it may sooner or later impact on the World Heritage Site itself… …the Site, most notably the coastal landforms and processes, are defined and explained by past and present geomorphological and hydrological systems that extend landward and seaward. Developments that impact on these systems may well have a resulting impact within the Site itself.

14.64 The Setting for the WHS can be helpfully interpreted using the description of the landscape character type of the area, Ridge and Vale, the key feature being the broad evenly spaced ridges and valleys which follow a west-east alignment. The landscape characteristics of the

Ridge and Vale within the setting of the WHS therefore provide important context and wider visible evidence that supports and illustrates the geological features for which the coastline was inscribed.

14.65 Bowleaze Cove exists at the margin of Weymouth and is the last significantly developed area of the coast moving eastward until reaching Swanage. It therefore acts as an important transition point between the developed coastline outside of the WHS and the natural coastline within the WHS. The undeveloped nature of the WHS, and its characteristic of being defined by ongoing natural processes, is key to its presentation both in the quality of people's experience of it and in how they understand and appreciate it as a natural and dynamic environment, which itself is another key attribute of the Site's inscription. Taken in isolation the proposed development would not necessarily represent significant impacts to the setting of the WHS. In the opinion of the Principal Officer World Heritage consultation response, there has been an overall cumulative impact in this area following a number of changes and developments since 2001. Since 2001, eleven planning applications have been granted consent that, overall, have set a trajectory of increased urbanisation of the area around Bowleaze.

14.66 The view of the World Heritage Site officer is that this trajectory of development around Bowleaze is having the effect of disrupting the visual connectivity between the coast and the ridge and vale character of the landscape, diminishing the crucial visible relationship between the structural and stratigraphic attribute of the WHS and its wider context. In addition, diminishing the transition from urban to undeveloped coast by increased urbanisation, changes in land use, and encroachment onto the WHS itself. This trend has a negative impact to the overall presentation of the WHS, especially in regard to major access paths and routes towards it and views into and out of the site.

14.67 The proposed extension to Weymouth Bay Holiday Park introduces further loss of open, undeveloped land along a well-used access route to the WHS, reduces the important fragmented character of the urban fringe and impacts the transition to undeveloped open coastline and rural setting for the WHS. This will be weighed in the planning balance.

Summary

14.68 The proposed development would result in changes to the landscape character and visual amenity, including within the setting of the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site.

14.69 As set out above, the proposal would give rise to short to medium term adverse effects on landscape character and would contribute to an incremental erosion of the undeveloped character of the site and its wider setting. Whilst mitigation measures, including extensive landscaping would reduce these effects over time they would not entirely remove the underlying change in character.

14.70 In relation to the Dorset and East Devon Coast World Heritage Site, the proposal would not affect its Outstanding Universal Value directly, but would give rise to harm to its setting, particularly in respect of the experiential qualities of the landscape and the transition between developed and undeveloped coastline. This harm is incremental but nonetheless material and must be afforded weight in the planning balance.

14.71 The extent of harm is moderated by the presence of existing development in the surrounding area and is not assessed as significant in EIA terms. However, these impacts remain important material considerations.

14.72 The proposal includes mitigation measures, including extensive planting, design controls and long-term management, which would reduce visual effects and provide some landscape and ecological benefits over time. These benefits do not outweigh or negate the harm identified but are relevant to the overall assessment.

14.73 The proposal is considered to partially comply with policies ENV1 and to comply with the NPPF para 213 in so far as it would not lead to substantial harm or loss. The Jurassic Coast Partnership Plan ended on 31 December 2025. However, the proposal would partially comply with policy R4 which seeks to protect elements of landscape character, seascape, seabedscape, natural beauty, biodiversity and cultural heritage that constitute the WHS's functional or experiential setting from inappropriate development. These are considerations in the planning balance at the end of the report. These matters are to be weighed in the overall planning balance, taking into account the identified harm to the World Heritage Site, alongside the benefits of the proposal.

Heritage assets

14.74 The proposals would affect the setting of a number of designated heritage assets. These are: Preston Roman Villa, The Romano-Celtic temple and associated remains at Jordan Hill, The Grade II* Church of St Andrew and potential archaeological deposits in the area surrounding these.

14.75 The Preston Roman Villa was likely the centrepiece of an agricultural economy and may be compared to rural estates. The villa has been partially excavated and found to contain both a north and western range (building) and a highly decorated mosaic. The archaeological finds recovered during those excavations suggest a 3rd to 4th century date for the occupation of the villa which is contemporary with the use of Roman temple on Jordon Hill to the south. Preston Roman villa sits within the main caravan park to the north of the application site and is surrounded on all but its western side by the existing caravan park. Indeed, caravans are positioned over the monument, as is a works yard. The increased capacity of the park will make no noticeable difference to the already significantly compromised setting of the Roman Villa.

14.76 The Romano Celtic Temple on Jordon Hill was likely built and used throughout the Roman period from the mid first century AD to the late fourth/early fifth century AD. Situated on the South Dorset Downs on Jordan Hill, a south-facing chalk ridge overlooking Weymouth Bay to the south. The temple benefits from far reaching views in almost every direction. Whilst modern residential development to the south has obscured the closest views of the sea from the temple, a general sense of an isolated, coastal, rolling, rural landscape can still be appreciated. This contributes to the significance of the monument. The Roman temple has far reaching views over the undulating landscape to the west of Weymouth. Whilst it is highly likely that the temple and villa have a contemporaneous relationship, there is no intervisibility between the two due to the topography. In northern views from the temple site an extensive array of static caravans can be seen in the distance, whilst these are visually distracting, they are not yet overbearing. A sense of the rolling chalk hills can still be appreciated, as can the temples' isolated location on the coastal fringe. However, this sense of isolation will continue to be eroded as the caravan parks increase in scale, size, and progress towards the monument. The proposals would contribute to that gradual erosion of isolation and rurality, extending the caravan park in a southerly direction and bringing development closer to the monument. Due to the topography the western extension will not be intervisible with

the temple, and whilst the eastern extension will be more apparent, it will be seen in the context of the existing park.

14.77 The Church of St Andrew is a14th century church with a 16th century tower within a churchyard and is a prominent landmark in the village of Preston. The views out from the church and back towards the church tower from within open countryside contribute to the appreciation and understanding of the origins of the church as a rural parish church and its close connection with the landscape. Whilst the proposals would contribute to the erosion of the surrounding rurality and connection with the agricultural landscape of the church of St Andrew, visibility to the application site is limited.

14.78 The site potentially has archaeological deposits, and investigation was carried out by the applicant. The trial trenching, which builds on the results of the earlier geophysical survey, has identified prehistoric settlement remains in the eastern part of the site. Trial trenches could not be excavated on part of the site because of the presence of hemlock. The prehistoric remains do not merit preservation in situ, but those remains that would be affected by the development should be recorded in advance, thus preserving these by record. The part of the site currently 'out of bounds' because of hemlock should be investigated archaeologically as well once it is safe to do so. The significance of these deposits is important in consideration of the evolution of occupation of this landscape.

14.79 The setting of St Andrew's Church has been compromised in the past by the location of 3 caravans immediately west of and adjacent to the church and church yard. The proposals would include relocation of these 3 bases for the siting of static caravans to elsewhere in the existing park.

14.80 Therefore, there would be impacts from the proposals on the setting of these heritage assets. The statements in Section 5.6 and 5.7 of the Cultural Heritage Statement, and F5.8 and F5.9 of Chapter F of the Environmental Statement, conclude that the proposals would result in less than substantial harm on the significance of the Roman Temple and the Church of St Andrew, at the lower end of the scale. It should be noted that Historic England and The Dorset Council Conservation Officer raise no objection.

Summary

14.81 Paragraph 212 of the NPPF provides that great weight is given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, irrespective of the level of harm and that the more important the asset the greater the weight should be. Where a development proposal would lead to harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm must be clearly and convincingly justified (para 213). Where harm is categorised as "less than substantial" this harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (para 215). The NPPF also requires that proposals seek to avoid or minimise harm to heritage assets and their settings (paragraph 208).

14.82 The Roman Temple and Roman Villa are Scheduled Monuments and therefore designated heritage assets of the highest significance. The Church of St Andrew is also a designated heritage asset of high significance.

14.83 Local Plan Policy ENV4 requires that development should conserve and where appropriate enhance the significance of a heritage asset or its setting. Any harm to the significance of a designated or non-designated heritage asset must be justified. Applications will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Where harm can be justified, appropriate

provision will be required to capture and record features, followed by analysis and where appropriate making findings publicly available. NP Policy W45 outlines that development proposals must not cause harm to heritage assets and their setting. The NPPF requires less than substantial harm to be balanced against the public benefits of the proposal (paragraph 215).

14.84 The proposed development would introduce additional built form into the setting of these assets, including the Roman Temple and the Church of St Andrew, which are currently experienced in a more open and pastoral context. This would result in a degree of harm to their significance through a change in their setting, including the erosion of openness and the extension of tourism-related development into views and surroundings which contribute to their appreciation.

14.85 The harm identified is assessed as less than substantial, at the lower end of the scale. This reflects the fact that the assets themselves would not be physically affected, and that intervening landform, existing development and proposed mitigation planting would limit the extent of visual and spatial change.

14.86 The proposal includes mitigation measures including landscape planting, layout design, relocation of 3 caravans to the west of St Andrew's Church and archaeological investigation and recording, which would reduce the impact on the setting of heritage assets. However, these measures would not entirely remove the harm arising from the change in character of the site and its surroundings.

14.87 In accordance with the NPPF, great weight has been given to the conservation of these heritage assets. The less than substantial harm identified must therefore be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

14.87 The proposal would not fully comply with Local Plan Policy ENV4 or Neighbourhood Plan Policy W45, as it would not conserve the significance of heritage assets. However, the identified level of harm is limited and, subject to the consideration of public benefits, may be capable of being justified in accordance with paragraph 215 of the NPPF. These are considerations in the planning balance at the end of the report.

Biodiversity

14.88 The application has been supported by ecological assessments and is proposed to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. More than 34 ha of the application site would be used for landscape and ecological mitigation and enhancement, with 16.3ha providing new landscaping and planting, and 18.5ha remaining as existing and utilised for potential BNG delivery.

14.89 The proposals include measures such as wildflower meadow creation, enhancement of reedbeds, new tree and hedgerow planting, and the provision of ecological features including bird boxes, bug hotels and log piles.

14.90 New permissive paths and on-site recreational routes are proposed to manage visitor behaviour and mitigate potential recreational pressures on designated and non-designated heritage sites.

14.91 Whilst these measures provide ecological enhancements, it is necessary to consider the extent to which these offset the ecological impacts arising from the development, including habitat loss, fragmentation and changes to ecological connectivity.

14.92 The coastal strip to its south is within the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs Special Area of Conservation (SAC), and the South Dorset Coast Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

Recreational impacts on the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC

14.93 The application lies within easy walking distance from the SAC located at Bowleaze Cove and the neighbouring coastal slopes and headland. The beach itself and the adjacent vegetated coastal slopes are all likely to support SAC qualifying habitats or play a role in maintaining the structure and function (including typical species) of the qualifying natural habitats.

14.94 With regard to likely impacts, there are public rights of way and associated desire lines that connect Bowleaze Cove and adjacent coastal slopes and the headland from the Holiday Park and proposed extension. These existing footpaths provide a convenient circular route from the Holiday Park to the coastal headland to the east of the Bowleaze Cove and back via Bowleaze Cove. It is therefore likely that the proposals will lead to an increase in recreational use of these routes which includes formal and informal access routes through and into the SAC.

14.95 The revised scheme provides for significant new permitted footpath routes, along with additional recreational enhancement measures as set out in paragraph 4.7 of the proposed mitigation and enhancement measures (ref 31473/04/JFB/HAR) and the annotated drawing of the proposed Footpath and Dog Walking Routes (Ref 106/09 February 2026). These are:

New footpath signage.

Provide a circular route within the Park;

Encourage dog walkers to use this route;

Encourage walkers to keep dogs on leads;

Provide pedestrian access to Jordan's Hill;

Help keep all users on the designated routes.

12 no. information boards.

Wildlife on site and the wider park;

Sensitive species and habitats present on the nearby designated sites; and,

Connecting routes available landward of the coast path, to promote inland public rights of way.

Welcome pack information for all overnight visitors

Provided to owners when they purchase a caravan with reminders issued annually; and,

Guests on each and every visit.

5 no. rubbish bins (including dog waste)

Strategic points within the site

Across the wider park – where these are not already provided

Perimeter and exit points to reduce the risk of littering beyond the park boundary.

Staff Training

Managers, rangers, reception team and landscape team.

14.96 Natural England raises no objection to the assessment that with these submitted measures in place the additional accommodation enabled by the development would avoid adverse impacts through additional recreational use of land within the Isle of Portland to Studland Bay SAC. These measures would need to be secured through a s106 agreement.

Assessment of potential loss of Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC supporting habitats.

14.97 A key conservation objective for the SAC is to maintain, "The structure and function (including typical species) of qualifying natural habitats". The habitats within the SAC include a range of specialist invertebrates which are functionally linked to the SAC. The applicant has carried out a comprehensive invertebrate survey. An "Additional Habitat Enhancement Strategy (v2)" has been provided in support of the application. The additional enhancement measures rely on a commitment to enhance the fields on Jordans Hill from 'Moderate' to 'Good' condition, as defined by the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Statutory Metric guidance, and the creation of significant new areas of scrub habitats which once established will help support the invertebrates. The area of woodland planting should be limited to that required to provide an adequate visual screen for the caravan park and the area of species rich scrub maximised and designed to create new edge habitats favoured by invertebrates.

14.98 The habitat enhancement measures proposed for the duration of the scheme would avoid any adverse impacts on the SAC. A Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) would be required as part of the statutory BNG approval process and will be secured by a S106 agreement.

Priority Habitats – Reedbeds

14.99 Reedbeds are considered a priority habitat for conservation in the UK. They are listed as a UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP) priority habitat and also under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. This designation reflects their importance for biodiversity and the threats they face from habitat loss and degradation. The scheme will result in the loss of 5% of the existing reedbed. This loss of reedbed habitat is anticipated within the scheme in order to accommodate the required flood compensation area. It is stated that the retained reedbed habitats will "be enhanced to a higher ecological condition through targeted enhancement measures and monitoring, which will be prescribed within a LEMP and the HMMP". Further, new areas of reedbed will be created to ensure an overall increase in reed bed habitat. The areas of new reed bed and grassland would be in the vicinity of the River Jordan corridor and north of Waterside Holiday Park to extend the retained high priority reed bed habitat west of Parcel B. This represents a replacement and enhancement strategy rather than avoidance of harm. The loss of established habitat is therefore material, notwithstanding that overall habitat extent and condition may improve over time.

14.100 The effectiveness of this mitigation is dependent on successful establishment, appropriate management and long-term monitoring, secured through a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) and Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP).

Ecological corridors and bat foraging habitats

14.101 The application site lies within the River Jordan Floodplain Corridor and Bowleaze Gap Corridor identified in the 'Urban Wildlife Corridors and Stepping Stones: Weymouth & Portland Borough – Addendum (September 2020)' report as the River Jordan Floodplain Corridor. The wildlife corridors identified in the report are considered important for bat foraging and also likely for migratory birds. The wildlife corridors comprise for the most part grasslands.

14.102 The loss of over two thirds of the identified wildlife corridor would result in a very significant narrowing of the corridor (from 140m to 40m). This represents a significant change to the spatial extent and functionality of the corridor and would result in a loss of ecological capacity and flexibility for future enhancement.

14.103 Whilst habitat enhancement measures including planting and management, would improve the quality of retained areas, they would not fully compensate for the reduction in width and the associated loss of openness and permeability.

14.104 Proposed mitigation measures include enhancement of the grasslands and significant new woodland planting, designed to help screen the proposals. This would be a 30 year on-site commitment to an Additional Habitat Enhancement Strategy to secure the long-term management of the east-west corridor. The light spill modelling prepared by Lumenata across the entire site has been provided to understand the effects on N-S and E-W connectivity for nocturnal species. This modelling demonstrates that post-development, light levels are acceptable in all areas considered suitable for bat habitat, which will reflect the request for a Dark Skies approach by National Landscapes.

14.105 The above measures would be secured by conditions and/or s106 and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) documentation. The conditions would secure implementation of the habitat creation and enhancement, lighting, a Construction Ecological Management (CEMP), a Precautionary Working Method Statement (PWMS) for reptiles, a Landscape and Ecological Management (LEMP) and a Biodiversity Gain Plan and Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan. A s106 would secure the maintenance and monitoring of the gains for 30 years. However, these measures are reliant on ongoing management and do not avoid the initial reduction in corridor extent. Natural England and the Dorset Council Natural Environment Team raise no objection to the proposed development and the mitigation proposed.

Summary

14.106 The principle of retaining and enhancing ecological networks is established in policy through paragraphs 187d and 192b of the NPPF, and by Local Plan policy ENV2.

14.107 NP Policy W02 outlines that areas of benefit to nature and geological conservation must be retained and protected from detrimental negative impacts, and that development must not have an adverse effect on the integrity of Habitat sites. NP Policy W03 outlines that proposals that will have significant adverse effect on the integrity of habitat sites will not be supported (unless in exceptional circumstances). The policy requires impacts to biodiversity to be mitigated in accordance with the NPPF. NP Policy W04 requires development impacting Wildlife Corridors identified within the NP to accord with Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol (DBAP), enhance and extend the Wildlife Corridors where possible and minimise impact and undertake remedial action where Wildlife Corridors are impacted. NP Policy W05 requires development to provide a minimum of 10% BNG, demonstrating provision of 20% BNG to be decided on a case-by-case basis, with ecological impacts considered from an early stage of design.

