

Application Number:	P/FUL/2025/05407
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/
Site address:	5A Surrey Close Granby Industrial Estate Chickerell DT9 9TY
Proposal:	Change of use of the land and siting of 34 storage containers and associated works including installation of electric gate and security fencing, reconfiguration of car park layout and modification of existing cycle store
Applicant name:	Chelaberd Ltd
Case Officer:	Steve Tapscott
Ward Members:	Cllr Clifford and Cllr Taylor

1. Reason application is going to committee

- 1.1 In accordance with the Council's scheme of delegation, this application is brought to committee for determination because Dorset Council is the landowner.

2. Summary of recommendation

- 2.1 Refuse for the following reasons:

1. The applicant has failed to supply sufficient information to allow for an accurate assessment of the transport implications of the proposed development. Adverse impacts on the local highway network and safety cannot therefore be ruled out or mitigated for, and the proposal is in conflict with Policy COM7 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2015) and paragraphs 116 and 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2025).

2. The application site contains a building that is currently overgrown with vegetation and is proposed to be partly demolished. Vegetation is also encroaching into the site in places, which will likely require removal. The new fencing and gates are proposed within existing areas of vegetation, but it is unclear whether this vegetation can be successfully retained. The applicant has failed to supply sufficient information to allow for an accurate assessment of any wildlife interest that may be affected by the development. This means it is impossible to understand the baseline position and assess what mitigation/compensation and enhancements are required. The proposal is therefore in conflict with Policy ENV2 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2015); Policy CNP12 of the Chickerell Neighbourhood Plan (2021); and paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2025).

3. Key planning issues

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	Acceptable: the proposal is for a B8 storage and distribution (employment) use on a safeguarded Key Employment Site.
Scale, design, impact on character	Acceptable: the site is within an existing employment site, with a range of buildings and scales. Revised plans have repositioned the proposed fencing, and additional landscaping could theoretically be secured by a condition.

Issue	Conclusion
Neighbour amenity	Acceptable: the site is approximately 240m from the nearest residential property, and the use is unlikely to result in harmful disturbance.
Highway impacts, safety, access and parking	Unacceptable: the applicant has failed to supply sufficient details to demonstrate the development would be safe from a transport perspective.
Flood risk and drainage	Acceptable: the site is an existing sealed surface, and the siting of containers would not lead to any material difference in flood risk or drainage terms.
Ecology	Unacceptable, as the applicant has not clarified the amount of habitat removal required. It is therefore unclear whether there would be impacts on protected species or habitats.
Biodiversity Net Gain	Acceptable: although officers believe the development is liable to BNG and the applicant's agent does not, this is a post-permission matter.
Impacts on Chesil and the Fleet Special Area of Conservation (SAC)	Acceptable: the identified risk to this habitat site is through recreational impacts associated with new overnight accommodation. The proposed B8 use would therefore not lead to any likely significant effects on the SAC.

4. Description of site

- 4.1 The 0.16ha site is located in the Granby Industrial Estate, which is safeguarded in the local plan as a Key Employment Site. It comprises an area of parking currently used by staff and visitors to the surrounding industrial units. To the north and south are industrial premises; to the west is the Dorset Echo building; to the east is a golf course.
- 4.2 Levels slope gently downwards to the north. Existing boundaries are a mixture of wooden fencing and planting. The existing access is not enclosed, but a barrier is in place to prevent access by vehicles larger than 2.1m in height.
- 4.3 Built form varies considerably in terms of styles, sizes and positions in their plots. There is a large amount of variation in the street scene.

5. Description of development

- 5.1 This application seeks full planning permission to install a total of 34 storage containers, of which 23 would measure around 6m long, 2.35m wide and 2.6m high, while 11 would measure approximately 3m long, 2.35m wide and 2.4m high. These would be concentrated towards the southern half of the site, albeit incorporating vehicular circulation space to allow for access. The northern half would retain 21 of the existing 60 parking spaces, i.e. leading to a loss of 39 spaces. An existing cycle store would be reduced in size, and a new palisade (or similar) fencing would be installed along the western edge of the site, around the entrance. A sliding electric gate is proposed for security. These means of enclosure would be approximately 2m high.
- 5.2 The application form states that the development would not provide any new jobs.

