

Western & Southern Area Planning Committee - 8 October 2020

Written Submissions

WD/D/20/000597 - Land West of, 5 Chapel Lane, Maiden Newton

Johanna and Bryan Ward

To the planning committee making the decision today about the proposed building of two 3 bedroom family houses on the land west of 5 Chapel Lane, Maiden Newton.

We are the owners and residents of 5 Chapel Lane, we bought the house 10 years ago. At this time the seller retained a large part of the garden, hoping to build one residence for her own use. This obviously did not happen and now this planning application for two 3 bedroom family houses has been submitted for your consideration.

I would just like to reiterate that this was a private garden belonging to the house we now own and live in. The garden was big but not large enough to fit two houses plus gardens in! One of these houses will be built right on the boundary with our garden, meaning it will shade over a large part of our garden. As a large part of our garden will potentially sit between our house and the proposed new house we will not get any sunlight at all in this area! So if this proposed planning gets the go ahead we will not only lose our privacy but also a lot of sunlight in our garden!

Chapel Lane is a small private lane, and the building of two houses on this piece of land, once the old garden of our house will be a serious case of over development. I would urge the committee to take our view into consideration as we at number 5 will be the most severely affected.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Sara Lane and Brian Longhurst

Further to my previous correspondence regarding this proposed development, and in summary, I would like to register my objection to it in its current form.

The planning application represents an inappropriate over development of a small plot which is surrounded by residential properties, all of which will suffer some degree of loss of privacy due to being overlooked. The access road is an unadopted, unmade track which is maintained by the residents of Chapel Lane, and numerous construction vehicles will cause serious deterioration, especially if the weather is wet, the cost of which needs to be considered. There is also no room for the parking of construction vehicles in the lane, without blocking access for the residents.

In our opinion, as residents who will be affected by this proposed development, a one single storey dwelling would be a much more appropriate building for this site, reducing the impact of loss of privacy, and construction traffic. Thank you for your consideration of these points.

Maiden Newton Parish Council

Maiden Newton Parish Council object to the development on the basis that the two houses, as designed, are too much for the site and that one house would fit much better. Two houses could have as many as 6 cars needing parking spaces and there is only room for 4. There is very limited off and on street parking in this area which could cause congestion. The Highways Officer draws attention to the fact that this site faces onto the narrowest part of Chapel Lane, which at this point is a 5m wide private road with no pavement. The houses will have to be moved further back into the plots to allow for workable parking spaces. The houses themselves are very cramped, especially upstairs where the loft space is incorporated into the bedrooms: all will have sloping ceilings and part of the upstairs lighting comes from velux windows. The boundary line between plots 1 and 2 is the wall of house 1. We note, from the amended plans, that option 1 of the Highways Engineer's comments, which required the widening of each parking space to 3.0m with a minimum of 5.0m clearance from the northern edge of the road has been adopted. As the road is a private road there is concern about how parking, turning etc would affect the other households and disruption when constructing the properties.

Drainage would be a problem as, during heavy rain, it floods in front of the two garages. This would need to be addressed. There is concern that if the water was fixed at the site, the water would then run down Chapel Lane onto the Church Road causing problems along the road up towards the church by the war memorial which also can flood in heavy rain.

Giles Moir (Agent)

This statement is provided on behalf of the applicants, Northshore Companies Ltd, supporting the Officer's recommendation that the application be approved.

As set out in the Officer's report the proposal seeks permission to demolish the existing outbuildings on the site and erect 2, 3 bedroom, detached family houses. The applicant, having worked proactively with Officers to respond to the comments raised during the determination of the application is pleased to see that the application has been recommended for approval.

The site is within the identified settlement boundary of Maiden Newton, enjoying good access to local services and amenities which are within walking distance for future occupants. The proposal will make a meaningful contribution to the Council's 5 year housing land supply, providing two family homes, both of which have off road parking and garden areas.

It is noted that the Parish Council have objected to the application, one of the concerns relating to highway safety and the proposal causing congestion. Amended plans were submitted by the applicant to address concerns raised in relation to highway safety providing improved access to the parking spaces. The Council's Highway Officer has confirmed that the amended plans are acceptable and has not raised an objection to the application.

With regard to flood risk, the site is within flood zone 1, being the area with the lowest risk of flooding. The Council's Technical Services have not raised an objection to the proposed soakaway solution.