14.108 The proposed development would result in ecological impacts including:

- The loss of existing habitats, including a proportion of reedbed habitat.
- A significant narrowing of a recognised wildlife corridor, reducing its special extent and ecological functionality.
- Increased recreational pressure on nearby designated sites, including the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC.

14.109 These impacts represent harm to biodiversity and ecological networks. Whilst the level of harm is moderated by the existing use of the site and surrounding development, it is nevertheless material and must be acknowledged.

14.110 The proposal incorporates a comprehensive package of mitigation and enhancement measures, including habitat creation, long-term management, lighting controls and visitor management measures. These are expected to deliver biodiversity net gain and, over time improve the ecological value of the site.

14.111 Mitigation measures are proposed that fully mitigate for the impacts on the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC. In respect of the reed bed habitat and wildlife corridor the mitigation measures do not fully avoid or eliminate the identified harm, particularly in relation to habitat loss and fragmentation. The ecological benefits are, to a significant extent, dependent on the successful establishment and long term management of habitats.

14.112 On this basis, whilst the proposal is capable of delivering biodiversity gains and can be made policy compliant subject to mitigation and legal controls, it would result in residual ecological impacts which must be taken into account.

14.113 The weight to be given to these impacts, alongside the ecological benefits of the proposal, is a matter to be considered in the overall planning balance.

14.114 The proposal is considered to partially comply with local plan policy ENV2, ENV3, NP policies W02, W03, W04, W05 & W07 and the NPPF.

Flood risk & drainage

14.115 Flood risk and drainage have been considered through a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and supporting technical information. The site lies predominantly within Flood Zone 1 (low probability of fluvial flooding) with limited areas falling within Flood Zones 2 and 3, and parts of the site being identified as being at risk from surface water flooding.

Fluvial Flood Risk

14.116 In consideration of fluvial flood risk, the FRA demonstrates that development within areas at higher flood risk has been minimised, with the majority of built development located within Flood Zone 1. Where development is proposed within Flood Zone 3a (limited to 2 caravans), level-for-level flood compensation is proposed. This compensation would be provided prior to any associated raising of grounds levels, ensuing no loss of floodplain storage capacity. Subject to this approach, the development would not increase flood risk elsewhere and would not be unduly vulnerable to fluvial flooding.

Surface Water Flood Risk and Drainage

14.117 In consideration of surface water flooding, the proposal incorporates a sustainable drainage strategy designed to manage runoff and reduce flood risk both on and off site. This includes

the use of attenuation features including a new attenuation basin, with discharge controlled to greenfield runoff rates.

14.118 The drainage strategy is informed by site investigation and demonstrates that a viable discharge route can be achieved. The proposals also show how existing areas of surface water flood risk within the site would be managed through layout, design and drainage infrastructure. Subject to detailed design secured by condition, the proposal is considered capable of managing surface water flood risk without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The latest surface water flooding information in the NAFRA2 has been reviewed and does not alter the conclusions reached.

Sequential test

14.119 Given that small parts of the site fall within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and areas of surface water flood risk, it is appropriate to apply the Sequential Test in a proportionate manner, in accordance with national policy. Caravans are a more vulnerable use under the vulnerability classification. The aim of the sequential test is to steer development to areas of the lowest probability of flooding.

14.120 The proposal comprises an extension to an existing holiday park and is operationally and functionally linked to that established use. As such, the scope for alternative sites is limited to land capable of accommodating an extension to the existing facility, including land that is suitably located relative to the existing park and its infrastructure.

14.121 In applying the Sequential Test, the key question is whether there are reasonably available sites at a lower risk of flooding that could accommodate the proposed development, having regard to its specific nature and locational requirements.

14.122 Given the need for the development to be physically and operationally connected to the existing holiday park, alternative sites elsewhere within Weymouth or beyond would not meet the functional requirements of the proposal and cannot reasonably be considered as sequentially preferable alternatives.

14.123 The FRA addresses the Sequential Test by suggesting that the site selected has the fewest constraints. Whilst it does not consider alternative locations beyond the site chosen, in applying the Sequential Test, consideration has been given to the availability of alternative sites within Weymouth. On this basis the applicant concludes that there are no reasonably available and suitable alternative sites at a lower risk of flooding capable of accommodating an extension to the existing holiday park. However, it does not consider if the two caravans within flood zone 3a could be located in an area of the site at lower risk of flooding. This is an omission on the part of the applicant's sequential test and therefore it cannot be said that the sequential test has been fully satisfied.

Exception test

14.124 Only a limited part of the site is affected by higher flood risk, and generally the more vulnerable elements of the development are located within areas of lowest flood risk. The part of the site where more vulnerable development remains affected is a small strip within flood risk zones 2 and 3 covering the outer extremity of Area B which would contain 2 caravans. These 2 caravans would only partially be within the flood zone. Access/egress to both caravans would not be affected by the flood risk zone.

14.125 The FRA demonstrates that, through site design, floodplain compensation and drainage measures, the development would be safe for its lifetime and would not increase flood risk elsewhere.

14.126 The proposal would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community in terms of the economic benefits of the development and environmental enhancements that are considered to outweigh the flood risk and the development would be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall in accordance with NPPF paragraph 178.

14.127 On this basis, the Exception Test is considered to be satisfied.

Residual Risk and Emergency Planning

14.128 Residual risks associated with extreme flood events would be managed through appropriate site design and emergency planning. A site-specific evacuation plan would be secured by condition to ensure safe access and egress for occupants and emergency services during flood events. The surface water management scheme would consist of swales and an attenuation basin immediately south of Area B. The swale and attenuation basin final details would form part of a condition which would also ensure that it would be safe for the public.

Infrastructure and Consultation

14.129 There is no evidence to suggest that the capability of the public sewerage system and mains water supply would not cope with the additional capacity. The proposals are in the Treatment Works Catchment of Wessex Water, which is the statutory undertaker. Whilst no comments have been received, Wessex Water does have a duty to provide for increased demand for its services.

Summary

14.130 The proposal has generally been designed sequentially to direct development to areas of lowest flood risk within the site and incorporates appropriate mitigation measures, including floodplain compensation and sustainable drainage systems.

14.131 Whilst parts of the site are affected by flood risk, this has been addressed through layout, design and mitigation. The sequential test is not considered to have been passed, but as set out above the exceptions test is passed. It is considered, that subject to conditions the development would be safe for its lifetime and would not increase flood risk elsewhere.

14.132 The proposal would satisfy paragraph 181 of the NPPF as the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient , it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, any residual risk can be safely managed and safe access and escape routes can be included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.

14.133 The Environment Agency and Dorset Council Flood Risk Management Team raise no objection

14.134 Subject to conditions and detailed design of the swales and attenuation basin the proposal is considered to comply with local plan policy ENV5 and the NPPF.

Trees and hedgerows

14.135 The proposal would encroach into adjacent areas of land that are predominantly scrub land of mixed species and hedgerows. The proposal would provide the planting of a minimum of 4,174 trees and result in the loss of only one tree, works to the crowns of 4 trees and removal of only 7 sections of hedgerow as set out in the table below

Table 3 - Details of tree/hedgerow loss

Schedule No	Description	Total length/area/unit	Length/area/unit removed	Percentage loss
6	Mixed broadleaf hedgerow	260 m	6 m	2%
8	Mixed broadleaf hedgerow	225 m	8 m	3.5%
19	Group of goat willow	501 m^2	150 m^2	30%
20	Mixed broadleaf hedgerow	942 m^2	306 m^2	32.5%
23	Mixed broadleaf hedgerow	320 m	6 m	1.8%
24	Mixed broadleaf hedgerow	255 m	6 m	2.35%
25	Group of hawthorn and blackthorn	1561 m^2	132 m^2	8.5%
26	Group of Monterey cypress	3 trees	1 tree	33.33%
51	Mixed broadleaf hedgerow	255 m	5.5 m	2%

14.136 The Keen Consultants, Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) ref: 2392-KC-XXYTREE-TreeSurvey-and-ImpactAssessment-RevC date: September 2025 and Tree protection Plan ref: 2392-KC-XX-YTREE-TPP01RevE have been supplied as supporting documents and would be acceptable. Conditions would be required for an arboricultural Method Statement and tree protection during development.

14.137 The tree Officer raises no objection.

Summary

14.138 The proposal is considered to avoid damage or loss of trees, woodland, orchards or hedgerow and where lost they would be replaced with new landscaping proposals elsewhere on the site. It would comply with local plan policy ENV5, NP Policy W06 and the NPPF.

Highway safety

14.139 Vehicular access would be taken from the existing primary access points for Seaview and Weymouth Bay holiday parks onto the A373 Preston Road. There are bus stops along the A373 and a number of footpath links head south towards the coast and into Weymouth town.

14.140 The proposal would add an additional 241 units, representing an increase of approximately a third above current operations. The applicant has provided trip generation data for a peak period at the holiday park, June 2022 (the platinum jubilee bank holiday weekend) and in October 2024, a neutral time, reflecting outside of the seasonal peak, both for the holiday park and on the highway network and August 2025. This forms the foundations to the Transport Assessment (TA).

14.141 The submitted transport assessment indicated the proposal would generate an extra 400 daily movements (an anticipated increase of 2.4% of road users during operation relative to traffic surveys undertaken in August 2025). Compared to the existing 2,200 daily movements at the Weymouth Bay access highlighted in the transport assessment, the proposed vehicular trip generation for an increase of a third appears to be on the low side. However, sensitivity testing is within the updated assessment that indicates the additional vehicle demand would have a modest impact on the surrounding highway network. In principle, and subject to measures to prioritise sustainable transport being provided alongside the development, this is acceptable.

14.142 It is understood that the additional units would be implemented incrementally over a number of years. This would help to both reduce the intensity of construction works but also giving the operator a chance to adapt and evolve how park arrivals operate in response to increasing demand to the site. Development is to be brought forward on a phased basis, over a period of approximately six years and six phases. Each phase would deliver between 28 and 56 bases and construction of the first phase would start between Autumn 2026 and Spring 2027. A condition would secure this.

14.143 Each caravan would be provided with a parking space. The existing car park at the entrance is managed by an attendant or gate staff and is adequate to cope with the increased demand for staff and visitors.

14.144 The proposals could increase demand, particularly for arrivals which are concentrated at particular times and have potential to queue onto the adjacent A373. The applicant has moved the check in point further into the site, which was approved as part of another application. This will provide increased capacity and resilience to deal with extra arrivals and it is recommended that this change to the access is implemented in advance of the submitted proposal.

14.145 The proposals would also increase demand for travel by foot, cycle and bus to and from the site. Existing bus stops are at times very well utilised, with insufficient shelter space to accommodate demand. To ensure sustainable travel is promoted, the following upgrades are being provided by the applicant:

Bus stops

14.146 Visitors and staff can use the local bus services to access Weymouth town centre and beyond to key coastal destinations. There is an opportunity to improve the bus stop infrastructure near to the development site to encourage visitors and staff to use the local bus services. Inclusion of real time information displays at bus stops can encourage bus journeys as it would provide passengers accurate information of when the next bus is arriving and make users aware of any delays. Therefore, the following are proposed:

- Weymouth Bay Access: Westbound stop including enhanced shelter facilities and provision of improved passenger information;
- Weymouth Bay Access: Eastbound stop. New real time passenger information;
- Fisher Bridge, Westbound stop. New shelter and passenger information.

These would be secured through a financial contribution to the sum of £43,500 to encourage public transport use by a s106 agreement.

Bicycles

14.147 Expansion of the bike hire network and promotion of opportunities to cycle in the local area would align with central government's vision for half of all journeys in towns and cities to be cycled or walked by 2030. Therefore, the following is proposed:

- Bike hire: A contribution towards the expansion of the e-cycle hire scheme, currently operated by Beryl Bikes. This would include a new station with 6 parking spaces and funding for four bikes. This would be secured by a contribution of £10,900, to be secured by a s106 agreement.
- Cycle parking: While accepted that people will generally store their cycles at their car and/or caravan, there also needs to be provision for parking of these for trips across the site. The provision of two Sheffield stands, or similar.

Footpaths

14.148 The Footpath and dog walking proposals (drawing 106/9) indicate a footway connection from Area G through towards to Forehill Close. The proposed development is also likely to increase demand on this link. This is acceptable in principle, subject to full details and being secured by a s106 agreement.

14.149 There are a number of Rights of way across the site and a linked footpath to David Bellamy Way. These are not affected by the proposals.

Construction

14.150 To ensure that the negative impacts of construction are minimised, details would be required by condition of a construction and traffic management programme (CTMP).

14.151 Dorset Council Highways Team raise no objection.

Summary

14.152 Local plan policy COM7 concerns creating a safe and efficient transport network. NP policy W41 requires development to result in no harmful impacts on local services, roads and other infrastructure. NP policy W46 requires development to identify the realistic level of traffic generated from the development, maximise active travel opportunities and support public transport schemes and infrastructure where possible and NP policy W47 demonstrates that proposals that improve public transport infrastructure and services without unacceptable harm will be supported.

14.153 The proposal is considered to not lead to an unacceptable impact on highway safety and would comply with local plan policy COM7, NP policies W41, W46 and W47 and the NPPF.

Amenity

14.154 Whilst a significant majority of the proposals would be distant from neighbouring dwellings, area G would be located within proximity to a number of dwellings in Forehill Close, the closest being 14-24 Forehill Close (even numbers). These dwellings are houses with an orientation that varies, although the gardens directly overlook the open space to the south and east where the proposals would be located. The principal rear elevations of 14-22 also directly overlook this open space, while the side elevation of 24 faces the open space but has outlook from the front elevation across it. Clearly, the proposals could potentially have implications for the amenity of occupants both from within the houses as well as using their gardens in terms of overlooking, overshadowing, overbearing and loss of view. This is considered below.

14.155 The proposals would seek to address the amenity of the occupants of these dwellings by providing a buffer zone between the houses and the caravans. This buffer would comprise landscaping varying in width from 10m - 20m between the nearest three caravans lying on the outer edge of the proposals and the houses (not the gardens). It would also contain a footpath link to Forehill Close which would make use of an existing field gate access which leads onto the open space between the park and the sea. This footpath would be to provide access to the proposed footpaths and dog walking route in the open space.

14.156 The nearest caravan would be 17m from 22 Forehill Close and 33m from 20 Forehill Close. The footpath would be nearer to 14 – 24 Forehill Close than the caravans occupying a route from the access, described above, southwards. The footpath would extend further southwards across the open space along the rear of houses in Forehill Close, Maple Close, Sandbourne Road and Overcombe Drive. Whilst these are the principal roads facing the open space, potentially any dwelling within proximity to the open space could potentially be aware of the proposed footpath.

14.157 The landscaping proposed would, in the fullness of time, screen the caravans from these dwellings. The landscaping would potentially reduce the impact on the outlook from some of the houses and their gardens. The landscaping would not be to such an extent to overbear or overshadow although there would be inevitably a loss of view. There is no absolute right to a view within the planning system.

14.158 The caravans and the footpaths would bring a degree of activity within proximity of the existing houses. It is noted that the amount of activity directly attributable to occupants of the caravans would most likely amount to the three nearest to houses. It is also noted that the existing caravan park extends close to the rear boundary of 22 Forehill Close bringing with it a degree of noise from activities thereon. With the degree of separation proposed, it is expected that the potential intrusion of occupants of caravans in terms of noise from outdoor activity, coming and going and overlooking would not be to such an extent as to warrant an unacceptable loss of amenity for occupants of the houses.

14.159 It is noted that the access from Forehill Close onto the open space is already well used by walkers. It is not a public right of way, but used nonetheless. The route is not delineated clearly on the ground. It is not considered that continued use by walkers accessing the open space would lead to significant intrusion as users would be transitory and limited in number, the majority seeking access to Forehill Close to reach services in Preston Road and the vicinity of it.

14.160 A large number of representations have been raised about potential noise and general disturbance (from traffic, music, people, pets, car doors, gardeners, ‘fairground’ type attractions, construction work, etc). The area is already characterised by caravan park activity, not only from Weymouth Bay Park, as well as (amongst other things) activity from those using the open

space between the park and the sea and those visiting Bowleaze Cove for recreation. The proposal, with the exception of area G described above, are located well away from residential development. Given these factors, it is not considered that the proposals would give rise to additional undue loss of amenity for existing residents and users of the open space in terms of noise and general disturbance.

14.161 There are concerns about the loss of open space for recreation including dog walking. There are no adopted public rights of way directly affected by the proposals. Area G would occupy land that is currently used informally, but an alternative route to the south is proposed as part of the proposals. Areas A, D and E are much less used and alternative routes would be provided.

14.162 The proposals would not be likely to directly lead to an increase in antisocial behaviour and crime (including wildfires) in whatever form and wherever it takes place. The proposal would be within the extended park where staff would actively patrol and where there would be natural passive surveillance by occupants of caravans. There is already a lack of surveillance within the open spaces. It is considered that with the more distinguishable footpaths proposed in the open space, natural surveillance by other users would be improved.

Summary

14.163 The proposal is considered to safeguard amenity. The proposal would comply with local plan policy ENV16 and the NPPF.

Economic Considerations

14.164 Consideration is given to the benefits of the proposal. There are potential economic and social benefits. The applicant has provided supporting information within the Socio-economic assessment in the ES. This is outlined below.