6. Relevant planning history

- 6.1 It appears likely that the parking area was provided pursuant to planning permission ref. 1/E/86/000113, granted in 1986 to '*erect office accommodation with car parking and*

landscaping.' Whilst there are no electronic records on file, the parking area can be seen in application ref. 1/E/88/000765 for a temporary cabin, which shows that it has been well established since at least the late 1980s.

7. List of constraints

- ECON2; Key Employment Site; Granby Industrial Estate, Chickerell
- SUS2; Defined Development Boundary; Weymouth
- Wessex Water Treatment Works Catchment Other WRC catchments
- Dorset Council Land Freehold: Waverley House & The Print Centre & various units at Surrey Close & Hampshire Road, Granby Industrial Estate, Weymouth - Reference FH004363
- Natural England - RAMSAR
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (5km buffer): Crookhill Brick Pit (UK0030349);
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (5km buffer): Chesil & The Fleet (UK0017076);
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (5km buffer): Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs (UK0019861);
- Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) impact risk zone;
- Risk of Surface Water Flooding Extent 1 in 100
- Risk of Surface Water Flooding Extent 1 in 1000
- Surface water flooding - 1 in 100 year event plus 20% allowance
- Surface water flooding - 1 in 100 year event plus 40% allowance
- Portland heliport consultation zone (within 13km)
- Radon: Class: 1.0
- Contaminated Land
- ONR Portland - 12km zone

8. Consultations

8.1 All consultee responses can be viewed in full on the website.

Consultees

1. **Dorset Council – Highways:** 'defer' comment on grounds of insufficient supporting information. This includes whether there is existing capacity for the displaced parking need and for the needs of the proposal; hours of business; whether there would be a booking system or carpark management plan; possibility of queues; details of active travel (walking, wheeling and cycling), sustainable travel and access for pedestrians/non-motorised modes; lack of detail on the submitted swept path drawing to show the type of vehicle and demonstrate an HGV can track through the proposed layout; arrangements for emergency services access; and visibility splays.
2. **Dorset Council – Environmental Protection:** no objection, subject to a condition detailing the procedure for the discovery of unexpected contamination.
3. **Dorset Council – Asset and Property:** no response received.
4. **Dorset Council – Building Control:** no response received.
5. **Dorset Council – Economic Development and Tourism:** no objection.
6. **Dorset Council – Natural Environment Team:** *'from the information provided I am not clear on the amount of vegetation removal required to facilitate the development, I would request that the applicant provide further information on the areas of habitat to be removed or cut back to ensure they meet the BNG exemption criteria and for me to provide comment on potential for impacts to protected species.'*
7. **Cllr Clifford:** no response received.
8. **Cllr Taylor:** no response received.

- 9. Chickerell Town Council:** initial question raised over what would be stored within the containers. The case officer informed the town council that the future contents of the containers is not a material planning consideration.

Representations received

- 8.2 Two letters of objection received from the occupier of Unit C, Oxford Court, Cambridge Road. The first was in respect of the original plans, on grounds of:
- Loss of parking for existing industrial units, which would lead to parking on the surrounding roads and therefore congestion.
 - Failure to demonstrate sufficient turning space.
 - Highway safety in terms of additional traffic movements.
 - No details of who would use the containers (domestic or commercial), hours of operation or how security would be managed. This could undermine the operation of neighbouring businesses. The development could affect their viability.
 - The carpark is a vital piece of infrastructure that would be lost.
 - Impacts on visual amenity.
 - Loss of habitat.
 - The development could lead to localised flooding or drainage issues.
- 8.3 The objector was notified of the revised plans, and they maintain all of their concerns.
- 8.4 The Weymouth Civic Society has also objected. This is on grounds of the lack of employment sites in both the existing and proposed local plans. They believe this proposal would lead to a reduction in existing allocated employment land.