The two detached properties have a traditional, pitched roof, design with a feature, arch, window in the front gable. The properties are 1.5 storeys in height, with accommodation provided within the roof space. The lowered eaves line of the units reflects the scale of the adjacent properties. The proposal includes decorative barge boards for the gables and porch, stone cills and headers for the windows and feature brickwork to the side of the windows.

The established settlement pattern for Chapel Lane consists of a variety of plot widths and depths and includes detached, semi-detached and terraced units. There is no regularly defined spacing between the existing properties and existing properties also have varied orientations. As such there is no regularity in the settlement pattern for the proposal to follow.

The proposed layout ensures that there is adequate spacing between the proposed units so that the proposal does not appear cramped within the street scene and provides landscaping to Chapel Lane. There is a clear gap of circa 1.5m between the properties, which provides visual separation. The layout of the proposal which has a north – south outlook ensures that there is no overlooking to adjacent properties.

In conclusion, the applicant ask that Councillors support the Officer's recommendation and approve the application.

WD/D/19/001514 - West Coombe, Smishops Lane, Loders, Bridport DT6 3SA

Diane May

I am a resident of Loders and was a member of the Steering Group set up to prepare the Loders Neighbourhood Plan which was 'made' by West Dorset Council in July 2016. I am writing in defence of the policies of the Loders Neighbourhood Plan and the Council's Local Plan. I fully support the comments and objections made by Cllr Aldford and Loders Parish Council.

I note this is the second report to Planning Committee from the officer. The first report was prepared without there being any apparent consultation with the Dorset AONB and the Council's conservation officer.

The proposal is to demolish an agricultural barn (extended in 2003) and build a non-descript three bedroom house on farmland at Westcombe. The barn appears to be redundant simply because of an intention to develop the farmland, despite there being a temporary building on the site used for farm storage.

The proposal lies in a conservation area, AONB and is outside the agreed development boundary. **It is directly contrary to policies of the Loders Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan.** LNP Policy E5 defines a Development Boundary for new building in Loders to safeguard the historic linear character of the settlement. The conservation area designation aims to safeguard the valued landscape setting of the Village. Policy SUS2 of the adopted local plan aims to "strictly control" development outside DDBs, "having particular regard to the need for the protection of the countryside and environmental constraints".

The proposal is unrelated to the historic character of the village; its location and design will do nothing to protect and enhance the valued, historic landscape setting and will offer nothing to meeting local housing need. There is no benefit or 'net gain' to be had by approving this application.

The Council's failure to secure a 5 year land supply for housing means the Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan policies are to be regarded as 'out of date'- enabling developers and their agents to override policies which have been the subject of wide consultation and took years to develop. My comments do not arise from 'nimbyism' but concern for the **proper stewardship of valued assets**.

Dorset Council is letting us all down. There has been no liaison/feedback between Parish Councils and Dorset Council on its failure to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and the implications for development plan policies; there appears to be no 'guiding hand' - in the form of published guidance or supervision - to provide clear management of the development process and related applications to assist the community, developers or their agents.

Loders Parish Council

This application involves the removal of a barn for the erection of a 3-bedroom house and re-designating more than .5 hectare of ancient agricultural land, in open countryside, to residential use,

The isolated barn is sited in the middle of a large natural amphitheatre of ancient open grazing land steeply rising to lynchets at the top of Waddon Hill, which cradles Loders village below, providing an important feature of the village setting. The Conservation Area boundary was extended in 2007 to include this site for its historic strip lynchets, an agricultural use of land feature going back to prehistoric times.

The site is also within the AONB and outside Loders DDB. **NPPF 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment** is therefore a relevant policy.

This requires that *“Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes ... (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status ...in the development plan)” (170 a)*

It states that *“Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in ... Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.” (170 d).*

There is no evidence offered in either the applicant’s submission or the planning officer’s report to demonstrate that this development will “contribute to or enhance the natural and local environment” and therefore comply with NPPG 15

Resting their case on its low visual impact, Conservation and AONB officers state only that the development would “not harm the appearance of the AONB or the Conservation Area,” making no mention of whether it would “contribute to or enhance the natural or local environment.”

Beyond listing NPPF 15 as a relevant policy the Planning Officer does not examine this application in relation to it anywhere else in his report. No evidence is offered to support that it complies with NPPF 15 and “contributes to or enhances the natural and local environment”.