14.165 The proposed development would attract significant new private investment, support new jobs and generate additional visitor expenditure at an existing holiday park, which the applicant has set out as follows:

- A capital investment of c.£19.6 million to be spent on a three-year construction period;
- The creation of 81 direct full time equivalent (FTE) jobs per annum through the build period. These would support a further 97 indirect/induced FTE jobs per annum;
- The generation of c.£17.9 million (direct and indirect) Gross Value Added (GVA) per annum across the construction period, comprising £7.9 million direct GVA and £10.0 million indirect GVA which equates to a total of £53.8 million direct and indirect GVA across the construction period;
- c.£5.56 million (on and off-site) visitor expenditure per annum and c.£3.56 million indirect expenditure per annum equating to a total of £9.12 million spending per annum, plus a total of £423,000 in maintenance expenditure per annum;
- The creation of 103 direct FTE jobs, comprising 59 jobs on-site and 44 jobs off-site, which would support the creation of an additional 66 indirect and induced FTE jobs; and,
- The increased expenditure associated with the additional lodges will support a total of £6.2 million (direct and indirect) GVA per annum.
- The nature of the new jobs would reflect the economic profile of the area, which relies on the tourism industry, and will help to increase the economic contribution of this sector.

14.166 In addition to the economic benefits outlined above, the proposed development would provide social and community benefits through the provision of training, job and career opportunities. This provision is particularly important for Weymouth Bay in order to support the retention of young people in the area, given the context of the ageing population in Dorset.

14.167 Support for the proposal was received from the Economic Development Officer from a tourism development point of view. The provision of additional accommodation in this location would be appropriate and beneficial to the local economy, plus supporting the council's ambition to increase visitor spend to Dorset by 5% by 2029.

14.168 Local plan policy ECON7 supporting text recognises that caravan and camping sites are key components of the area's stock of self catering tourist accommodation. It provides support in principle subject to considerations made in relation to the principles set out in this report. NPPF paragraph 85 recognises that planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development.

14.169 In light of local plan policy ECON7 and NPPF paragraph 85 support, there would be economic benefits which are considerations to be weighed in the planning balance. It is acknowledged that economic benefits will take time to accrue as the proposals would be developed in phases over a period of years.

Other matters

14.170 Concerns have been raised that the proposals would be excessive, overdevelopment, there are enough caravans, the developer is profiteering and the community pays. The quantum of development is that sought by this application and assessment has been made as to whether the quantum can be accommodated in this location having regard in this report to impacts on landscape, biodiversity, flood risk and so on. It is considered that 'need' and a developer's profit (or loss) are not planning considerations. Consideration can be given to whether the need and thus the provision of additional caravans would support tourism and other businesses and services, which are valid planning considerations. Consideration of 'betterment' in so far as the comments made that the 'community pays', house prices may be affected and competition with local businesses are not planning considerations.

14.171 The additional visitor numbers that would be likely generated from the proposal would potentially require support from local infrastructure (GP surgeries, emergency services, etc). Owing to the relatively infrequent and transitory nature of demand, it would not be expected that any additional demand would be onerous or unmet by existing services.

14.172 The existing facilities on the park would be sufficient to support the additional users. Some extensions to the main entertainment complex where the amusements, café and pool are located are planned with planning permission. More recent improvement has been seen in the outdoor activity areas. The proposals also include new footpaths with information boards which would add to the facilities on offer, as well as visitor enjoyment.

14.173 Additional bins are proposed within the open space which would help reduce littering and dog fouling.

14.174 The proposals would lead to an increase in employment including for seasonal workers. Seasonal employment is considered to be beneficial to the economy.

14.175 The mains gas pipeline which travels south of the park would not be affected.

14.176 It is noted that there have been previous applications for additional caravans refused planning permission (see planning history above). These decisions were made in different circumstances (such as the policy at the time) and in different locations and do not bear significantly in consideration of the proposals now being considered.

14.177 The mobile phone mast that would be removed is not operational.

14.178 Health & Safety, including safe storage of Calor gas tanks and electric vehicles, is covered by specific legislation and licencing that governs these matters. The current site licence on record for this site is Ref HO/TO/TE/83/89/1995/1/PAL dated 4th April 2000 and has a restricted occupancy between 1st March and 14th January.

14.179 As the caravans are required for holiday use and would not be designed to be permanent dwellings and the impacts of the development have been assessed as such, a condition ensuring holiday use only and stating no use as a person's sole or main place of residence would be required.

15 Environmental implications

15.1 The proposal would lead to additional CO2 emissions from the construction of the proposed development and from the activities of future residents and occupiers.

15.2 The construction phase would include the release of CO2 emissions from workers vehicles during the construction process. CO2 emission would be produced as a result of the production and transportation of the building materials and during the construction process.

15.3 This has to be balanced against the benefits of providing holiday accommodation in a broadly sustainable location and should be offset against factors including the provision of electric car charging. At this stage, details of low-carbon and/or renewable energy technologies have not been specified.

15.4 NP Policy W000 (Environmental Implications) requires development should aim to meet 4 environmental objectives. The objectives fall within categories: Carbon Neutrality, Resource efficiency, Biodiversity Net Gain and Climate Change Management. Within each target there are a list of individual measures that should be taken.

15.5 It is considered that the proposals would go some way towards meeting the aims of policy W000 in terms of these objectives where applicable and in so far as a development of this type for caravans.

16 Summary of issues and the planning balance

16.1 The proposal would give rise to identified harm to the setting of the Dorset National Landscape. The proposal would give rise to short to medium term adverse effects on landscape character and would contribute to an incremental erosion of the undeveloped character of the site and its wider setting. Whilst mitigation measures, including extensive landscaping would reduce these effects over time to a low level they would not entirely remove the underlying change in character. The development would not amount to an enhancement of natural beauty. The statutory duty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 has therefore been engaged and given due regard in reaching this conclusion. It is noted however that whilst the landscape officer and the officer for the Dorset National Landscape acknowledge the low level of residual harm in the longer term neither of them object to the proposed development due to the level of harm being so low it does not, in their view, warrant the refusal of the

application. The level of harm identified to landscape character and the setting of the Dorset National Landscape is afforded weight at the lower end of the scale in the planning balance.

16.2 The proposal would not directly affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site, but would give rise to harm to its setting, particularly in respect of the experiential qualities of the landscape and the transition between developed and undeveloped coastline. This harm is incremental but nonetheless material and must be afforded weight in the planning balance. It is considered to be at the lower end of the scale.

16.3 The proposed development would introduce additional built form into the setting of designated heritage assets, including the Roman Temple and the Church of St Andrew, which are currently experienced in a more open and pastoral context. This would result in a degree of harm to their significance through a change in their setting, including the erosion of openness and the extension of tourism-related development into views and surroundings which contribute to their appreciation. The harm identified is assessed as less than substantial, at the lower end of the scale. This reflects the fact that the assets themselves would not be physically affected, and that intervening landform, existing development and proposed mitigation planting and removal of caravans in proximity to St Andrew's Church would limit the extent of visual and spatial change.

16.4 Residual ecological harm: The proposed development would result in ecological impacts including:

- The loss of existing habitats, including a proportion of reedbed habitat.
- A significant narrowing of a recognised wildlife corridor, reducing its special extent and ecological functionality.
- Increased recreational pressure on nearby designated sites, including the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC.

These impacts represent harm to biodiversity and ecological networks. Whilst the proposal is capable of delivering biodiversity gains and can be made policy compliant subject to mitigation secured by condition and legal agreement it would result in residual ecological impacts which must be taken into account. This is considered to be at the lower end of the scale.

16.5 Against these impacts, the proposal is considered to deliver moderate economic benefits through tourism and employment. The proposals would bring public benefit in the provision of holiday accommodation which would support tourism in the Weymouth area. The Dorset Council Economic Development & Tourism Team support the proposals stating that the proposals in this location would be appropriate and beneficial to the local economy, plus supporting the council's ambition to increase visitor spend to Dorset by 5% by 2029.

16.6 The proposal would provide limited infrastructure improvements through the provision of additional footpath access to open space and enhancements to sustainable transport options.

16.7 The proposal would bring enhancement to the appearance of the existing park through the additional landscaping and the removal of caravans adjacent to St. Andrew’s church.

16.8 The above public benefits are considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm to heritage assets which has been identified.

16.9 The proposals would be acceptable in all other respects including in terms of flood risk, highway safety, amenity and other material considerations subject to the completion of a s106 legal agreement and planning conditions.

16.10 The benefits of the proposals need to be balanced against the identified harm. The proposals would be sustainable development bringing social, economic and environmental benefits. There would be a number of public benefits in the provision of new tourism accommodation, provision of footpath access within the open space, sustainable transport options including a bus shelter and Beryl bikes and provision of planting which would benefit the screening of the existing development from public viewpoints.

16.11 Whilst finely balanced it is considered that the benefits of the proposed development outweigh the identified impacts and the proposals are considered to constitute sustainable development when assessed against the development plan as a whole. For these reasons, the proposal is considered to comply with the policies of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan, the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan and the NPPF when taken as whole.

17 Recommendation

Recommendation A:

To delegate authority to the Service Manager for Development Management & Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager Southern & Western to grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report and the completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation under Section106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (S106 agreement) to secure:

A contribution of £43,500 towards enhanced facilities at westbound and eastbound bus stops on the A373 by Weymouth Bay access and at Fisher Bridge;

A contribution of £10,900 towards a Beryl bike bay and the purchase of 4 new bikes;

The additional recreational enhancement measures as set out in paragraph 4.7 of the submitted document ref 31473/04/JFB/HAR and the annotated drawing of the proposed Footpath and Dog Walking Routes (Ref 106/09 February 2026) including footpath signage, 12 information boards, welcome pack and 5 rubbish bins (including dog waste);

A Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan to secure the maintenance and monitoring of the gains for 30 years;

Advanced planting: Mixed species native advanced stock and feathered trees planted between caravans and at the edges of development and areas of native scrub around the edges of area G and south of area E shown on plans AP01D, AP02D & AP03E; and,

subject to the following conditions:

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

   106/01 C Site location plan

   106/05 G Proposed site plan

   106/06 Existing & proposed site levels & cross sections

   106/07 Existing & proposed site levels & cross sections

106/08 Proposed site levels

2392-KC-XX-YTREE-TPP01 E Tree protection plan

MP01 N Landscape masterplan

AP02 D Advanced proposals - Area 2

LP02 F Landscape proposals - Area B

LP03 F Landscape proposals - Area D

LP05 J Landscape proposals - Area G - West

LP06 G Landscape proposals - Area G - East

LP04 F Landscape proposals - Area E

LP01 M Soft landscape parameters plan

LPP01 H Landscape phasing plan

AP01 D Advanced proposals - Area 1

AP03 E Advanced proposals - Area 3

FP01 G Footpath plan

106-09 Footpath & Dog walking route proposals

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

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

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

3 No development shall commence until a phasing plan for the development has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing plan.

   Reason: To allow the development to proceed on a phased basis.

4. The caravans hereby approved shall be occupied for holiday purposes only; shall not be occupied as a person's sole, or main place of residence; and the owners/operators must maintain an up-to-date register of the names of all owners/occupiers of the caravans 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 caravans are not used for unauthorised permanent residential occupation.

5. The following shall be removed and the land made good in accordance with a scheme which shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consideration of the relevant phase of the development:

3 caravans and bases from the west of St Andrew’s church;

1 caravan and base from the west of Area D;

1 caravan and base from the north of Area E; and,

The telecommunications mast and associated infrastructure from Area G.

Reason: To secure the improvements to the appearance of the development.

6. Prior to the siting of the first caravan on any of the bases hereby permitted, parameters for the caravans shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, any caravan sited must comply with the parameters agreed. The parameters shall include the external dimensions, finish and colour of the walls and roof of the caravan including details of all decking.

   Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the development.

7. No development of any phase of development shall commence unless and until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall cover archaeological fieldwork together with post-excavation work and publication of the results. Thereafter the development shall proceed strictly in accordance with the agreed programme.

   Reason: To safeguard the archaeological remains in and around the site.

8. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (prepared by Thinkurban, Issue D dated January 2026) in conjunction with the Technical Note (prepared by Thinkurban, dated 25th November 2025), and the following specific details:

   1. Finished site levels shall be set at least 300mm above the design flood level including climate change.

   2. Caravan finished floor levels shall be set at least 600mm above the finished site level.

   3. Caravans shall be "anchored" to the finished slab.

   4. Compensatory floodplain storage shall be provided as shown in FRA Appendix H (drawing 172854_BL_SK_006 Revision D). The compensatory storage shall be completed prior to commencement of the associated proposed floodplain infill (western end of Area B).

   These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation of the development and in accordance with the scheme’s timing/phasing arrangements. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

   Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants and to prevent increased flood risk elsewhere by ensuring that compensatory storage of flood water is provided.

9. No development of any phase of development shall commence unless and until a Flood Warning and Response Plan (FWRP) which must include an emergency evacuation plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development thereafter shall be carried out in accordance with the approved FWRP and shall be and managed and maintained in accordance with it.

   Reason: In order to safeguard and minimise the risk posed to the site and its users from flooding.

10. Prior to the commencement of development, a Landscape Management Plan, detailing management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all proposed landscaped areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the Landscape Management Plan shall be implemented as approved and the landscaping managed and maintained in accordance with it and any trees or plants which, within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased 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 that due regard is paid to the continuing enhancement and maintenance of amenity afforded by landscape features of communal, public, nature conservation or historical significance.

11. No development of any phase of development shall commence until details of the proposed planting and a timetable for planting implementation for the soft landscaping works detailed on the following approved drawings has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

    Landscape Masterplan dwg MPO Rev N

    Advanced proposals dwgs APO1 rev D, APO2 rev d, APO3 rev E

    Soft Landscaping Parameters Plan dwg LPO1 rev M

    Landscape Phasing Plan dwg LPPO1 rev H

    Landscape proposals Area B dwg LPO2 rev F

    Landscape proposals Area D dwg LPO3 rev F

    Landscape proposals Area E dwg LPO4 rev F

    Landscape proposals Area G dwg LPO5 rev J

    Landscape proposals Area G dwg LPO6 rev G

    The planting proposals shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable for implementation and prior to development commencing for each phase.

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

12. No development of any phase of development shall commence unless and until details of the hard surfacing/paving, fences and other external structures shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for that phase. Thereafter the

development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory hard landscaping of the site and appearance of the development.

13. No development of any phase of development shall commence unless and until a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) for that phase shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement shall include details of how the existing trees are to be protected and managed before, during and after development and shall include information on traffic flows, phased works and construction practices near trees. The development shall thereafter accord with the approved statement.

Reason: To ensure thorough consideration of the impacts of development on the existing trees.

14 No development of any phase of development shall commence unless and until, all existing trees and hedges shown on approved plan 106/05G for that phase to be retained, shall have been fully safeguarded in accordance with BS 5837:2005 (Trees in relation to construction - recommendations) or any other Standard that may be in force at the time that development commences and these safeguarding measures shall be retained for the duration of construction works and building operations. No unauthorised access or placement of goods, fuels or chemicals, soil or other material shall take place within the tree protection zone(s).

Reason: To ensure that trees and hedges to be retained are adequately protected from damage to health and stability throughout the construction period and in the interests of amenity.

15. No part of Area G shown on drawing no. 106/09 shall be occupied until details of the footpath connection to Forehill Close has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall be at a scale of not less than 1:50 showing the access layout, appropriate signage and any fencing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and the footpath shall be provided and be open for use prior to the occupation of any part of area G and shall be maintained and retained as such thereafter in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure safe and suitable access is provided onto Forehill Close.

16. No development of any phase of development shall commence unless and until a Construction Traffic Management Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. This shall include:

- a programme of construction works and anticipated deliveries.
- construction vehicle details (number, size, type and frequency of movement).
- a framework for managing abnormal loads (if applicable).
- location of construction site access.

• details of how construction plant and vehicles will, as much as possible, be contained within the site.

• contractors' arrangements (compound, storage, parking, turning, surfacing and drainage. If applicable).

The development must be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved Construction Traffic Statement.

Reason: To minimise the likely impact of construction traffic on the surrounding highway network and prevent the possible deposit of loose material on the adjoining highway

17. The development hereby permitted must not be first occupied or utilised until a scheme showing precise details of the proposed cycle parking facilities for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme must be constructed before the development is occupied and, thereafter, must be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purpose specified.

Reason: To prioritise sustainable transport modes.

18. Before the development of each phase is occupied or utilised details of Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure for each caravan for that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and the infrastructure shall thereafter be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

Reason: To ensure the proper construction of the EV facilities and to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes.

19. The development shall strictly accord with the detailed biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement strategy set out within the following measures:

The habitat creation and enhancement as described in the Additional Habitat Enhancement Strategy (v2) (Baker Consultants, 12th November 2025) and in 4.27 of the Environmental Statement (ES) Addendum (Lichfields, March 2026) .

The development hereby approved must not be first brought into use unless and until:

i) the mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures detailed in the approved measures have been completed in full, in accordance with any specified timetable, unless any modifications to the approved measures as a result of the requirements of a European Protected Species Licence have first been issued to the Local Planning Authority in writing, and

ii) evidence of compliance, including photographic evidence, in accordance with section F of the approved Biodiversity Plan has been supplied to the Local Planning Authority prior to the substantial completion, or the first bringing into use of the development hereby approved, whichever is the sooner. The development shall subsequently be implemented entirely in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Plan and thereafter the approved mitigation, compensation and enhancement/net gain measures must be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To mitigate and compensate for impacts on ecological receptors, and to provide biodiversity gains.

20. The detailed biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement strategy set out within the following measures:

    The interior and external lighting as set out in the Exterior Lighting Design Proposals document (Lumenata, 12th November 2025);

    must be strictly adhered to during the carrying out of the development and retained thereafter.

    The development hereby approved must not be first brought into use unless and until:

    i) the mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures detailed in the approved measures have been completed in full, in accordance with any specified timetable, unless any modifications to the approved measures as a result of the requirements of a European Protected Species Licence have first been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and

    ii) evidence of compliance, including photographic evidence, in accordance with section F of the approved Biodiversity Plan has been supplied to the Local Planning Authority prior to the substantial completion, or the first bringing into use of the development hereby approved, whichever is the sooner. The development shall subsequently be implemented entirely in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Plan and thereafter the approved mitigation, compensation and enhancement/net gain measures must be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.