9. Duties

- 9.1 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.

10. Relevant policies

Development plan

West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2015)

- INT1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- ENV2: Wildlife and Habitats
- ENV9: Pollution and Contaminated Land
- ENV10: The Landscape and Townscape Setting
- ENV12: The Design and Positioning of Buildings
- ENV13: Achieving High Levels of Environmental Performance
- ENV15: Efficient and Appropriate Use of Land
- ENV16: Amenity
- SUS2: Distribution of Development
- ECON1: Provision of Employment
- ECON2: Protection of Key Employment Sites
- COM7: Creating a Safe and Efficient Transport Network
- COM9: Parking Provision

Chickerell Neighbourhood Plan (2021)

- CNP11: General Design Principles
- CNP12: Enhancing Biodiversity

Material considerations

Emerging Dorset Local Plan

- 10.1 The Dorset Council Local Plan Options consultation took place between January and March 2021, with further consultation between 18th August – 31st October 2025. In accordance with paragraph 48 of the NPPF, this emerging plan is at too early a stage to carry any weight in decision making.

National Planning Policy Framework

- 10.2 Paragraph 11 sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Development plan 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 any adverse impacts of approval would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the NPPF or specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.

- 10.3 Other relevant NPPF sections include:

- Section 4: 'Decision making.' Paragraph 39 requires local planning authorities to 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.' Paragraph 87 specifically supports storage and distribution operations in suitably accessible locations.
- Section 11: 'Making effective use of land.'
- Section 12: 'Achieving well-designed places.' This indicates that all development is 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.

Other material considerations

- 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).

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.

- 11.1 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

- 12.1 As set out in the Equalities Act 2010, all public bodies, in discharging their functions must have 'due regard' to this duty. There are three 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.

12.2 Whilst there is no absolute requirement to fully remove any disadvantage, the Duty is to have 'regard to' and remove or minimise disadvantage. In considering the merits of this planning application, the planning authority has taken into consideration the requirements of the Public Sector Equalities Duty.

13. Financial benefits

What	Amount/value
Material considerations	
Job creation	The applicant has stated that no jobs would be created.
Non-material considerations	
Business rates	Unknown.

14. Environmental implications

14.1 The environmental implications of the proposal are unclear, as the applicant has not supplied sufficient information in respect of habitat loss or biodiversity.

15. Planning assessment

Background

- 15.1 This application was originally described and advertised as relating to 35 new storage containers. The plans identified a container to the east of the site as being proposed for removal, but that was at odds with the supporting statement and application form, which make no reference to it. When this was queried with the agent, they then requested it be removed from the plans, and for the red line to be redrawn. The agent was advised that this would reduce the number of containers to 34, and the description of development would need to be changed.
- 15.2 At the same time, concerns were raised by the case officer over the visual impacts of the 2m high '*palisade or similar*' fence right along the road frontage, which would have not been mitigated by any planting. The case officer suggested to the agent to adjust the application red line to include more land that could be used for planting, while the fencing could be set further back. Owing to the presence of existing planting to the north of the proposed new access gates and within the application red line, the case officer also suggested setting back the fencing and gate behind this planting to take advantage of the screening it would provide.
- 15.3 Amended plans were submitted and the agent agreed to the revised description. The revisions were subject to a three-week period of re-consultation.