The Planning Authority’s recommendation for approval is centred on the NPPF 11 requirement for presumption in favour of sustainable development in planning decision-making, even more so where local plans are classified as out-of-date, as currently in Dorset.

But NPPF 11 also allows for developments to be refused where other NPPF policies apply that *“protect areas or assets of particular importance”* and *“provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed” (11d)*

NPPF 15 is such a policy and applies here. This proposal offers no evidence that this development will “contribute to or enhance the natural and local environment”.

This failure to comply with NPPF policy 15 provides clear grounds for refusal.

Update Report - Potential Enforcement Action, Homestead Farm, Main Street, Bothenhampton, Bridport, DT6 4BJ

Rachael Styles

I very much welcome the Planning Committee's unanimous decision on 12 August to refuse planning permission for the development at Homestead Farm in Bothenhampton.

I welcome too that the Committee is considering enforcement action against the development, and thank the Committee for offering me the chance to comment.

I very much hope such enforcement action can be taken now, and not again deferred.

After expert assessments commissioned by local residents, the Council noted back in April 2019 that the development was not being built in accordance with the original planning permission. As the Committee noted, it is too high, too near the road, is overbearing and wholly unsympathetic with its surroundings, particularly as it lies amongst listed buildings and at the heart of a small, historic village.

The owners were told by the Council at the time, in April 2019, that any further work would be at their own risk (this important point is not mentioned in the Case Officer's recent Update Report). They nevertheless continued with the development. Normal building work continues even today (1 October).

This is not the first opportunity the Council has had to take enforcement action. The Update Report states that an enforcement investigation was opened back in January 2019. The Council chose to defer enforcement action when the Non-Material Amendments were refused in October 2019.

Given the length of time action has been under consideration, and given the fact that this is a building in a sensitive location which has contravened planning regulations for well over a year, and which has caused a great deal of upset for many residents, enforcement action is long overdue. Further unnecessary delays would not be in anyone's interest. Enforcement action now would avoid this, enabling any appeals to be heard together rather than one after the other.

Action is also arguably necessary in order to restore both the planning system's integrity and residents' battered confidence in it.

Mike Best

This is a written submission in relation to Item 6, Potential Enforcement Action, Homestead Farm, Main Street, Bothenhampton DT6 4BJ

Having read the update report regarding potential enforcement action I am concerned that any action at this stage would be a misuse of process. It is normal to wait for the outcome of the appeal process before issuing an enforcement notice. There is an appeal underway and there is an arguable case for the building to be retained despite the refusal to give planning permission, given the planning officers' positive recommendation at the committee meeting on 12th August. Because of this I think that enforcement action would be premature. It also seems to me that the applicant could pursue costs against the council for unreasonable behaviour if this enforcement is granted.

I was surprised that retrospective planning permission was refused, and feel that the reasons given by the planning committee for refusal could be seen as partisan rather than objective. I hope very much that the appeal will be allowed to run its course, giving the applicant time to formulate an appeal and to make full use of independent experts.

I hope that the Portfolio Holder for Planning will bear these points in mind.

I am a Bothenhampton resident (I have lived here for 20 years) and believe that it is important for this to be resolved fairly as well as expeditiously. It seems to me that the applicant has worked hard to address the concerns of local residents in good faith.

Simon Brody

In the light of the unanimous refusal of the current application, it would be easy, but not reasonable, to recommend that the current building be demolished and replaced with what was given permission in 2018.

May I suggest, as a compromise, that works are carried out which at least get us back to the spirit of the original permission.

The over-heights are material. It would be practicable, because of the structural steel framing, to remove the roofs of the wings and glazed winter garden. They could be replaced with flat roofs set at eaves level which would still maintain some semblance of headroom in the ground floor spaces. Maybe an aside, but we would get rid of the rusty crinkly tin roof. If the Applicant wishes to retain pitched roofs the useable ground floor space would reduce by about 50%, and there could be no access onto the balconies.

I still maintain that the drive is dangerously steep. I suggest that a narrow driveway be taken down between the garage and Village Hall, at the pre-existing ground levels, such that the garage can be accessed from the south side. The as built driveway could be infilled, top soiled and re-planted with an apple orchard, which would hide the lowered east wing – as the original photo montages imply.

The area between the west wing and road could also be planted with apple trees, which would help to conceal the lowered west wing as well.