    Reason: To mitigate and compensate for impacts on ecological receptors, and to provide biodiversity gains.

21. No development shall commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved CEMP.

    Reason: In the interests of the environment, ecology and biodiversity.

22. No development shall commence until a Precautionary Working Method Statement (PWMS) for reptiles, to be informed by the recommendations in Chapter D: Ecology of the Environmental Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved PWMS.

    Reason: To mitigate and compensate for impacts on ecological receptors, and to provide biodiversity gains.

23. No development shall commence until a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP), to be informed by the recommendations in the Chapter D: Ecology of the ES; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved LEMP.

Reason: To mitigate and compensate for impacts on ecological receptors, and to provide biodiversity gains.

24. No development of any phase of development shall commence unless and 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 and a timetable for implementation, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The detailed design of the surface water management scheme shall be in accordance with the National Standards for SuDS. The surface water scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the submitted details including the timetable for implementation.

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

25. No development of any phase of development shall commence unless and until details of maintenance & management of both the surface water sustainable drainage scheme and any receiving system shall be 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.

26. The development hereby approved shall not exceed the installation of a total of 241 no. static caravans and associated decking.

    Reason: For clarity over the extent of the planning permission.

Informatives:

1. In addition to this permission, the applicant is advised that any works to the vehicle crossing to Forehill Close (that is, the area of highway land between the nearside carriageway edge and the site's road boundary) must be constructed to the specification of the Highway Authority in order to comply with Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980. The applicant should contact Dorset Highways by telephone at 01305 221020, by email at dorsethighways@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Dorset Highways, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ, before the commencement of any works on or adjacent to the public highway.

2. This permission is subject to an agreement made pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 dated ## ##.

3. Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition") that development may not begin unless:

(a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and

(b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission would be Dorset Council.

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. These are listed below.

Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because none of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements listed below are considered to apply.

Read more about Biodiversity Net Gain and Biodiversity Gain Plans at https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/biodiversity-net-gain and https://www.gov.uk/guidance/submit-a-biodiversity-gain-plan

4. Statutory Exemptions and Transitional Arrangements in respect of the Biodiversity Gain Plan

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.

3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and

(i)the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or

(ii)the application for the original planning permission* to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not ‘major development’ (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

i)the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;

ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or

iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:

i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and

ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A “householder application” means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;

ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and

iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.6 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.

* “original planning permission means the permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates” means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

5. The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit to be obtained for any activities which will take place:

On or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal)

On or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culverted main river (16 metres if tidal)

On or within 16 metres of a sea defence

Involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert

In the floodplain of a main river if the activity could affect flood flow or storage and potential impacts are not controlled by a planning permission.

For further guidance please visit https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-ctivitiesenvironmental-permits or contact our National Customer Contact Centre on 03708 506 506. The applicant should not assume that a permit will automatically be forthcoming

once planning permission has been granted, and we advise them to consult with us at the earlies opportunity.

6. In accordance with paragraph 39 of the NPPF the council, as local planning authority, takes a positive approach to development proposals and is focused on providing sustainable development.

   The council works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

   - offering a pre-application advice service, and

   - as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

   In this case:

   - The applicant/agent was updated of any issues and provided with the opportunity to address issues identified by the case officer.

   - The applicant was provided with pre-application advice.

Recommendation B:

Refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below if the s106 agreement is not completed by 15 January 2027 or such extended time as agreed by the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager Southern & Western:

1. In the absence of a suitable s106 agreement to secure financial contributions of £43,500 for bus stops on the A373 and a contribution of £10,900 towards a Beryl bike bay and the purchase of 4 new bikes; the proposal would fail to contribute to the provision of sustainable transport options (active travel) for those staying and working at the site which would therefore likely result in a significant increase in the use of and reliance on travel by car, having regard to the location of the site, contrary to the environmental objectives of sustainable development. This would be contrary to West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) policies INT1, ECON7 and COM7, Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan (2025) policies W00 and W46 and paragraphs 109, 110 and 135 of the NPPF (as amended 2025).

2. In the absence of a suitable s106 agreement to secure provision of the recreational mitigation measures and ecological/biodiversity enhancements the proposal would fail to provide adequate mitigation for the recreational impacts of the development on the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliff Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the ecological impacts of the development contrary to West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) policies INT1 and ENV2, Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan (2025) policies W00, W02, W03, W04, W05 and W41 and paragraph 193 of the NPPF (as amended 2025).

3. In the absence of a suitable s106 agreement to secure advanced planting the proposal would fail to provide adequate landscape mitigation such that the development would have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the area, landscape character and the setting of the Dorset National Landscape contrary to West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan

(2015) policies INT1, ENV1 and ECON7, Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan policy (2025) W41 and paragraph 189 of the NPPF.

Application Number:	P/FUL/2025/06223
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/
Site address:	Pavement Opposite 32 The Esplanade Weymouth
Proposal:	Installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphone
Applicant name:	Verity Cheyne
Case Officer:	Rob Piggot
Ward Member(s):	Cllr Orrell

1. **Reason application is going to committee:** The application site is on Dorset Council Land.

2. **Summary of recommendation**:

2.1 Refuse for the following reason:

The proposed BT Street Hub would be a harmful addition to the historically sensitive and significant Esplanade promenade within the Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area, given its siting, scale, design, appearance and colour with inbuilt LED screens being visually intrusive, adding to the proliferation of street furniture and being read alongside existing LED advertising screens which have been installed along the Esplanade. Whilst it is noted that there would be public benefits from the proposed hub, namely increased coverage of 5G and the provision of Wi-Fi, this is not considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the setting of Edwardes Statue and The Promenade Shelter, and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, which the hub would cause. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated or evidenced that suitable alternatives, which would cause less harm to visual amenity and the Conservation Area, for the provision of Wi-Fi and 5G have been considered. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policies COM10, ENV4, ENV10, ENV12, ENV14 and WEY1 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2015) and Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan (2026) policies W39, W44 and W45 and chapters 10 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. **Key planning issues**

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	Supported by Local Plan policy SUS2, however, would not be in accordance with Local Plan policy COM10, which requires demonstration that the 5G and Wi-Fi proposed would not be possible through other means.
Scale, design, impact on character and appearance	The proposed unit is considered to be in relatively close proximity to recently installed LED advertising units of similar size and function. It is considered that the unit would result in the proliferation of advertising and increase both physical and visual clutter on the promenade.

Issue	Conclusion
Impact on the living conditions of the occupants and neighbouring properties	The BT Hub would not be harmful to residential amenity, given the separation distance and north/south orientation of the unit.
Impact on landscape or heritage assets	The scheme would be located in a sensitive historic area, in Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area. It is considered that the unit would harm the significance of the Conservation Area and the setting of Edwardes Statue and The Promenade Shelter, being detrimental to the street scene due to the height, mass, colour and illumination of the proposed structure and predominantly due to the accumulation of visual clutter in this historic setting.
Flood risk and drainage	Whilst the unit would be located in Zones 2 and 3 flood risk areas, it would be a less vulnerable development and is not considered to lead to further risk of flooding.
Economic benefits	The provision of Wi-Fi would be of benefit to the tourist offering for Weymouth, with increased 5G coverage improving mobile connectivity for both personal and business use, along the Esplanade.
Highway impacts, safety, access and parking	The proposal would be acceptable in terms of impact to highway safety, with conditions required to ensure the unit would not be distracting to road users.
Crime / Policing	The unit would be acceptable, where an Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan is conditioned.
Environmental Implications	Given the scale and nature of the proposal, it is not considered there would be any environmental or ecological impacts.

4. Description of site

4.1 The application site is located on the promenade/walkway which runs along the northern side of The Esplanade, being at the southern end of the walkway, opposite Alexandra Gardens and in close proximity to the Weymouth Beach Sand Sculpture tourist attraction. It is within Weymouth's Defined Development Boundary (DDB), but just outside the town centre. Nevertheless, it is washed over by the town centre sub-area WEY5 (Esplanade (South)).

4.2 The site is within the Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area, and within the setting of numerous listed buildings. These include the grade II listed 24-34 Esplanade, 36 Esplanade, the Fairhaven Hotel, 40 Esplanade, Edwarde's Statue and the Promenade shelter. Number 36 Esplanade is a non-designated heritage asset. The Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2012) shows a key view and a 'townscape effect' adjacent to the site. The Alexander Gardens are noted in terms of greenery, but it says enhancements to this area are required.

4.3 The site is identified in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the Environment Agency's National Flood Maps for Planning as being at risk of flooding.

5. Description of development

5.1 Consent is sought to replace an existing cash machine and payphone kiosk with an illuminated LED advertising unit which incorporates Wi-Fi and 5G technologies, known as a 'BT Hub'. The proposed hub would be approximately 1.2m W x 2.98m H x 0.35m D. The existing kiosk/booth to be removed is approximately 0.9m W x 2.2m H.

5.2 It has been confirmed during the life of the application that the unit would provide 5G and Wi-Fi transmission/coverage. Wi-Fi coverage would be approximately 150m radius, and 5G coverage would be approximately 150m – 200m. These would be activated upon installation and would come at no cost to the Local Authority or end user.

5.3 To reduce the degree of visual harm caused by the Street Hub, during the life of the application the BT Street Hub was relocated so as to remain on the same site as the existing kiosk/cash machine, where it had previously been placed approximately 10m to the southeast, in front of the existing 'Sand Sculpture' attraction.

6. Background and relevant planning history

11/01108/FUL3 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 08/02/2012

Replacement sand sculpture structure

WP/14/00010/FUL - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 26/03/2014

Replacement and upgrade of existing public telephone kiosk combining public telephone service and ATM service

P/PAP/2022/00737 - Decision: RES - Decision Date: 17/05/2023

Street Hub Units

P/ADV/2024/02758 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 28/02/2025

Install internally illuminated double sided digital advertising panel to replace existing advertising drum

P/ADV/2024/02759 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 28/02/2025

Install internally illuminated double sided digital advertising panel to replace existing advertising drum

P/PAP/2025/00514 - Decision: RES - Decision Date: 20/08/2025

Proposed street hubs

P/ADV/2025/06228 - Decision: AWA - Decision Date: Not yet determined

Installation of 1no. internally illuminated double sided LCD display screen

7. List of constraints

Grade: II Listed Building: PROMENADE SHELTER OPPOSITE EDWARDES STATUE List Entry: 1328305; - Distance: 16.58

Grade: II Listed Building: EDWARDES STATUE List Entry: 1365874; - Distance: 19.18

LP - WEY 1; Weymouth Town Centre Strategy; Weymouth Town Centre

LP - SUS2; Defined Development Boundary; Weymouth

LP - ENV 4; Conservation Area; Town Centre Conservation Area

LP - WEY5; The Esplanade (South); The Esplanade (South)

LP - ENV 4; Area of Archaeological Potential; Town Centre North of Harbour, Weymouth

Dorset Council Land Freehold: Weymouth Beach Promenade from Weymouth Pavilion to Brunswick Terrace, Weymouth - Reference FH00443

Natural England - RAMSAR - Distance: 3014.36

Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (5km buffer): Chesil & The Fleet (UK0017076); - Distance: 2995.8

Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (5km buffer): Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs (UK0019861); - Distance: 3257.18

Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (5km buffer): Crookhill Brick Pit (UK0030349); - Distance: 3645.68

Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) impact risk zone

Flood Zone 3 (record ID 11253093.0)

SFRA 2 Boundary

8. Consultations

All consultee responses can be viewed in full on the website.

Consultees

1. **Dorset Council – Highways:**

   Initial Response (8/1/26): No objection, however concerns with the light levels/brightness both during daytime and nighttime. Level of illumination to be reduced to match ambient levels, not a constant 5000cd/m2, with night levels to be 300cd/m2. Note that there should be a mechanism to default to a blank screen in the event of malfunction/when not in use.

   Recommend that a condition be placed to prevent intermittent/flashing lights, exposed cold cathode tubing, animation or reflective material, and that a lighting scheme be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for agreement.

   Further Response (14/5/26): I refer to the amended plan(s), in respect of the above planning application, received on 12th May 2026. The Highway Authority has nothing further to add to its previous observation dated 8th January 2026.

2. **Dorset Council - Asset & Property:** No comments received.

3. **- Env. Services – Protection:**

   Initial Response (17/11/26): No comment.

   Further Response (22/5/26): No comment.

4. **Dorset Council - Conservation Officer:**

Initial Response (9/2/26): Based on the assessment detailed below, there is no objection to the removal of the existing BT Payphone. However, the proposed installation of 1no. BT Street Hub is considered detrimental to the street scene due to the height, mass, colour, animation and illumination of the proposed structure and predominantly due to the accumulation of visual clutter in this historic setting. The proposal would not enhance the historic promenade, would have a negative impact on the neighbouring heritage assets and would have a detrimental effect on the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Further Response (29/5/26): Whilst it is acknowledged that the distance from the sand sculptures and the existing freestanding advertisement has been improved by the revised location, it considered that the Conservation Officer comments provided on 6 February 2026 are still valid; the proposal would cause less than substantial harm due to the height, mass, colour, animation and illumination of the proposed structure and predominantly due to the accumulation of visual clutter in this historic setting. The proposal would not enhance the historic promenade, would have a negative impact on the neighbouring heritage assets and would have a detrimental effect on the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

I am therefore unable to support this application and conclude with an **objection**.

5. **Dorset Council – Connectivity**: On the initial proposal the wording was very generic indicating that deployments such as those planned could improve connectivity. This is true only if the equipment deployed includes the correct equipment which is optional so we would probably want assurances from the company that they would deliver and maintain both 5G small cell technology and publicly accessible free Wi-Fi on each of the four Street Hub deployments if that is the basis on which approval is given.

   It is worth noting that in addition to all of the standard cellular services that Mobile Operators provide, BTEE are the partner for the Home Office in the Emergency Services Network (ESN) which provide connectivity to police, fire, ambulance and coastguard services across the UK. Of all the networks, ensuring BTEE has a reliable cellular network in places like Weymouth is very important.

   The mobile phone network operated by BTEE is amongst the most popular in the country and across the Dorset Council area so it would be reasonable to expect a significant number of the visitors, businesses and residents that need mobile connectivity in and around Weymouth Town Centre would benefit from the improvements to the user experience that these hubs would provide. The technical detail provided with the proposal makes sense and is consistent in terms of the range etc with what might be expected from a 5G small cells deployment.

6. **Police Architectural Liaison Officer**

   Concerns raised as follows:

   - Where free Wi-Fi is available, it can attract groups of people who then act anti-socially.
   - The proposed locations fall within areas with higher-than-average rates of crime and ASB.
   - Colleagues in other police forces have advised that there have been incidents of misuse of the 999-call button, mainly in city centre or high traffic locations in the night-time economy.
   - The ability to make free calls could allow abuse of that service, including the hubs being used to facilitate the distribution of drugs or nuisance calls, particularly for domestic abuse/stalking victims. It is noted that incoming calls have been deactivated, thus preventing misuse for drug distribution.
   - The hubs are solid units and would therefore block natural, formal and informal surveillance (including CCTV) and offer a hiding opportunity for offenders.
   - No consultation/contact has been made with Dorset Police to date, despite identifying as such in the Anti-Social Management plan submitted.

Whilst Dorset Police does not formally object to this planning application of BT Street Hub installations in principle, at this stage, in order to ensure Dorset Council is able to comply with its duty under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area to include anti-social behaviour. Conditions are recommended, they being the activation of integrated CCTV camera; Strict compliance with Street Hub Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan; Removal of existing BT Payphone.

7. **Environment Agency:** No comment, application falls outside of EA remit.

8. **Weymouth Town Council:**

Initial Response (3/12/26): The Council objects to the application on the grounds of layout and density, design, visual appearance and materials, and the impact on the Conservation Area. This is subject to Weymouth not losing out on Wi-Fi enhancement.

Further Response (10/6/26): The Council objects to the application on the grounds of layout and density, design, visual appearance and materials, and the impact on the Conservation Area. This is subject to Weymouth not losing out on Wi-Fi enhancement.

9. **Melcombe Regis Ward Member:** No comments received.

Representations received

1 objection has been received

Summary of comments for initial scheme:

- Object to the scheme.
- The applicant's photo is out of date; it shows a town council poster roundel – these were replaced with digital screens in 2025. ***Officer note: Illustrations have been revised to show current street furniture.***
- The new digital advertising screen would be just 11m from another digital advertising screen. These two screens would be close together, which would be unnecessary visual clutter in the Conservation Area. ***Officer note: Scheme has been revised, with Street Hub now located in same position as existing kiosk, approximately 19m from existing digital advertising screen.***
- The image shows a charcoal-coloured device, other screens on the promenade are in the "Weymouth blue" to match the local area colour scheme and to be less visually obtrusive in the Conservation Area. If approved, it is hoped that it is conditioned that the device be the correct colour in this sensitive area.

Summary of comments for revised scheme:

- None received.

10. Duties

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.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that when considering whether to grant planning permission for a development which affects a listed building or its setting, there is a general duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

11. Relevant policies

Development plan

In this case the development plan comprises:

Local Plan Adopted West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland Local Plan:

The following policies are considered to be relevant to this proposal:

INT1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development

ENV4: Heritage assets

ENV5: Flood risk

ENV10: The landscape and townscape setting

ENV12: The design and positioning of buildings

ENV14: Shopfronts & advertisements

ENV15: Efficient and appropriate use of land

ENV16: Amenity

SUS2: Distribution of development

ECON4: Retail and Town Centre Development

COM7: Creating a safe & efficient transport network

COM10: The Provision of utilities services infrastructure

WEY1: Town Centre Strategy

WEY5: The Esplanade (South)

Made Neighbourhood Plans

Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan 2021 to 2039 (made 29/01/2026

W05: Ecological Impact of Development

W13: Panoramas, Vistas and Views

W14: Development Boundaries

W34: Sustainable Development

W39: Weymouth Town Centre

W44: Design

W45: Heritage Assets

W46: Transport and Travel

Material considerations

Emerging local plans:

Paragraph 49 of the NPPF provides that local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant plan policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan are to the policies of the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

The Dorset Council Local Plan

The Dorset Council Local Plan Options consultation took place between January and March 2021, with further consultation between 18 Aug – 31 October 2025. Being at a very early stage of preparation, the relevant policies in the draft plan should be accorded very limited weight in decision making.

Local Nature Recovery Strategy

National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (as amended 2025)

Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date then permission should be granted unless specific NPPF policies protecting areas or assets provide a strong reason for refusal and/or any adverse impacts of approval would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole, with particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places and providing affordable homes.

Other relevant NPPF sections include:

- Section 4 'Decision making': Para 39 - Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available…and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.
- Section 12 'Achieving well designed places' This indicates that all development to be of a high quality in design, and the relationship and visual impact of it to be compatible with the surroundings. In particular, and amongst other things, Paragraphs 131 – 141 advise that:

  The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

  Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.
- Section 14 'Meeting the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change'
- Section 16 'Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment'- Paragraph 212 says that when considering designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. The effect of an application on the significance of non-designated heritage assets should also be taken into account (para 216).

Other material considerations

Historic England: Streets For All (2018)

National Planning Practice Guidance

<u>All of Dorset:</u>

Dorset Council Interim Guidance and Position Statement Appendix B: Adopted Local Plan policies and objectives relating to climate change, renewable energy, and sustainable design and construction. December 2023.

<u>Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance For West Dorset area:</u>

Weymouth & Portland Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (2002)

Weymouth & Portland Urban Design (2002)

Landscape Character Assessment (Weymouth & Portland)

Conservation Area Appraisals:

Weymouth – Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal adopted December 2012

12. 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.

13. 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 Public Sector Equalities Duty. The Street Hub proposed is not of such a size that it would block or prevent access to the pavement by those with buggies or using a wheelchair/mobility scooter.

14. Public Benefits

The proposals would provide a number of financial and non-financial benefits, including public benefits. These are summarised in the table below:

What	Amount / value
Material considerations	
Improved digital offering to visitors and residents in Weymouth, providing potential wider economic benefits to businesses in Weymouth.	
Improved digital inclusion	
Improved access and facilitation of emergency services communication – both through the 5G and Wi-Fi functionality, 999 calling facilities, and the use of the LED screens for emergency messaging.	
Potential for improved environmental monitoring, through air/odour testing.	
Non material considerations	
None identified.	

15. Planning Assessment

Principle of development

14.1 The development would be located within the Weymouth Defined Development Boundary (DDB) and therefore would be supported by policy SUS2 in the Local Plan.

14.2 Policy COM10 of the local plan specifically refers to telecommunications development, saying it will be supported, provided:

• '*the development will not be unduly detrimental to the appearance of the locality, particularly in sensitive areas of landscape, nature conservation or townscape importance; and*

• *the applicant has demonstrated that there is a need for the technology and that all technically feasible alternatives have been explored and that the application proposal results in the least visual harm*.

14.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) says at paragraph 119 that "planning policies and decisions should support the expansion of electronic communications networks, including next generation mobile technology (such as 5G) and full fibre broadband connections."

14.4 Paragraph 120 goes on to say "The number of radio and electronic communications masts, and the site for such installations should be kept to a minimum consistent with the needs of consumers, the efficient operation of the network and providing reasonable capacity for future expansion. Use of existing masts, buildings and other structures for new electronic communications capability (including wireless) should be encouraged. Where new sites are required (such as for new 5G networks, or for connected transport and smart city applications), equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate."

14.4 In terms of demonstrating there is a need for the telecommunications technology, it is considered that this would not be a relevant consideration with regard to the installation of 5G and Wi-Fi, as paragraph 123 of Chapter 10 of the NPPF clearly states that councils are '*not to question the need for an electronic communications system'.* As such that part of policy COM10 is considered to be out of date. In addition, whilst paragraph 119 of the NPPF says that planning decisions should support the expansion of electronic communications networks, it is considered that the units would not be operating solely as communications systems, with the LED advertising panels being an integral function of each unit.

14.5 Whilst the applicant isn't required to demonstrate the need for the 5G and Wi-Fi technology they are encouraged, in accordance with paragraph 120 of the NPPF, to keep sites to a minimum and to explore the use of existing masts, buildings and other structures. In accordance with Policy COM10 the applicant should demonstrate that they have explored all technically feasible alternatives and that the least visually harmful site has been chosen. As part of this application the applicant has not submitted any information to demonstrate that all other alternatives for the provision of the 5G technology have been explored, and that this site represents the least visually harmful.

14.6 The proposed BT Hub is considered to have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the Esplanade and promenade, as a sensitive area of townscape importance. Whilst the removal of an existing telephone kiosk and cash machine would be considered a betterment, the proposed hubs are 36% higher, at 3m, compared to 2.2m, and 33% wider at 1.2m, compared to 0.9m. The units would also include LED panels on either side, which would be utilised for advertising purposes. Whilst it is acknowledged that LED panel units have been approved and installed in close proximity along the Esplanade, the nearest being under applications P/ADV/2024/02758 and P/ADV/2024/02759, it is considered that the BT Hub would be in close proximity to these other units recently installed, both physically and visually, and that the cumulative effect would appear as a proliferation of this form of technology, cluttering the promenade and being harmful to the setting of heritage assets nearby (this will be further considered later in this report). It should be noted that this proposal is also subject to a separate application for advertisement consent, under P/ADV/2025/06228.

14.7 The BT Hub unit is considered to deliver public benefits, through the transmission of 5G and Wi-Fi coverage, and it has been confirmed by the Council's Telecommunications Lead that Weymouth has capacity issues in regard to both of these technologies. Telecommunications are defined as Community Infrastructure in the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2015). These public benefits would be both social and economic and would take the form of:

- improved digital offering to visitors and residents in Weymouth, providing potential wider economic benefits to businesses in Weymouth
- improved digital inclusion
- improved access and facilitation of emergency services communication – both through the 5G and Wi-Fi functionality, 999 calling facilities, and the use of the LED screens for emergency messaging
- potential for improved environmental monitoring, through air/odour testing

14.8 It should be noted that existing LED advertising units along The Esplanade do also offer emergency service alert facilities, however, they do not include 999 calling facilities or the other public benefits identified above.

14.9 Therefore, whilst the proposal would accord with Local Plan policy SUS2, and would provide public benefits, it is not considered that the proposal would accord with policy COM10 given that it has not been demonstrated that technically feasible alternatives, which create less visual harm, have been explored. There is also conflict with paragraph 120 of the NPPF where it encourages the use of existing masts, buildings and other structures for new electronic communications capability.

Design and Character

14.10 The BT Hub is proposed to be located in a highly visible and sensitive area of The Esplanade, being within a high footfall area of the promenade, located in front of a tourist attraction – Sandcastle Sculpture, and opposite Alexandra Gardens. Further to this, the newly adopted Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan identifies The Esplanade as an important landscape feature, with the location of the BT Hub falling within a Key View Direction from Viewpoint V11. It is noted that The Esplanade, promenade and surrounding area can be characterised as illuminated during the evening and night time, with various forms of street lighting, and an amusement centre immediately opposite the site, in Alexandra Gardens.

14.11 The proposal is considered to provide a betterment through the removal of an existing cash machine/phone kiosk, however, as previously noted in 14.7, the proposed BT Hub units would be sited in close proximity to two almost identical advertising units, installed to the north and south of the existing Sand Sculpture display/attraction, and would, cumulatively, appear as a proliferation of advertising on the promenade. Whilst it is acknowledged that the wider setting of the proposed unit would be characterised as illuminated, with Alexandra Gardens to the west, it is considered that the BT Hub would be read as a larger and more direct form of illumination, and, where there are other LED units in close proximity, the nearest being approximately 19m to the southeast, it would lead to a proliferation of this form of illuminated advertising, thus cluttering the street scene, public realm and historical setting.

14.12 The proposal is considered to cause harm by virtue of its siting, scale and illumination, and therefore it is not considered that the proposal contributes positively to the local identity and distinctiveness of The Esplanade, nor does it harmonise with the positive character of the area. The proposal would therefore not accord with Local Plan Policy ENV10, nor Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan policies W13 and W44.

Heritage Impact

14.13 The proposal would be in the Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area (CA) and would be in the setting of several heritage assets: Edwardes Statue (Grade II) and the Promenade Shelter Opp. Edwardes Statue (Grade II) - being one of a number of Victorian shelters along the Esplanade. The application site is also within the wider setting of several listed buildings, they

being The Oxford Hotel (Grade II) and Grosvenor Place (Grade II). The Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2012) shows a key view and a 'townscape effect' adjacent to the site. The Alexander Gardens are noted in terms of greenery, but it says enhancements to this area are required. The significance of this part of the CA can be summarised as The Esplanade providing an important example of late Georgian town planning, related firmly to the sea and the historic uses of the late 18th and early 19th century that has defined the character of The Esplanade, which has been, and continues to be, associated with visitors, entertainment, leisure and fun. As such the CA is considered to have historic, architectural and communal/social heritage significance. Furthermore, the quality of The Esplanade and its bay have been recognised and appreciated since the start of noble and royal patronage of the Georgian resort and as such is considered to have aesthetic heritage significance. The CA appraisal sets out that *"The Esplanade is of national significance in the history of the seaside resort and in terms of social history".*

14.14 The Council's Conservation Team have reviewed the proposal, in both its original location and revised location, and have raised concerns with the height, mass, colour, animation and scale of the proposed structure, not being in accordance with the street furniture colour scheme along The Esplanade, and more specifically, being close to the existing sand sculpture building, and in close proximity to other illuminated double sided digital advertising panels. Their updated comments state that: '*Whilst it is acknowledged that the distance from the sand sculptures and the existing freestanding advertisement has been improved by the revised location, it considered that the Conservation Officer comments provided on 6 February 2026 are still valid; the proposal would cause less than substantial harm due to the height, mass, colour, animation and illumination of the proposed structure and predominantly due to the accumulation of visual clutter in this historic setting. The proposal would not enhance the historic promenade, would have a negative impact on the neighbouring heritage assets and would have a detrimental effect on the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area.'.* Their previous comments noted that *'alternative options are considered which could provide improvements to the 5G network within the town but which are more discrete and reflect a sensitive and considered approach to heritage values'.*

14.15 The Conservation Officer's view is supported. Whilst it is accepted that the proposed setting of the BT Hub could be described as illuminated, given various forms of street lighting, and the amusement centre to the west, in Alexandra Gardens, it is considered that the installation of the proposed BT Hub would be harmful, being read alongside the two existing LED advertising units installed in 2025, leading to a cumulative proliferation of similar forms of illumination, within the Conservation Area, and the close setting of Edwardes Statue (Grade II) and the Promenade Shelter (Grade II). It is considered that this would lead to less than substantial harm, being on the higher end of this harm, given the less receptive setting and the prominence of the proposed Street Hub alongside existing LED advertising units. Whilst there would be public benefits associated with the scheme, it is not however considered that these public benefits would outweigh the harm caused. Given distance separation, it is not considered that there would be harm to the setting of either The Oxford Hotel or Grosvenor Place.

14.16 On this basis the scheme is not considered to accord with Local Plan policy ENV4, Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan policy W45, or Section 16 of the NPPF. In reaching this conclusion regard has been had to Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Residential Amenity

14.17 The proposed BT Hub is considered to be acceptable in terms of impact to residential amenity – through light or noise, given that the unit would be oriented with the panels facing north and south, being sufficiently distanced from nearby residential accommodation, the nearest being 31 The Esplanade, approximately 50m to the west.

14.18 The Environmental Health Team have reviewed the proposal and have no comments to make.

14.19 Notwithstanding the low level of impact to neighbouring properties, if the scheme were to be granted consent, then it is recommended that the lighting be controlled by way of a lighting management plan, to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Flooding

14.20 The site is subject to a higher risk of flooding, being within Flood Zones 2 and 3, however, the proposal is for a less vulnerable class of development, not being habitable, replacing a similar development, a cash machine/phone kiosk, being on an area of existing hardstanding. The proposal is therefore not considered to pose any risk to safety nor lead to an increase in flood risk elsewhere and would accord with policy ENV5 of the Local Plan.

Highway Safety

14.21 The Highway Authority have reviewed the proposal and have stated that it would appear acceptable in principle, however this would be subject to conditioning to ensure that illumination levels do not lead to a danger to highways safety, being overly bright and thereby distracting. This assessment is considered to be reasonable and proportionate and as such if consent were to be granted a lighting scheme should be agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

14.22 On this basis the scheme is considered to accord with Local Plan policy COM7, Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan policy W46.

Crime/Policing

14.23 Comments have been received from Dorset Police, raising concerns that the BT Hub could be used for criminal purposes, and lead to an increase in anti-social behaviour, in an area which has a higher-than-average rate of crime and anti-social behaviour. It is suggested that the Wi-Fi and free calling facilities could lead to nuisance calls, and the solicitation of drugs. This notwithstanding, an Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan has been submitted, and this would be conditioned alongside any consent granted. Further, Dorset Police have recommended that any integrated camera within the BT Hub be activated when installed, to ensure the monitoring of any calling of 999. Lastly, they request the removal of the existing BT payphone.

14.24 The concerns raised are considered to be valid ones, with Local Plan policy WEY5 making reference to anti-social behaviour in the area where the unit would be located. It is accepted that the submitted Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan would be the appropriate manner in which to address these concerns. Given the potential for misuse of the BT Hub unit it would seem reasonable to activate any surveillance which could reduce this. The removal of the existing phone kiosk/cash machine would be conditioned alongside any consent, given this application is for the replacement of that unit and thereby would also be considered reasonable.

Other Matters

14.25 In terms of public health and non-ionising radiation protection, a statement of conformity with public radio frequency guidelines has been provided.

16. Environmental implications

15.1 Given the small-scale nature of the development, where no habitable accommodation is being formed, it is not considered that there would be any environmental implications as a result of the works.

17. Summary of issues and the planning balance

16.1 It is considered that for the reasons set out above that the development would have an acceptable impact in terms of flood risk and subject to conditions would have an acceptable impact on highway safety and residential amenity in accordance with the relevant policies of the development plan. Subject to a planning condition requiring the implementation of the anti-social behaviour management plan the development is not considered to likely result in an unacceptable impact in respect of crime and anti-social behaviour.

16.2 The development would result in the public benefits of:

- improved digital offering to visitors and residents in Weymouth, providing potential wider economic benefits to businesses in Weymouth
- improved digital inclusion
- improved access and facilitation of emergency services communication – both through the 5G and Wi-Fi functionality, 999 calling facilities, and the use of the LED screens for emergency messaging
- potential for improved environmental monitoring, through air/odour testing

16.3 The proposed development would be located within the Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area in what is identified in both the Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) and the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan as a key view. Alongside this the development would be in the close setting of two heritage assets, Edwardes Statue (Grade II) and the Promenade Shelter (Grade II). The development is therefore in a historically sensitive setting, where The Esplanade is considered to have historic, architectural and communal/social heritage significance - the CAA appraisal sets out that *"The Esplanade is of national significance in the history of the seaside resort and in terms of social history".*

16.4 It is considered that the proposed development by reason of its siting, height, mass, design and appearance (including colour) would add to the proliferation of street furniture (despite the removal of the existing telephone kiosk and cash machine) and other paraphernalia on the sea front and as a result of the inbuilt LED advertisement screens would be a visually prominent addition which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and the immediate setting of Edwardes Statue and the Promenade Shelter. This harm is considered to be less than substantial and so in accordance with chapter 16 of the NPPF consideration must be given to whether the public benefits would outweigh the identified harm.

16.5 Whilst public benefits have been identified and could be secured by planning condition it is not considered that the applicant has demonstrated that there are no alternative means of providing those benefits in a way which would have a less harmful impact. As such the proposed development does not accord with Policy COM10 of the adopted local plan.

16.6 Given that it has not been demonstrated that the public benefits could not be achieved by other less harmful means, and for the fact that the heritage harm would be on the higher end of less than substantial harm, it is considered that the limited weight which can be attached to the public benefits is not sufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets. As such the development is contrary to Policies ENV4, ENV10, ENV12, ENV14, WEY1 and COM10 of the adopted local plan, Policies W13, W44 and W45 of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan and chapters 10 and 16 of the NPPF. In reaching this conclusion regard has been had to Sections 66 and 72 of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

17 **Recommendation**

17.1 Refuse for the following reason:

The proposed BT Street Hub would be a harmful addition to the historically sensitive and significant Esplanade promenade within the Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area, given its siting, scale, design, appearance and colour with inbuilt LED screens being visually intrusive, adding to the proliferation of street furniture and being read alongside existing LED advertising screens which have been installed along the Esplanade. Whilst it is noted that there would be public benefits from the proposed hub, namely increased coverage of 5G and the provision of Wi-Fi, this is not considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the setting of Edwardes Statue and The Promenade Shelter, and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, which the hub would cause. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated or evidenced that suitable

alternatives, which would cause less harm to visual amenity and the Conservation Area, for the provision of Wi-Fi and 5G have been considered. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policies COM10, ENV4, ENV10, ENV12, ENV14 and WEY1 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2015) and Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan (2026) policies W39, W44 and W45 and chapters 10 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

This page is intentionally left blank

Application Number:	P/ADV/2025/06228
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/
Site address:	Pavement Opposite 32 The Esplanade Weymouth
Proposal:	Installation of 1no. internally illuminated double sided LCD display screen
Applicant name:	Verity Cheyne
Case Officer:	Rob Piggot
Ward Member(s):	Cllr Orrell

1. **Reason application is going to committee:** The application site is on Dorset Council Land.