The road frontage is very relevant. In hindsight the barn could have been re-built to exactly the same dimensions as the original – it had been well surveyed, using easily available Forest Marble stone. I think the barn should be re-built in its entirety to match the original, as should the roadside dry stone wall – there using low grade Forest Marble stone.

The landscaping needs a really good look at as well. We can see people, cars, machinery and buildings which we could never see before, because ground levels have been raised. This is not a problem for us but the residents in Duck Street must have their privacy seriously compromised.

I recommend that enforcement action is initiated now. To simply advise the Applicant that they proceed at risk has not been sufficient.

Sarah Butcher

Following the planning committee's very welcome decision not to grant planning permission to the building constructed at Homestead Farm, Bothenhampton, I would like to urge the committee to take enforcement action at the earliest opportunity.

That the planning officer involved in this project is recommending against enforcement at this stage is unsurprising. The officer concerned has appeared persistently unwilling to take action and has compelled villagers to invest their own money in surveyors' reports proving the existence of planning infringements evident to the naked eye. Even the report submitted by the officer to this committee in August contained inaccuracies that favoured the owners and their agents, stating that the excess height of 'bedroom cottage' was 0.68m, despite a previous acknowledgement by the owner's own planning consultant that building was 0.89m over-height (a report commissioned by the village suggests the height excess is actually closer to 1.34m over-height). Villagers have understandably, therefore, lost confidence in the planning department's ability or willingness to act in their interest.

If enforcement action against Homestead Farm is delayed, it will not be for the first time. After very considerable expense of both time and money by Bothenhampton residents fighting for recognition that this building does not adhere to plans since February 2019, the planning department finally ruled against the height and width infringements in October 2019. One year on, nothing has changed. - Work has continued apace, with no indication that the owners have any intention of remediating the damage they have done to the centre of this historic village.

In section 6.10 of his report recommending against immediate enforcement, Mr Rogers suggests that demolition "would not be expedient" and that the building is "capable of being altered" to "more closely match the approved building." However, it is unclear how this could be achieved without removing entire floors to lower the heights in line with the permission originally granted. Moreover, even if whole floors were removed it would do little to address the fact that the building has been constructed too close to the road and of materials unsympathetic to its surroundings (What, for example, has become, of the original stone used in the ancient wall that is a key feature of the village?).

In short, the continuation of this structure undermines respect for and the integrity of the planning department. The owners and architects have persisted in finishing it off (indoor cinema installers have been seen in attendance in the past month) irrespective of the potential for enforcement action to be taken. They appear to feel they can act with impunity. Further delaying enforcement action would appear to vindicate them in this.

Dr Meriel and Dr Trevor Powell

As residents of the High Pavement opposite the Homestead Farm site, we wish to voice our disillusionment with the planning department's handling of the matter which has been long drawn out, expensive for the villagers moneywise to contest the mistakes, and psychologically, considerably upsetting when we really just want to get on with our lives.

We reiterate that the new build at the centre of the old village, is completely out of keeping with the character of this historic beautiful place. Our house is listed and we would not dream of breaking tradition, flouting regulations in place for a good reason, and spoiling such an attractive spot. Yet the new build is vast and has been built far higher than the original plans, and too near the road with the wrong materials. We have repeated this so many times, but it has fallen on the deaf ears of those owners or people in power who are at a financial advantage, who think they can buy their way out of flouting the law.

I hope enforcement of the decision to stop building will be carried out with immediate effect, as work has continued on opposite with absolutely no reduction in the number of builders' vehicles entering and leaving the site each day. It just feels like either a complete breakdown of the planning system, or a deliberate and wanton disregard of the protections that are supposed to be in place to prevent such an injustice, or blatant disrespect for ordinary people's values of cooperation, honesty and justice.

Allan and Jane Read

We live directly opposite the main entrance to Homestead Farm and have witnessed the demolition of the derelict farmhouse and rebuilding at first hand. Whilst there has been the inevitable vehicle noise and mess associated with any building site, the builders have always been friendly and well organised and there has never been loud music and shouting often associated with building sites.

Mr and Mrs Hughes went out of their way at the start of the project to explain what they were intending to do at the site, took on board comments and adapted their plans to accommodate where ever possible They worked closely with the Dorset County planners to achieve a compromise between their needs and the planners requirements. Despite the problems with roof heights the County Planners recommended the building to be completed. Indeed we were shocked when the Planning Committee turned down the recent amended application given the Planning Department's backing.

We do not consider the building, unfinished as it is, to be out of place. It looks like a farm house with outbuildings, which is what it was, and with planting and landscaping at the front and the wall rebuilt would quickly become and established part of the village. We find it difficult to understand why such a fuss is being made over it.

Since the planning application was turned down Mr and Mrs Hughes have been working to "winterproof" the house to prevent water or cold from damaging the structure, and are now in the process of closing the site down. With no more building work possible they have again worked with Dorset Council to offer parking to those residents of the village who will be affected by the rebuilding of the wall opposite the site - a thoughtful and generous gesture.

We feel that Mr and Mrs Hughes have been treated unfairly by some residents of the village, and that they should be given appropriate time to put together an appeal without being steamrollered.

We have lived opposite a building site for over two years now. Unless the committee approves the completion of the house we will have to live with a building site and all that entails for many more months/years to come, depending on what is decided. Please can we have completion of the building work soon.

Peter Walker

Homestead Farm as presently constructed is satisfactory.

Simon and Julie Wood

As direct neighbours with the longest common boundary to Homestead Farm, we have a clear view of the rear elevation, and are very happy with the appearance of the house. Whilst we understand the main objection to the build is the height of the front elevation, given the fact that the completion of the house is only a matter of weeks away, we feel that the build should be accepted as it currently stands.

In addition the Hughes' have been very considerate in the design of the building; from the lower positioning of the garage, the sedum roof, the mature planting at the front of the house, to the materials used in its construction.

The site has been run efficiently and the building contractors extremely thoughtful and understanding to the village and its occupants, ensuring deliveries were kept to a suitable time thereby ensuring minimum disruption.

Finally, we have lived in Bothenhampton at Manor Farm for almost 30 years and have seen many alterations and additions to the village over that time, some we've liked and many others not. However as members of a village community, and one we like to think of accepting of others and charitable, we understand change is inevitable. Whilst not everyone agrees with the style or size of Homestead Farm, it is a matter of personal opinion and surely only down to choice of the owners.

For us it is indeed a welcome change in comparison to the building that stood on that site before. Quaint as it was, it was also dilapidated and an eyesore in the midst of the village. And rather Homestead Farm than the cluster of houses that were proposed for that site prior to the current build.

We feel strongly that the Hughes' should be given time to formulate an appeal and have the opportunity for a considered and fair judgement on their application, made by an independent and qualified team of people.

David and Beverley Capewell

Regarding the development of Homestead Farm, we would like to express our disappointment regarding the ongoing planning issues. We live next door to the site, at Ab Antiquo, and have for the last two years endured noise and dust from the builders and contractors. While this is to be expected with any house building or development it is endured knowing there is an end date. We would like the building work to be quickly completed without further delay.

Pat Brody

Whilst I fully understand the reasons for the Planning Officer's recommendation of Option 1, as a local resident who supported the original Application, but object very strongly to approval of the as built structure, I would commend Option 3.

The arguments and reasons for objection to the as built structure have already been made and supported in the Committee's decision on 13th August 2020.

However, I would like to state that my support of the original Application was based on all the documentation submitted during early December 2017 to early January 2018. I spoke in support at the Parish Council Meeting. That documentation included drawings and a statement in the Design and Access and Heritage Statement that "Existing ridge line of farmhouse retained". All other building heights and proposed perspectives as drawn were related to that known ridge line. In January 2019 when viewed from our property it was obvious that the building heights, lengths of the various elements and relationship to one another were not "As Approved" and I registered my concern with WDDC. At that time only groundworks and the steel frame had been erected. In April 2019 there was a meeting between the Architect and WDDC Planning Department, including a Conservation Officer, to discuss the overheight construction in breach of the Planning Approval. At the meeting the Architect was asked to submit an application for the change in height and was warned at that time that they proceeded with any further construction at their own risk. The application for change in height was eventually made under WD/D/19/002277/NMA in September 2019.

Legal necessity and protection of the Council's risk to liability may well be expedient, but watching the building deviate from what was approved (including witnessing 3 noncompliant dormer windows constructed and then demolished) move me to commend Option 3. This has been a very sorry episode in the village and a serious erosion of confidence in the Planning process. The residents need closure on this as quickly as possible.