2. **Summary of recommendation**:

2.1 Refuse for the following reason:

The proposed BT Street Hub would be a harmful addition to the historically sensitive and significant Esplanade promenade within the Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area, given its siting, scale, design, appearance and colour with inbuilt LED screens being visually intrusive, adding to the proliferation of street furniture and being read alongside existing LED advertising screens which have been installed along the Esplanade. Whilst it is noted that there would be public benefits from the proposed hub, namely increased coverage of 5G and the provision of Wi-Fi, this is not considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the setting of Edwardes Statue and The Promenade Shelter, and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, which the hub would cause. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated or evidenced that suitable alternatives, which would cause less harm to visual amenity and the Conservation Area, for the provision of Wi-Fi and 5G have been considered. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policies COM10, ENV4, ENV10, ENV12, ENV14 and WEY1 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2015) and Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan (2026) policies W39, W44 and W45 and chapters 10 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. **Key planning issues**

Issue	Conclusion
Scale, design, impact on character and appearance	The proposed unit is considered to be in relatively close proximity to recently installed LED advertising units of similar size and function. It is considered that the unit would result in the proliferation of advertising and increase both physical and visual clutter on the promenade.
Impact on the living conditions of the occupants and neighbouring properties	The BT Hub would not be harmful to residential amenity, given the separation distance and north/south orientation of the unit.
Impact on landscape or heritage assets	The scheme would be located in a sensitive historic area, in Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area. It is considered that the unit would harm the significance of the Conservation Area, being

Issue	Conclusion
	detrimental to the street scene due to the height, mass, colour and illumination of the proposed structure and due to the accumulation of visual clutter in this historic setting.
Economic benefits	The provision of Wi-Fi would be of benefit to the tourist offering for Weymouth, with increased 5G coverage improving mobile connectivity for both personal and business use, along the Esplanade.
Highway impacts, safety, access and parking	The proposal would be acceptable in terms of impact to highway safety, with conditions required to ensure the units would not be distracting to road users.
Crime / Policing	The unit would be acceptable, where an Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan is conditioned.

4. Description of site

4.1 The application site located on the promenade/walkway which runs along the northern side of The Esplanade, being at the southern end of the walkway, opposite Alexandra Gardens and in close proximity to the Weymouth Beach Sand Sculpture tourist attraction. It is within Weymouth's Defined Development Boundary (DDB), but just outside the town centre. Nevertheless, it is washed over by the town centre sub-area WEY5 (Esplanade (South)).

4.2 The site is within the Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area, and within the setting of numerous listed buildings. These include the grade II listed 24-34 Esplanade, 36 Esplanade, the Fairhaven Hotel, 40 Esplanade, Edwarde's Statue and the Promenade shelter. Number 36 Esplanade is a non-designated heritage asset. The Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2012) shows a key view and a 'townscape effect' adjacent to the site. The Alexander Gardens are noted in terms of greenery, but it says enhancements to this area are required.

4.3 The site is identified in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the Environment Agency's National Flood Maps for Planning as being at risk of flooding, either now or in the future.

5. Description of development

5.1 Consent is sought to replace an existing cash machine and payphone kiosk with an illuminated LED advertising unit which incorporates Wi-Fi and 5G technologies, known as a 'BT Hub'. The proposed hub would be approximately 1.2m W x 2.98m H x 0.35m D. The existing kiosk/booth to be removed is approximately 0.9m W x 2.2m H.

5.2 It has been confirmed during the life of the application that the unit would provide 5G and Wi-Fi transmission/coverage. Wi-Fi coverage would be approximately 150m radius, and 5G coverage would be approximately 150m – 200m. These would be activated upon installation and would come at no cost to the Local Authority or end user.

5.3 To reduce the degree of visual harm caused by the Street Hub, during the life of the application the BT Street Hub was relocated so as to remain on the same site as the existing kiosk/cash machine, where it had previously been placed approximately 10m to the southeast, in front of the existing 'Sand Sculpture' attraction.

6. Background and relevant planning history

11/01108/FUL3 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 08/02/2012

Replacement sand sculpture structure

WP/14/00010/FUL - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 26/03/2014

Replacement and upgrade of existing public telephone kiosk combining public telephone service and ATM service

P/PAP/2022/00737 - Decision: RES - Decision Date: 17/05/2023

Street Hub Units

P/ADV/2024/02758 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 28/02/2025

Install internally illuminated double sided digital advertising panel to replace existing advertising drum

P/ADV/2024/02759 - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 28/02/2025

Install internally illuminated double sided digital advertising panel to replace existing advertising drum

P/PAP/2025/00514 - Decision: RES - Decision Date: 20/08/2025

Proposed street hubs

P/FUL/2025/06223 - Decision: AWA - Decision Date: Not yet determined

Installation of 1no. internally illuminated double sided LCD display screen

7. List of constraints

Grade: II Listed Building: PROMENADE SHELTER OPPOSITE EDWARDES STATUE List Entry: 1328305; - Distance: 16.58

Grade: II Listed Building: EDWARDES STATUE List Entry: 1365874; - Distance: 19.18

LP - WEY 1; Weymouth Town Centre Strategy; Weymouth Town Centre

LP - SUS2; Defined Development Boundary; Weymouth

LP - ENV 4; Conservation Area; Town Centre Conservation Area

LP - WEY5; The Esplanade (South); The Esplanade (South)

LP - ENV 4; Area of Archaeological Potential; Town Centre North of Harbour, Weymouth

Dorset Council Land Freehold: Weymouth Beach Promenade from Weymouth Pavilion to Brunswick Terrace, Weymouth - Reference FH00443

Natural England - RAMSAR - Distance: 3014.36

Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (5km buffer): Chesil & The Fleet (UK0017076); - Distance: 2995.8

Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (5km buffer): Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs (UK0019861); - Distance: 3257.18

Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (5km buffer): Crookhill Brick Pit (UK0030349); - Distance: 3645.68

Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) impact risk zone

Flood Zone 3 (record ID 11253093.0)

SFRA 2 Boundary

8. Consultations

All consultee responses can be viewed in full on the website.

Consultees

1. Dorset Council - Highways

Initial Response (8/1/26): No objection, however concerns with the light levels/brightness both during daytime and nighttime. Level of illumination to be reduced to match ambient levels, not a constant 5000cd/m2, with night levels to be 300cd/m2. Note that there should be a mechanism to default to a blank screen in the event of malfunction/when not in use. Recommend that a condition be placed to prevent intermittent/flashing lights, exposed cold cathode tubing, animation or reflective material, and that a lighting scheme be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for agreement.

Further Response (14/5/26): I refer to the amended plan(s), in respect of the above planning application, received on 12th May 2026. The Highway Authority has nothing further to add to its previous observation dated 8th January 2026.

2. Dorset Council - Conservation Officer

Initial Response (9/2/26): Based on the assessment detailed below, there is no objection to the removal of the existing BT Payphone. However, the proposed installation of 1no. BT Street Hub is considered detrimental to the street scene due to the height, mass, colour, animation and illumination of the proposed structure and predominantly due to the accumulation of visual clutter in this historic setting. The proposal would not enhance the historic promenade, would have a negative impact on the neighbouring heritage assets and would have a detrimental effect on the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Further Response (29/5/26): Whilst it is acknowledged that the distance from the sand sculptures and the existing freestanding advertisement has been improved by the revised location, it considered that the Conservation Officer comments provided on 6 February 2026 are still valid; the proposal would cause less than substantial harm due to the height, mass, colour, animation and illumination of the proposed structure and predominantly due to the accumulation of visual clutter in this historic setting. The proposal would not enhance the historic promenade, would have a negative impact on the neighbouring heritage assets and would have a detrimental effect on the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

3. Weymouth Town Council

Initial Response (3/12/26): The Council objects to the application on the grounds of layout and density, design, visual appearance and materials, and the impact on the Conservation Area. This is subject to Weymouth not losing out on Wi-Fi enhancement.

4. Melcombe Regis Ward Member

No comments received.

Representations received

No comments received.

9. Duties

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.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 - includes a general duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses when considering whether to grant listed building consent.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that when considering whether to grant planning permission for a development which affects a listed building or its setting, there is a general duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

10. Relevant policies

Local Plan Adopted West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland Local Plan:

The following policies are considered to be relevant to this proposal:

ENV4: Heritage assets

ENV10: The landscape and townscape setting

ENV12: The design and positioning of buildings

ENV14: Shopfronts & advertisements

ENV16: Amenity

COM7: Creating a safe & efficient transport network

WEY1: Town Centre Strategy

Made Neighbourhood Plans

Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan 2021 to 2039 (made 29/01/2026):

W13: Panoramas, Vistas and Views

W39: Weymouth Town Centre

W44: Design

W45: Heritage Assets

W46: Transport and Travel

Material considerations

Emerging local plans:

Paragraph 49 of the NPPF provides that local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);

- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant plan policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan are to the policies of the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

The Dorset Council Local Plan

The Dorset Council Local Plan Options consultation took place between January and March 2021, with further consultation between 18 Aug – 31 October 2025. Being at a very early stage of preparation, the relevant policies in the draft plan should be accorded very limited weight in decision making.

Local Nature Recovery Strategy

The Dorset Local Nature Recovery Strategy identifies local priorities for nature recovery and maps areas where action would be most beneficial. In planning decisions it is a material consideration, helping to ensure that development supports biodiversity enhancement and aligns with Dorset's agreed priorities for nature recovery.

National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (as amended 2025)

Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date then permission should be granted unless specific NPPF policies protecting areas or assets provide a strong reason for refusal and/or any adverse impacts of approval would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole, with particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places and providing affordable homes.

Other relevant NPPF sections include:

- Section 4 'Decision making': Para 39 - Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available…and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.
- Section 12 'Achieving well designed places' This indicates that all development to be of a high quality in design, and the relationship and visual impact of it to be compatible with the surroundings. In particular, and amongst other things, Paragraphs 131 – 141 advise that:

  The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

  Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.

  Paragraph 141 - The quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed. A separate consent process within the planning system controls the display of advertisements, which should be operated in a way which is simple, efficient and effective. Advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.
- Section 16 'Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment'- Paragraph 212 says that when considering designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. The effect of an application on the significance of non-designated heritage assets should also be taken into account (para 216).

Other material considerations

National Planning Practice Guidance

All of Dorset:

Dorset Council Interim Guidance and Position Statement Appendix B: Adopted Local Plan policies and objectives relating to climate change, renewable energy, and sustainable design and construction. December 2023.

Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance For West Dorset area:

Weymouth & Portland Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (2002)

Weymouth & Portland Urban Design (2002)

Landscape Character Assessment (Weymouth & Portland)

Conservation Area Appraisals:

Weymouth – Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal adopted December 2012

11. 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. 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 Public Sector Equalities Duty. The Street Hub proposed is not of such a size that it would block or prevent access to pavement by those with buggies or using a wheelchair/mobility scooter.

13. Public Benefits

The proposals would provide a number of financial and non-financial benefits, including public benefits. These are summarised in the table below:

What	Amount / value
Material considerations	

What	Amount / value
Improved digital offering to visitors and residents in Weymouth, providing potential wider economic benefits to businesses in Weymouth.	
Improved digital inclusion	
Improved access and facilitation of emergency services communication – both through the 5G and Wi-Fi functionality, 999 calling facilities, and the use of the LED screens for emergency messaging.	
Potential for improved environmental monitoring, through air/odour testing.	
Non material considerations	
None identified.	

14. Planning Assessment

14.1 The application is for advertisement consent and therefore the only considerations in the determination of the application are amenity and public safety.

Design and Character

14.2 The BT Hub is proposed to be located in a highly visible and sensitive area of The Esplanade, being within a high footfall area of the promenade, located in front of a tourist attraction – Sandcastle Sculpture, and opposite Alexandra Gardens. Further to this, the newly adopted Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan identifies The Esplanade as an important landscape feature, with the location of the BT Hub falling within a Key View Direction from Viewpoint V11. It is noted that The Esplanade, promenade and surrounding area can be characterised as illuminated during the evening and night time, with various forms of street lighting, and an amusement centre immediately opposite the site, in Alexandra Gardens.

14.3 The proposal is considered to provide a betterment through the removal of an existing cash machine/phone kiosk, however, as previously noted in 14.7, the proposed BT Hub unit would be sited in close proximity to two almost identical advertising units, installed to the north and south of the existing Sand Sculpture display/attraction, and would, cumulatively, appear as a proliferation of advertising on the promenade. Whilst it is acknowledged that the wider setting of the proposed unit would be characterised as illuminated, with Alexandra Gardens to the west, it is considered that the BT Hub would be read as a larger and more direct form of illumination, and, where there are other LED units in close proximity, the nearest being approximately 19m to the southeast, it would lead to a proliferation of this form of illuminated advertising, thus cluttering the street scene, public realm and historical setting.

14.4 The proposal is considered to cause harm by virtue of its siting, scale and illumination, and therefore it is not considered that the proposal contributes positively to the local identity and distinctiveness of The Esplanade, nor does it harmonise with the positive character of the area. The proposal would therefore not accord with Local Plan Policy ENV10, nor Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan policies W13 and W44.

Heritage Impact

14.5 The proposal would be in the Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area (CA) and would be in the setting of several heritage assets: Edwardes Statue (Grade II) and the Promenade Shelter Opp. Edwardes Statue (Grade II) - being one of a number of Victorian shelters along the Esplanade. The application site is also within the wider setting of several listed buildings, they being The Oxford Hotel (Grade II) and Grosvenor Place (Grade II). The Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2012) shows a key view and a 'townscape effect' adjacent to the site. The Alexander Gardens are noted in terms of greenery, but it says enhancements to this area are required. The significance of this part of the CA can be summarised as The Esplanade providing an important example of late Georgian town planning, related firmly to the sea and the historic uses of the late 18th and early 19th century that has defined the character of The Esplanade, which has been, and continues to be, associated with visitors, entertainment, leisure and fun. As such the CA is considered to have historic, architectural and communal/social heritage significance. Furthermore, the quality of The Esplanade and its bay have been recognised and appreciated since the start of noble and royal patronage of the Georgian resort and as such is considered to have aesthetic heritage significance. The CA appraisal sets out that *"The Esplanade is of national significance in the history of the seaside resort and in terms of social history".*

14.6 The Council's Conservation Team have reviewed the proposal, in both its original location and revised location, and have raised concerns with the height, mass, colour, animation and scale of the proposed structure, not being in accordance with the street furniture colour scheme along The Esplanade, and more specifically, being close to the existing sand sculpture building, and in close proximity to other illuminated double sided digital advertising panels. Their updated comments state that: '*Whilst it is acknowledged that the distance from the sand sculptures and the existing freestanding advertisement has been improved by the revised location, it considered that the Conservation Officer comments provided on 6 February 2026 are still valid; the proposal would cause less than substantial harm due to the height, mass, colour, animation and illumination of the proposed structure and predominantly due to the accumulation of visual clutter in this historic setting. The proposal would not enhance the historic promenade, would have a negative impact on the neighbouring heritage assets and would have a detrimental effect on the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area.'.* Their previous comments noted that *'alternative options are considered which could provide improvements to the 5G network within the town but which are more discrete and reflect a sensitive and considered approach to heritage values'.*

14.7 The Conservation Officer's view is supported. Whilst it is accepted that the proposed setting of the BT Hub could be described as illuminated, given various forms of street lighting, and the amusement centre to the west, in Alexandra Gardens, it is considered that the installation of the proposed BT Hub would be harmful, being read alongside the two existing LED advertising units installed in 2025, leading to a cumulative proliferation of similar forms of illumination, within the Conservation Area, and the close setting of Edwardes Statue (Grade II) and the Promenade Shelter (Grade II). It is considered that this would lead to less than substantial harm, being on the higher end of this harm, given the less receptive setting and the prominence of the proposed Street Hub alongside existing LED advertising units. Whilst there would be public benefits associated with the scheme, it is not considered that these public benefits would outweigh the harm caused. Given distance separation, it is not considered that there would be harm to the setting of either The Oxford Hotel or Grosvenor Place.

14.8 On this basis the scheme is not considered to accord with Local Plan policy ENV4, Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan policy W45, or Section 16 of the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

14.9 The proposed BT Hub is considered to be acceptable in terms of impact to residential amenity – through light or noise, given that the unit would be oriented with the panels facing north and south, being sufficiently distanced from nearby residential accommodation, the nearest being 31 The Esplanade, approximately 50m to the west.

14.10 The Environmental Health Team have reviewed the proposal and have no comments to make.

14.11 Notwithstanding the low level of impact to neighbouring properties, if the scheme were to be granted consent, then it is recommended that the lighting be controlled by way of a lighting management plan, to be agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Highway Safety

14.12 The Highway Authority have reviewed the proposal and have stated that it would appear acceptable in principle, however this would be subject to conditioning to ensure that illumination levels do not lead to a danger to highways safety, being overly bright and thereby distracting. This assessment is considered to be reasonable and proportionate and as such if consent were to be granted a lighting scheme should be agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

14.13 On this basis the scheme is not considered to accord with Local Plan policy COM7, Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan policy W46.

Crime/Policing

14.14 Comments have been received from Dorset Police, raising concerns that the BT Hub could be used for criminal purposes, and lead to an increase in anti-social behaviour, in an area which has a higher-than-average rate of crime and anti-social behaviour. It is suggested that the Wi-Fi and free calling facilities could lead to nuisance calls, and the solicitation of drugs. This notwithstanding, an Anti-Social Behaviour Management Plan has been submitted, and this would be conditioned alongside any consent granted. Further, Dorset Police have recommended that any integrated camera within the BT Hub be activated when installed, to ensure the monitoring of any calling of 999. Lastly, they request the removal of the existing BT payphone.