Robin Carter

As a resident of Bothenhampton I wish to register my dismay regarding the Planning Enforcement Manager's report to counsellors. In the report he recommends that no enforcement action should be taken at this stage.

I would like to ask Counsellors to be resolute in forwarding their former declaration. They realised that there was a gross breach of planning regulations and they acted honourably in refusing permission for further work on the building. It seems however that the developer is again progressing the project beyond essential protective work, continuing to push every legal control beyond its bounds.

In the present political climate where authorities are sometimes struggling to maintain their authority and credibility I would like to ask Councillors to ahead with immediate limited enforcement.

Andy Partridge (Agent) on behalf of Mr and Mrs Hughes

Thank you for allowing us to make representations to the committee against enforcement action.

We are appealing against the decision. We have now instructed heritage and ecological experts, as well as other experts and have clear directions to submit the appeal quickly. It is not in our clients' interests to delay matters.

Despite the complexity of the design, the case is straight forward. The Council has granted planning permission for a replacement dwelling. This sets the benchmark of what the Council considers acceptable within the conservation area. The issue therefore is whether the change between the approved plans and the as built development is acceptable. Officers (and statutory consultees) came to a different conclusion to the Council. This difference of opinion illustrates the matter is not conclusive but more delicately nuanced.

The appeal will determine whether the scheme as built is acceptable or not. In the event, that the appeal is dismissed it should also determine which elements are harmful and which are not. It will therefore establish what, if any, degree of harm exists. It will therefore provide clarification of (and we hope and end) to the issue.

We do recognise the strength of feeling that the development has aroused and that was very much made plain at committee which culminated in the refusal of the application. Since then the only work undertaken (with the agreement of officers) was to make the building weathertight and put it in a static state, aside from a request by a resident to finish the frontage wall to allow the street sign for Duck Street to be put back up. We accept this has been done entirely at risk. All work has now ceased on site, pending the outcome of the appeal.

Mr and Mrs Hughes have, though, offered to make the site available for residents to park their cars at their own risk, while work is being carried out by the Council to repair the High Pavement. This will be subject to agreement with the Council.

Enforcement action by the Council is discretionary. The Council should only issue an enforcement notice where it is expedient to do so under Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). We feel that in the above circumstances that it would not be expedient to do so, and moreover that it would be premature to do so before the appeal is determined.

WP/20/00417/TEL - Telecommunications Mast Site, Weymouth Way, Radipole, Weymouth

Mary Jordan-Winter

1. The proposed 18m high 5G monopole, by reason of its increased height and bulk, would have a significant harmful visual impact on the surrounding area. In addition, the proposed cabinets will have a cluttered appearance and detract from the open character of the area. The key characteristic of the locality of the proposed application site is its openness, as the gateway to Weymouth.
2. This application was passed by Weymouth Town Council even though there was missing documentation and no consultation or correspondence with environmental groups and residents. Local residents are most unhappy about this lack of consultation. The only notification appears to be a planning notice pinned to a lamp post, partially hidden from view near the cycle/public footpath off Greenway Road towards Two Mile Copse.
3. As a popular tourist destination, Weymouth council encourages cycling, walking and outdoor pursuits across the town, which will result in an increase of traffic to this very busy area, uncomfortably close to the site of the proposed 5G monopole. The proposed site, adjacent to the public footpath, is close to many residential houses, Morrison's supermarket and a light industrial area.
4. Radipole Primary School is in the vicinity, yet consultation was deemed not applicable, the documentation citing 'No schools nearby'. Along the Dorchester Road is a nursery, special needs school, St Nicholas and St Lawrence Primary School and Wey Valley Academy. A large number of students pass this roundabout twice daily, either on foot, bicycle, car or bus. This is concerning as exposure to RFs-EMFs has now been determined by scientists to be detrimental to health and wellbeing, particularly for children and young people.
5. Regarding ICNIRP certification. No such ICNIRP certificate exists. ICNIRP neither endorse nor produce a certificate for submission with any planning application. Their website says categorically that ICNIRP: *"Does not provide or issue certificates to verify the safety of any device or installation"*. Thus, any telecoms company or their contractors submitting an 'ICNIRP certificate' with a planning application before a local authority are falsifying safety assurances and committing a fraudulent act.
6. As a new technology, 5G goes far beyond a straightforward planning discussion. As Councillors, you need to carefully consider your Duty of Care to the community and environment when reaching any decision and must act in the best interest of the people.
7. Please reject this application and invoke the Precautionary Principle until such time as independent research proves 5G to be safe.

Roma Harding

1. Regarding the implementation of 5G technology, have any adverse health or environmental considerations been taken into account, as documented by peer reviewed science?
2. There are currently **two** existing 11.7m structures on the proposed site. The application is to replace one existing structure with a new 5G 18m high monopole. No mention is made in the documentation or plan to the second 11.7m structure. What is to happen to this second existing structure needs to be clarified. The proposed 18m monopole and cabinets will have an extremely detrimental impact on visual amenity and will not *“be sympathetically designed and camouflaged.”*
3. At the Weymouth Town Council meeting on 28 July, one of the councillors quoted in part from the World Health Organisation (WHO): *“... no adverse health effect has been causally linked with exposure to wireless technologies.”* The rest of this statement was omitted, which misled those present. The WHO statement continues: *“... so far, only a few studies have been carried out at the frequencies to be used by 5G.”*
4. It should be borne in mind that WHO and ICNIRP guidelines, are just that, guidelines, and not safety standards. WHO relies on ICNIRP for its guidelines, which do not constitute legislation or law. A disclaimer on ICNIRP’s website states, ICNIRP *“does not guarantee the correctness, reliability, or completeness of the information and views published.”*
5. Although planning does not consider the health effects regarding 5G technology, it should be acknowledged that 5G is classified by WHO as a ‘possible’ carcinogen (2B).
6. Regarding technical performance specifications, none have been provided to identify the power density and frequency emissions of the equipment at various bandwidths. These are required by NPPF. The applicant also omits to declare compliance with ISO standards. Will this information be requested?
7. The application site is located within a SSSI Risk Assessment Zone. Have Risk Assessments regarding 5G technology been carried out, and if so, by whom? Assessments relevant to this application in accordance with SSSI Impact Risk Zones are required for:
 - a) *“Large non residential developments outside existing settlements/urban areas”*
 - b) *“Residential development of 50 units or more.”*
 - c) *“Any development that could cause air pollution.”* This includes 5G frequencies.
8. I appeal to your conscience to consider your responsibilities of Duty of Care. Weymouth should not be a test ground for this untested and uninsurable new technology. Please reject this planning application and invoke The Precautionary Principle until such time as independent research concludes 5G technology to be safe.

Vicky Parsons (Agent)

The existing site is being upgraded in order to provide 5G coverage to the surrounding area, where there is currently no such provision, in line with the Government's aspirations for the UK to be world leader in 5G. The existing mast is not capable of being upgraded to provide 5G as the new technology would not be able to fit in the existing column, and because the signal attenuation of 5G is greater, the radio frequency is higher, which requires a taller height to clear nearby urban clutter and trees. This is the most sensitive design which will be able to provide the latest 5G technologies to the area. It remains a simple, functional, vertical structure and will be able to assimilate with the other linear structures in the streetscene. 5G will provide faster, more reliable network coverage to this area, and has social and economic benefits for local residents and visitors, and supports growth in productivity, efficiency and labour force participation across the whole economy.

The proposed installation meets NPPF requirements in relation to health. An ICNIRP certificate has been submitted with the application and therefore health matters should not be considered further in the determination of this application in line with Paragraph 116 of the NPPF.

Matt Warman MP highlighted in a keynote speech at Connected Britain 2020 on 23rd September 2020 that he fully supports the Government's work with the telecoms industry to bring 5G into the area and the importance of good quality communications, which most had first hand experience of the value of during lockdown, when it was a lifeline to many to keep in touch with friends and family, and to allow working from home. Without the operators work to continually invest in upgrading sites, customers will be increasingly unable to use their handheld devices for the purposes in which they were purchased, whenever and wherever they are for whatever reason, as demand on the network increases and capacity to deal with it reduces. Without 5G, this part of Weymouth will fall further behind the rest of the country and lose out from the well documented social and economic benefits that next generation connectivity brings.

In addition to the support from central Government, the 5G RuralDorset initiative provides support for next generation mobile infrastructure within Dorset. Although this particular mast will not form part of the trial, it will allow for this area of Weymouth to benefit from the advantages of a faster, more reliable network. A letter from Matt Warman was also submitted as part of the application detailing the advantages of 5G in relation to superfast broadband, which is an issue at the forefront of the 5G RuralDorset initiative.