14.15 The concerns raised are considered to be valid ones, with Local Plan policy WEY5 making reference to anti-social behaviour in the area which the unit would be located. It is accepted that the submitted Anti-Social Management Plan would be the appropriate manner in which to address these concerns. Given the potential for misuse of the BT Hub unit it would seem reasonable to activate any surveillance which could reduce this. The removal of the existing phone kiosk/cash machine would be conditioned alongside any consent, given this application is for the replacement of that unit and thereby would also be considered reasonable.

Other Matters

14.16 In terms of public health and non-ionising radiation protection, a statement of conformity with public radio frequency guidelines has been provided.

15. Environmental implications

15.1 Given the type and small-scale nature of the proposed development it is not considered that there would be any significant environmental implications as a result.

16. Summary of issues and the planning balance

16.1 It is considered that for the reasons set out above that the development would, subject to conditions have an acceptable impact on highway safety and residential amenity in accordance with the relevant policies of the development plan. Subject to a planning condition requiring the implementation of the anti-social behaviour management plan the development is not considered to likely result in an unacceptable impact in respect of crime and anti-social behaviour.

16.2 The development would result in the public benefits of:

- improved digital offering to visitors and residents in Weymouth, providing potential wider economic benefits to businesses in Weymouth
- improved digital inclusion
- improved access and facilitation of emergency services communication – both through the 5G and Wi-Fi functionality, 999 calling facilities, and the use of the LED screens for emergency messaging
- potential for improved environmental monitoring, through air/odour testing

16.3 The proposed development would be located within the Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area in what is identified in both the Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) and the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan as a key view. Alongside this the development would be in the close setting of two heritage assets, Edwardes Statue (Grade II) and the Promenade Shelter (Grade II). The development is therefore in a historically sensitive setting, where The Esplanade is considered to have historic, architectural and communal/social heritage significance - the CAA appraisal sets out that *"The Esplanade is of national significance in the history of the seaside resort and in terms of social history".*

16.4 It is considered that the proposed development by reason of its siting, height, mass, design and appearance (including colour) would add to the proliferation of street furniture (despite the removal of the existing telephone kiosk and cash machine) and other paraphernalia on the sea front and as a result of the inbuilt LED advertisement screens would be a visually prominent addition which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and the immediate setting of Edwardes Statue and the Promenade Shelter. This harm is considered to be less than substantial and so in accordance with chapter 16 of the NPPF consideration must be given to whether the public benefits would outweigh the identified harm.

16.5 Whilst public benefits have been identified and could be secured by planning condition it is not considered that the applicant has demonstrated that there are no alternative means of providing those benefits in a way which would have a less harmful impact. As such the proposed development does not accord with Policy COM10 of the adopted local plan.

16.6 Given that it has not been demonstrated that the public benefits could not be achieved by other less harmful means, and that the heritage harm would be on the higher end of less than substantial harm, it is considered that despite the limited weight which can be attached to the public benefits that is not sufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets. As such the development is contrary to Policies ENV4, ENV10, ENV12, ENV14, WEY1 and COM10 of the adopted local plan, Policies W13, W44 and W45 of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan and chapters 10 and 16 of the NPPF.

17. Recommendation

17.1 Refuse for the following reason:

The proposed BT Street Hub would be a harmful addition to the historically sensitive and significant Esplanade promenade within the Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area, given its siting, scale, design, appearance and colour with inbuilt LED screens being visually intrusive, adding to the proliferation of street furniture and being read alongside existing LED advertising screens which have been installed along the Esplanade. Whilst it is noted that there would be public benefits from the proposed hub, namely increased coverage of 5G and the provision of Wi-Fi, this is not considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the setting of Edwardes Statue and The Promenade Shelter, and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, which the hub would cause. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated or evidenced that suitable alternatives, which would cause less harm to visual amenity and the Conservation Area, for the provision of Wi-Fi and 5G have been considered. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policies ENV4, ENV10, ENV12, ENV14 and WEY1 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2015) and Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan (2026) policies W39, W44 and W45 and chapters 10 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

This page is intentionally left blank

Application Number:	P/FUL/2026/01894
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/
Site address:	13 The Esplanade, Weymouth, DT4 8EB
Proposal:	Removal of existing upper floor window and enlargement of opening in order to add new french doors giving access onto a new balcony area formed upon the existing bay window roof.
Applicant name:	Mr & Mrs Peirce
Case Officer:	Rob Piggot
Ward Member(s):	Cllr Orrell

1. **Reason application is going to committee:** The application site is owned by Dorset Council.

2. **Summary of recommendation**:

   Grant subject to the conditions as set out at the end of this report.

3. **Key planning issues**

Issue	**Conclusion**
Principle of development	Acceptable, supported by Local Plan policy SUS2.
Scale, design, impact on character and appearance	The development would be acceptable, read as a lightweight addition which would not appear out of place on the rear elevation of the block it sits within.
Impact on the living conditions of the occupants and neighbouring properties	The balcony would not be harmful to residential amenity, given that it would introduce no worse overlooking or noise than existing levels at the rear of 7-15 The Esplanade.
Impact on landscape or heritage assets	The development would not harm the historic or architectural significance of 13-15 The Esplanade, 7-12 The Esplanade, or the wider Conservation Area. There would be less than substantial harm through the minor loss of historic fabric, however this would be outweighed by economic benefits.
Flood risk and drainage	Whilst the development would be located in a flood risk area, it does not involve the erection of an extension or a change of use and is not considered to lead to further risk of flooding at the site or off-site.
Economic benefits	Enhancement of overnight tourist accommodation, benefiting immediate operator and Weymouth Town Centre.

Issue	Conclusion
Environmental Implications	Given the scale and nature of the proposal, it is not considered there would be any environmental or ecological impact.

4. Description of site

4.1 No.13 Esplanade, The Lantana Guest House, is located on the eastern section of The Esplanade, opposite Alexandra Gardens, with Custom House Quay running along the rear boundary, and Weymouth Harbour beyond this to the southeast. No.13 is a 3 storey, mid-terrace property with a lower ground floor and attic space, being Grade II Listed, in a group listing with No.14 and No.15 known as Pulteney Buildings. Immediately to the rear of the property is a two-storey gabled extension, a single storey extension with terrace above, a courtyard and parking area.

4.2 The property is currently operated as overnight tourist accommodation, consisting of 6 separate rooms and a bed and breakfast service.

4.3 The property is within Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area and the terrace has architectural significance with Georgian architectural detailing. Furthermore, the properties have historic and group significance and as noted within the listing description, the terrace, in conjunction with the neighbouring Devonshire Buildings, provides a worthy starting group for the long Esplanade stretching to the north.

4.4 The site is identified in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the Environment Agency's National Flood Risk Maps for Planning as being at risk of flooding now and in the future.

5. Description of development

5.1 Consent is sought for the removal of an existing upper floor window, and vertical enlargement of the existing opening, in order to add new French doors, giving access onto a new balcony area formed upon the existing roof of the first floor bay window.

5.2 The existing opening would remain the same width, approximately 1m, with fabric being removed below it, down to the level of the roof of the existing bay window, to facilitate the new French doors, being approximately 2m high. The existing roof to the bay window would be replaced, with structural alterations undertaken to accept loading, and a 1.1m high metal balustrade is to be installed above the outer perimeter of the second-floor bay window.

6. Background and relevant planning history

93/00409/LBC - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 23/03/1994

Replacement windows and installation of iron balustrade on 3rd and 4th floors

P/PAP/2024/00643 - Decision: RES - Decision Date: 17/01/2025

Removal of upper floor window and replace and widen with French doors to give access to new balcony.

7. List of constraints

Grade: II* Listed Building: NUMBERS 7-12 PULTENEY BUILDINGS (TERRACE) List Entry: 1145965; - Distance: 3.12

Grade: II Listed Building: NUMBERS 13, 14 AND 15 PULTENEY BUILDINGS (TERRACE) List Entry: 1145966; - Distance: 9.34

WEYM, Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area

Neighbourhood Plan Area - Weymouth

LP - WEY 1; Weymouth Town Centre Strategy; Weymouth Town Centre

LP - SUS2; Defined Development Boundary; Weymouth

LP - ECON4; Town Centre Areas; Weymouth

LP - ENV 4; Area of Archaeological Potential; Town Centre North of Harbour, Weymouth

LP - WEY4; Custom House Quay and Brewery Waterfront; Custom House Quay and Brewery Waterfront

S106 - A Unilateral Undertaking has been made

Dorset Council Land Freehold: 1-8 & 10-15 The Esplanade and Alexandra Gardens, Weymouth - Reference FH004371

Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) impact risk zone

EA - Flood Zone: FZ3

EA - AEP 3.3% 1 in 30 Defended Climate Change: 1 in 30 modelled sea

EA - Annual likelihood of flooding - Rivers and Sea 1 in 30: 1 in 30 modelled sea - Distance: 0

EA - Annual likelihood of flooding - Rivers 1 in 100 Sea 1 in 200: sea - Distance: 0

EA - Annual likelihood of flooding - Rivers and Sea 1 in 1000: sea - Distance: 0

EA - Annual likelihood of flooding - Rivers 1 in 100 Sea 1 in 200: sea - Distance: 0

EA - Annual likelihood of flooding - Rivers and Sea 1 in 1000: sea - Distance: 0

EA - Risk of surface water flooding: Low

EA - Main River Consultation Zone

SFRA - Flood Risk Zone 3a

8. Consultations

All consultee responses can be viewed in full on the website.

Consultees

1. **Dorset Council - Conservation Officer:**

Initial Response (17/4/26)

Given the significance of this building and its group value within the terrace any alterations should be carefully considered. Therefore, for the avoidance of doubt, please would it be possible for the Agent to provide / confirm:-

- A larger scale sectional drawing of the proposed bay roof build up and materials.
- The submitted proposed section drawing notes *"as per structural engineers design if existing joists are not cantilevered provide new timber joists bolted to the existing joists".* Are further onsite investigations required to confirm this matter?
- Please confirm, as the drawing suggests, that any new timber joists will be within the floor void and not visible from the bedroom below?
- The proposed section drawing includes a note *"upon agreement with the conservation officer no insulation is to be used within the replacement flat roof covering to allow the existing structure and proportions and detailing to be retained".* Please could the Agent clarify this statement.

Further Response (27/5/26)

Further to my initial comments dated 17 April 2026 regarding the above applications and the subsequent information provided by the Agent (1574/07 - *Horizontal Section Proposed)* I have the following comments:-

The proposal would see minor changes to the historic facade and a minor loss of historic fabric resulting in harm to the significance of the Listed building. However, it is considered that the level of harm would be to the lower end of 'less than substantial harm' and would be offset by the enhanced facilities that would be provided to the visitors of the Guest House.

It is concluded that the proposal would not be detrimental to the special architectural and historic interest of the host building, the neighbouring Listed buildings nor the Conservation Area. There is **no objection** to this application.

2. **Dorset Council - Building Control:** No comments.
3. **Dorset Council - Asset & Property:** No comments received.
4. **Weymouth Town Council:** The Council supports this application and raises no objection.
5. **Melcombe Regis Ward Member:** No comments received.

9. Duties

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.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 - includes a general duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses when considering whether to grant listed building consent.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that when considering whether to grant planning permission for a development which affects a listed building or its setting, there is a general duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

10. Relevant policies

Development plan

In this case the development plan comprises:

Local Plan Adopted West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland Local Plan:

The following policies are considered to be relevant to this proposal:

INT1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development

ENV1: Landscape, seascape & sites of other geological interest

ENV2: Wildlife and habitats

ENV4: Heritage assets

ENV5: Flood risk

ENV10: The landscape and townscape setting

ENV12: The design and positioning of buildings

ENV13: Achieving high levels of environmental performance

ENV16: Amenity

SUS2: Distribution of development

WEY1: Town Centre Strategy

WEY5: The Esplanade (South)

Made Neighbourhood Plans

Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan 2021 to 2039 (made 29/01/2026

W14: Development Boundaries

W34: Sustainable Development

W39: Weymouth Town Centre

W44: Design

W45: Heritage Assets

Material considerations

Emerging local plans:

Paragraph 49 of the NPPF provides that local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant plan policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan are to the policies of the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

The Dorset Council Local Plan

The Dorset Council Local Plan Options consultation took place between January and March 2021, with further consultation between 18 Aug – 31 October 2025. Being at a very early stage of preparation, the relevant policies in the draft plan should be accorded very limited weight in decision making.

National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (as amended 2025)

Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date then permission should be granted unless specific NPPF policies protecting areas or assets provide a strong reason for refusal and/or any adverse impacts of approval would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole, with particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places and providing affordable homes.

Other relevant NPPF sections include:

- Section 4 ‘Decision making’: Para 39 - Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available…and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.

- Section 6 ‘Building a strong, competitive economy’, paragraphs 88 and 89 ‘Supporting a prosperous rural economy' promotes the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, through conversion of existing buildings, the erection of well-designed new buildings, and supports sustainable tourism and leisure developments where identified needs are not met by existing rural service centres.
- Section 11 ‘Making effective use of land’
- Section 12 ‘Achieving well designed places’ This indicates that all development to be of a high quality in design, and the relationship and visual impact of it to be compatible with the surroundings. In particular, and amongst other things, Paragraphs 131 – 141 advise that:

The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.

- Section 14 ‘Meeting the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change’
- Section 16 ‘Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment’- Paragraph 212 says that when considering designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. The effect of an application on the significance of non-designated heritage assets should also be taken into account (para 216).

Other material considerations

- Historic England, Statement of Heritage Significance (2019)
- Historic England Advice Notes 2: Making Changes to Heritage Assets
- Historic England: Conservation Principles
- Historic England: Good Practice Advice Note 3: Setting of Heritage Assets
- Historic England: Good Practice advice Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision Taking

National Planning Practice Guidance

<u>All of Dorset:</u>

Dorset Council Interim Guidance and Position Statement Appendix B: Adopted Local Plan policies and objectives relating to climate change, renewable energy, and sustainable design and construction. December 2023.

<u>Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance For West Dorset area:</u>

Weymouth & Portland Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (2002)

Weymouth & Portland Urban Design (2002)

Landscape Character Assessment (Weymouth & Portland)

<u>Conservation Area Appraisals:</u>

Weymouth – Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal adopted December 2012

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.

11. 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 Public Sector Equalities Duty. This proposal is not considered to impact upon persons with protected characteristics.

12. Public Benefits

The proposals would provide a number of financial and non-financial benefits, including public benefits. These are summarised in the table below:

What	Amount / value
Material considerations	
Economic benefits through improved/enhanced accommodation facilities for Bed and Breakfast operation at 13 The Esplanade.	Not quantifiable.
Non material considerations	
None.	

13. Planning Assessment

Principle of development

14.1 The development would be located within the Weymouth Defined Development Boundary (DDB) and therefore would be supported by policy SUS2 in the Local Plan.

14.2 It is not considered that Local Plan policy ECON6, that relates to Tourist Accommodation, would be applicable to this application, given that the development would not lead to either new accommodation being formed, nor the loss of existing accommodation.

Design and Character

14.3 The proposed alterations would be located on the rear wall of 13 The Esplanade and would be prominently located, given this is on the upper/third floor of the terrace block, where views of it would be possible from Custom House Quay, the adjacent footpath, and the Harbour beyond. It should also be acknowledged that No.13 forms part of a terrace which has historical amenity value, within the wider setting.

14.4 Notwithstanding this, the rear elevation of the terrace block has been subject to various alterations, particularly at ground and first floor, through the form of rear extensions and

veranda/decking areas. More specifically, a balcony has been formed at 3rd floor at no.14 The Esplanade, consented in 1993, and an additional bay window has been formed on the rear elevation at no.10 The Esplanade. Thus, sat alongside other rear additions, it is not considered that the proposed balcony would look out of place, further, it would be lightweight, where appropriate material finishes would ensure that it appears in keeping with No.13, and the wider terrace.

14.5 On this basis the scheme is considered to accord with Local Plan policies ENV10, ENV12 and Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan policy W44.

Heritage Impact

14.5 The proposal would involve works to a listed building, 13 The Esplanade (Grade II), being part of a group listing, alongside no.14 and no.15 (LB No: 1145966). No.13 is also within the immediate setting of an adjoining Grade II* terrace block, no.'s 7-12 Pulteney Buildings (LB No: 1145965). Lastly, it is within the Town Centre Conservation Area.

14.6 The properties within this terrace have architectural significance with Georgian architectural detailing. Furthermore, the properties have historic and group significance and as noted within the listing description, the terrace, in conjunction with the neighbouring Devonshire Buildings, provides a worthy starting group for the long Esplanade stretching to the north. The property is therefore part of a prominent group of buildings located within the Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area.

14.7 A Conservation led Pre-Application Enquiry was submitted for the proposed works, with the formation of a balcony and insertion of French doors supported, in principle, subject to further detail on the proposed window, and structural support required to utilise the roof of the existing bay window as a balcony. The Conservation Team's response can be summarised as follows:

> *The proposed French doors and balcony are considered sympathetic in their scale, design and materials and would not look out of keeping with the street scene nor the wider Conservation Area.*
>
> *It is considered that changing the window to a door and having a small balcony area would have less impact than the double bay noted on the neighbouring property. It is also considered that the property to the left-hand side has the same arrangement as proposed.*
>
> *The proposed French doors should be timber multi-paned painted white to match existing.*

14.8 The Conservation Officer initially reviewed the proposed works submitted under this application and requested further information, namely section plans showing what structural intervention would be required. Further structural details have been submitted, and the Conservation Officer has submitted a final response, stating that they have no objections, with any harm through the loss of historic fabric being outweighed by the enhanced facilities and thus economic benefits which would be achieved.

14.9 The Conservation Officer's view is supported, and it is considered that the scheme would not harm the architectural or historical significance of either 13-15 The Esplanade, nor the neighbouring block 7-12 Pulteney Buildings. It is considered that it would have no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As is noted in the Conservation Officer's response, there would be a small degree of harm to the listed building by virtue of the loss of historic fabric, below the existing casement window, and this harm is considered to be at the lower end of less than substantial. This low level of less than substantial harm is considered to be outweighed by the public benefits derived from enhancement of the facilities at the Bed and Breakfast being operated at No.13, which would lead to potential economic benefits.

14.10 Lastly, it is considered appropriate that detailed drawings are provided for both the French doors proposed, and the balustrade. Conditions requiring these will be applied to the associated listed building consent application.

14.10 On this basis the scheme is considered to accord with Local Plan policy ENV4, Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan policies W39 and W45, and Section 16 of the NPPF. In reaching this

conclusion regard has been had to Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Residential Amenity

14.11 A site visit was carried out to inform this assessment, and it should be noted that no neighbour objections have been received.

14.12 It is accepted that the formation of a new balcony area at the 3rd floor of 13 The Esplanade would introduce a new form of overlooking, given that users of said balcony would be able to stand and/or sit further out from the existing casement window. However, it is not considered that there would be significant adverse harm to neighbouring properties on either side, those being 12 and 14 The Esplanade, given the small size of the balcony, and for the fact that there is already a high degree of overlooking of ground and first floor areas of all properties within the terrace block containing 7-15 The Esplanade. It is accepted that views back toward no.12 maybe possible, however, there is no window immediately adjacent to the proposed balcony, with the other casement window at 3rd floor level of that property being sufficiently distanced, with only indirect views into it available from the balcony. Any new noise which may occur as a result of the use of the proposed balcony is considered to be minor also, given its size, and for the fact that it would not be considered significantly worse than the urban setting it sits within, with a road and busy harbour footpath directly adjacent, to the south.

14.13 On this basis the scheme is considered to accord with Local Plan policy ENV16.

Flooding

14.13 The application site is subject to a higher risk of river or sea flooding, being within Flood Zone 3a in the National Flood Risk Assessment 2. That notwithstanding, the proposal is not for an extension or a change of use and there would be no increase in impermeable surface area. The proposal is therefore not considered to pose any risk to safety in respect of flood risk or lead to an increase in flood risk off-site and would accord with policy ENV5 of the Local Plan.

14. Environmental implications

15.1 Given the type and small-scale nature of the proposed development it is not considered that there would be any significant environmental impact as a result.

15. Summary of issues and the planning balance

16.1 The proposed works are considered to be acceptable in terms of design and siting, and impact on the historic asset, the listed building, with a low level of less than substantial harm which would be outweighed by public (economic) benefits. There would be no harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Given the scale and nature of the works, they are not considered to impact on flood risk or have environmental implications. Finally, the works are not considered to lead to significant harm to neighbour amenity, being no worse than existing overlooking or noise. On this basis the scheme is acceptable in planning terms and accords with the development plan.

16. Recommendation

Grant subject to the following conditions:

1. 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).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
   Location Plan 1574/01

Block Plan 1574/02
Second Floor Plan and Roof Plan 1574/05
Elevations 1574/06
Section Plan 1574/07

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

Informatives:

1. National Planning Policy Framework Statement

In accordance with paragraph 39 of the NPPF the council, as local planning authority, takes a positive approach to development proposals and is focused on providing sustainable development.

The council works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

- offering a pre-application advice service, and

- as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

In this case:

- The applicant/agent was updated of any issues and provided with the opportunity to address issues identified by the case officer.

- The applicant was provided with pre-application advice.

2. Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition (biodiversity gain condition) that development may not begin unless:
(a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
(b) the planning authority has approved the plan.
The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan, if one is required in respect of this permission would be Dorset Council.
There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. These are listed in full in a subsequent informative below.
Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements are considered to apply.

- Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:
i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and
ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

Read more about Biodiversity Net Gain at https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/biodiversity-net-gain

3. Statutory Exemptions and Transitional Arrangements in respect of the Biodiversity Gain Plan
1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.
2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.

3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and

(i)the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or

(ii)the application for the original planning permission* to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;

ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or

iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:

i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and

ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;

ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and

iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.6 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.

* "original planning permission means the permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

4. Any works would need to be authorised by the owner/operator of the land which is under development and as such the applicant is advised to contact Dorset Council Assets.

This page is intentionally left blank

Application Number:	P/LBC/2026/01893
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/
Site address:	13 The Esplanade Weymouth DT4 8EB
Proposal:	Internal and external alteration to facilitate the removal of existing upper floor window and enlargement of opening in order to add new French doors giving access onto a new balcony area formed upon the existing bay window roof
Applicant name:	Mr & Mrs Peirce
Case Officer:	Rob Piggot
Ward Member(s):	Cllr Orrell

1. **Reason application is going to committee:** The application site is owned by Dorset Council.

2. **Summary of recommendation**:

Grant subject to the conditions as set out at the end of this report.

3. **Key planning issues**

Issue	Conclusion
Impact on landscape or heritage assets	The development would not harm the historic or architectural significance of 13-15 The Esplanade, 7-12 The Esplanade, or the wider Conservation Area. There would be less than substantial harm through loss of historic fabric, however this would be outweighed by economic benefits.
Economic benefits	Enhancement of overnight tourist accommodation, benefiting immediate operator and Weymouth Town Centre.

4. Description of site

4.1 No.13 Esplanade, The Lantana Guest House, is located on the eastern section of The Esplanade, opposite Alexandra Gardens, with Custom House Quay running along the rear boundary, and Weymouth Harbour beyond this to the southeast. No.13 is a 3 storey, mid-terrace property with a lower ground floor and attic space, being Grade II Listed, in a group listing with No.14 and No.15 known as Pulteney Buildings. Immediately to the rear of the property is a two-storey gabled extension, a single storey extension with terrace above, a courtyard and parking area.

4.2 The property is currently operated as overnight tourist accommodation, consisting of 6 separate rooms and a bed and breakfast service.

4.3 The property is within Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area and the terrace has architectural significance with Georgian architectural detailing. Furthermore, the properties have historic and group significance and as noted within the listing description, the terrace, in conjunction with the neighbouring Devonshire Buildings, provides a worthy starting group for the long Esplanade stretching to the north.

5. Description of development

5.1 Consent is sought for the removal of an existing upper floor window, and vertical enlargement of the existing opening, in order to add new French doors, giving access onto a new balcony area formed upon the existing roof of the first floor bay window.

5.2 The existing opening would remain the same width, approximately 1m, with fabric being removed below it, down to the level of the roof of the existing bay window, to facilitate the new French doors, being approximately 2m high. The existing roof to the bay window would be replaced, with structural alterations undertaken to accept loading, and a 1.1m high metal balustrade is to be installed above the outer perimeter of the second-floor bay window.

6. Background and relevant planning history

93/00409/LBC - Decision: GRA - Decision Date: 23/03/1994

Replacement windows and installation of iron balustrade on 3rd and 4th floors

P/PAP/2024/00643 - Decision: RES - Decision Date: 17/01/2025

Removal of upper floor window and replace and widen with French doors to give access to new balcony.

7. List of constraints

Grade: II* Listed Building: NUMBERS 7-12 PULTENEY BUILDINGS (TERRACE) List Entry: 1145965; - Distance: 3.12

Grade: II Listed Building: NUMBERS 13, 14 AND 15 PULTENEY BUILDINGS (TERRACE) List Entry: 1145966; - Distance: 9.34

Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area

Neighbourhood Plan Area - Weymouth

LP - WEY 1; Weymouth Town Centre Strategy; Weymouth Town Centre

LP - SUS2; Defined Development Boundary; Weymouth

LP - ECON4; Town Centre Areas; Weymouth

LP - ENV 4; Area of Archaeological Potential; Town Centre North of Harbour, Weymouth

LP - WEY4; Custom House Quay and Brewery Waterfront; Custom House Quay and Brewery Waterfront

S106 - A Unilateral Undertaking has been made

Dorset Council Land Freehold: 1-8 & 10-15 The Esplanade and Alexandra Gardens, Weymouth - Reference FH004371

Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) impact risk zone

EA - Flood Zone: FZ3

EA - AEP 3.3% 1 in 30 Defended Climate Change: 1 in 30 modelled sea

EA - Annual likelihood of flooding - Rivers and Sea 1 in 30: 1 in 30 modelled sea - Distance: 0

EA - Annual likelihood of flooding - Rivers 1 in 100 Sea 1 in 200: sea - Distance: 0

EA - Annual likelihood of flooding - Rivers and Sea 1 in 1000: sea - Distance: 0

EA - Annual likelihood of flooding - Rivers 1 in 100 Sea 1 in 200: sea - Distance: 0

EA - Annual likelihood of flooding - Rivers and Sea 1 in 1000: sea - Distance: 0

EA - Risk of surface water flooding: Low

EA - Main River Consultation Zone

SFRA - Flood Risk Zone 3a

1. Consultations

All consultee responses can be viewed in full on the website.

Consultees

1. Dorset Council - Conservation Officers:

Initial Response (17/4/26)

Given the significance of this building and its group value within the terrace any alterations should be carefully considered. Therefore, for the avoidance of doubt, please would it be possible for the Agent to provide / confirm:-

- A larger scale sectional drawing of the proposed bay roof build up and materials.
- The submitted proposed section drawing notes *"as per structural engineers design if existing joists are not cantilevered provide new timber joists bolted to the existing joists".* Are further onsite investigations required to confirm this matter?
- Please confirm, as the drawing suggests, that any new timber joists will be within the floor void and not visible from the bedroom below?
- The proposed section drawing includes a note *"upon agreement with the conservation officer no insulation is to be used within the replacement flat roof covering to allow the existing structure and proportions and detailing to be retain".* Please could the Agent clarify this statement.

Further Response (27/5/26)

Further to my initial comments dated 17 April 2026 regarding the above applications and the subsequent information provided by the Agent (1574/07 - *Horizontal Section Proposed)* I have the following comments:-

The proposal would see minor changes to the historic facade and a minor loss of historic fabric resulting in harm to the significance of the Listed building. However, it is considered that the level of harm would be to the lower end of 'less than substantial harm' and would be offset by the enhanced facilities that would be provided to the visitors of the Guest House.

It is concluded that the proposal would not be detrimental to the special architectural and historic interest of the host building, the neighbouring Listed buildings nor the Conservation Area. There is **no objection** to this application.

Dorset Council - Building Control: No comments.

3. Dorset Council - Asset & Property: No comments received.

4. Weymouth Town Council: The Council supports this application and raises no objection.

5. Melcombe Regis Ward Member: No comments received.

8. Duties

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.

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 - includes a general duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses when considering whether to grant listed building consent.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that when considering whether to grant planning permission for a development which affects a listed building or its setting, there is a general duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

9. Relevant policies

Development plan

In this case the development plan comprises:

Local Plan Adopted West Dorset and Weymouth & Portland Local Plan:

The following policies are considered to be relevant to this proposal:

ENV4: Heritage assets

Made Neighbourhood Plans

Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan 2021 to 2039 (made 29/01/2026

W45: Heritage Assets

Material considerations

Emerging local plans:

Paragraph 49 of the NPPF provides that local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant plan policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan are to the policies of the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

The Dorset Council Local Plan

The Dorset Council Local Plan Options consultation took place between January and March 2021, with further consultation between 18 Aug – 31 October 2025. Being at a very early stage of preparation, the relevant policies in the draft plan should be accorded very limited weight in decision making.

National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (as amended 2025)

Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date then permission should be granted unless specific NPPF policies protecting areas or assets provide a strong reason for refusal and/or any adverse impacts of approval would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole, with particular regard to key policies for directing

development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places and providing affordable homes.

Other relevant NPPF sections include:

- Section 4 ‘Decision making’: Para 39 - Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available…and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.
- Section 6 ‘Building a strong, competitive economy’, paragraphs 88 and 89 ‘Supporting a prosperous rural economy' promotes the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, through conversion of existing buildings, the erection of well-designed new buildings, and supports sustainable tourism and leisure developments where identified needs are not met by existing rural service centres.
- Section 12 ‘Achieving well designed places’ This indicates that all development to be of a high quality in design, and the relationship and visual impact of it to be compatible with the surroundings. In particular, and amongst other things, Paragraphs 131 – 141 advise that:

The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design.

- Section 16 ‘Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment’- Paragraph 212 says that when considering designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. The effect of an application on the significance of non-designated heritage assets should also be taken into account (para 216).

Other material considerations

- Historic England, Statement of Heritage Significance (2019)
- Historic England Advice Notes 2: Making Changes to Heritage Assets
- Historic England: Conservation Principles
- Historic England: Good Practice Advice Note 3: Setting of Heritage Assets
- Historic England: Good Practice advice Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision Taking

National Planning Practice Guidance

All of Dorset:

Dorset Council Interim Guidance and Position Statement Appendix B: Adopted Local Plan policies and objectives relating to climate change, renewable energy, and sustainable design and construction. December 2023.

Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance For West Dorset area:

Weymouth & Portland Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (2002)

Conservation Area Appraisals:

Weymouth – Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal adopted December 2012

10. 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.

11. 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 Public Sector Equalities Duty.This proposal is not considered to impact upon persons with protected characteristics.

12. Public Benefits

The proposals would provide a number of financial and non-financial benefits, including public benefits. These are summarised in the table below:

What	Amount / value
Material considerations	
Economic benefits through improved/enhanced accommodation facilities for Bed and Breakfast operation at 13 The Esplanade.	Not quantifiable
Non material considerations	
None.	

13. Planning Assessment

14.1 Heritage Impact

14.2 The proposal would involve works to a listed building, 13 The Esplanade (Grade II), being part of a group listing, alongside no.14 and no.15 (LB No: 1145966). No.13 is also within the immediate setting of an adjoining Grade II* terrace block, no.'s 7-12 Pulteney Buildings (LB No: 1145965). Lastly, it is within the Town Centre Conservation Area.

14.3 The properties within this terrace have architectural significance with Georgian architectural detailing. Furthermore, the properties have historic and group significance and as noted within the listing description, the terrace, in conjunction with the neighbouring Devonshire Buildings, provides a worthy starting group for the long Esplanade stretching to the north. The property is therefore part of a prominent group of buildings located within the Weymouth Town Centre Conservation Area

14.4 A Conservation led Pre-Application Enquiry was submitted for the proposed works, with the formation of a balcony and insertion of French doors supported, in principle, subject to further

detail on the proposed window, and structural support required to utilise the roof of the existing bay window as a balcony. The Conservation Team's response can be summarised as follows:

> *The proposed French doors and balcony are considered sympathetic in their scale, design and materials and would not look out of keeping with the street scene nor the wider Conservation Area.*
>
> *It is considered that changing the window to a door and having a small balcony area would have less impact than the double bay noted on the neighbouring property. It is also considered that the property to the left-hand side has the same arrangement as proposed.*
>
> *The proposed French doors should be timber multi-paned painted white to match existing.*

14.5 The Conservation Officer initially reviewed the proposed works submitted under this application and requested further information, namely section plans showing what structural intervention would be required. Further structural details have been submitted, and the Conservation Officer has submitted a final response, stating that they have no objections, with any harm through the loss of historic fabric being outweighed by the enhanced facilities and thus economic benefits which would be achieved.

14.6 The Conservation Officer's view is supported, and it is considered that the scheme would not harm the architectural or historical significance of either 13-15 The Esplanade, nor the neighbouring block 7-12 Pulteney Buildings. It is considered that it would have no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As is noted in the Conservation Officer's response, there would be a small degree of harm by virtue of the loss of historic fabric, below the existing casement window, and this harm is considered to be at the lower end of less than substantial. This low level harm is considered to be outweighed by the potential public benefits derived from enhancement of the facilities at the Bed and Breakfast being operated at No.13, which would lead to economic benefits.

14.7 Lastly, it is considered appropriate that detailed drawings are provided for both the French doors proposed, and the balustrade. Conditions are therefore recommended accordingly.

14.8 On this basis the scheme is considered to accord with Local Plan policy ENV4, Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan policies W39 and W45, and Section 16 of the NPPF. In reaching this conclusion regard has been had to Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

14. Summary of issues and the planning balance

The proposed works are considered to be acceptable in terms of their design and siting, and would result in no harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and less than substantial harm at the lower end as a result of the loss of a very small amount of historic fabric. It is considered that the less than substantial harm is outweighed by public (economic) benefits. On this basis the scheme is acceptable and accords with the development plan.

15. Recommendation

Grant subject to the following conditions:

1. 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).

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
   Location Plan 1574/01
   Block Plan 1574/02
   Second Floor Plan and Roof Plan 1574/03

Elevations 1574/06
Section Plan 1574/07

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

3. Prior to their installation detailed drawings and specifications showing the design, construction and finished external paint colour of the external French doors (at a scale no less than 1:10) shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and agreed in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

   Reason: To preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the heritage asset.

4. Prior to their installation detailed drawings and specifications showing the design, construction and finished colour of the proposed balustrading (at a scale no less than 1:10) shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and agreed in writing. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

   Reason: To preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the heritage asset.

Informatives:

1. National Planning Policy Framework Statement

In accordance with paragraph 39 of the NPPF the council, as local planning authority, takes a positive approach to development proposals and is focused on providing sustainable development.

The council works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

- offering a pre-application advice service, and

- as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

In this case:

- The applicant/agent was updated of any issues and provided with the opportunity to address issues identified by the case officer.

- The applicant was provided with pre-application advice.

2. Any works would need to be authorised by the owner/operator of the land which is under development and as such the applicant is advised to contact Dorset Council Assets.