Principle of development

- 15.4 This proposal is for storage and distribution, which is a B8 use. The preamble to Policy ECON1 of the local plan confirms that employment development includes B-class uses. The proposed fencing and cycle storage would be in conjunction with the proposed use.
- 15.5 Policy SUS2 of the local plan aims to direct development, including employment, towards Defined Development Boundaries (DDBs), while Policy ECON1 also directs employment to within settlements.
- 15.6 Policy ECON2 allows for B8 uses within Key Employment Sites, '*subject to proposals not having a significant adverse impact on surrounding land uses.*'

- 15.7 The application site is within Weymouth's DDB and in a Key Employment Site. The proposal is therefore in accordance with policies SUS2, ECON1 and ECON2 of the local plan. It is acceptable in principle, subject to consideration of all other relevant policies and material considerations.
- 15.8 The neighbour's objections on grounds of a lack of details as to who would use the containers (domestic or commercial) and how security would be managed are noted. However, these are commercial matters and not material planning considerations. Chickerell Town Council's question over what would be stored within the containers is also noted, but the substantive issue for consideration under this application is the use of the land for storage, not what would be stored. Should anything hazardous be stored, for example, that would be a matter for Environmental Protection or potentially the Environment Agency to enforce.

Scale, design and impacts on local character

- 15.9 Whilst the site is visible from the public highway, it is in a relatively discreet location towards the end of Surrey Close, already well screened by fencing and vegetation. There is a wide variation in terms of building sizes and designs in this part of the industrial estate, and there are no relevant townscape or heritage constraints covering the locality that would influence the proposal.
- 15.10 The revised site plan shows that the containers would be arranged towards the southern half of the site, meaning the northern half would remain as parking. With the proposed 2m high new fencing and electric gate in place, it is unlikely the c.2.4 – 2.6m high containers would be visually intrusive in this context.
- 15.11 The proposed new fencing originally followed the western edge of the application red line, and no planting was shown on the submitted site plan. At 2m high and '*palisade or similar*,' this fencing could have appeared dominant, intrusive and at odds with the open verges and softer chain link fencing found in the immediate local area. Revised plans were therefore received from the agent, to show the fencing set back behind existing planting, while the application red line has been enlarged to allow for additional planting. This planting could theoretically be secured by a planning condition, had the application been acceptable in all other respects.
- 15.12 The proposal therefore accords with policies ENV12 and ECON2 of the local plan and Policy CNP11 of the neighbourhood plan.

Neighbour amenity

- 15.13 The most likely source of disturbance from this proposal is noise from vehicles entering and exiting the site. However, it is located approximately 240m from the nearest residential properties at Cumberland Drive to the south, which is a sufficient separation distance. Office workers in the units to the immediate north may be able to perceive comings and goings of vehicles, but the level of disturbance is unlikely to be significant, particularly given the context of this being a safeguarded employment site where a degree of noise and activity is expected.
- 15.14 No objections are raised by Environmental Protection to the proposals, subject to a condition in respect of the procedure for the discovery of unexpected contamination. Had the application been acceptable in all other respects, this would be reasonable.
- 15.15 The neighbour's concerns in terms of hours of operation are noted, but there are no compelling amenity grounds that would justify a condition restricting opening hours.
- 15.16 The proposal therefore accords with policies ENV9 and ENV16 of the local plan.

Flood risk and drainage

- 15.17 The site is identified in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as being at risk of surface water flooding, both now and with an allowance for climate change. According to Annex 3 of the NPPF, storage and distribution is a 'less vulnerable' use, and it is unlikely that people

would be present onsite for the majority of the time. As such, there would be no demonstrable risk to life requiring consideration.

- 15.18 The containers would be sited on existing hard surfacing, so there would be no material difference in drainage terms. The development would not be subject to the sequential test as paragraph 176 of the NPPF confirms that it does not apply to changes of use, save for caravanning, camping, mobile homes and chalet sites, which this is not. Whilst a new cycle store is proposed, it is much smaller than the existing on site and is sited outside of the area of flood risk on the site (northern edge of the site only) and so taking a proportionate approach as per the planning practice guidance on flood risk it is considered that the proposed new cycle store would not trigger the need for a sequential test assessment.

Highway impacts, safety, access and parking

- 15.19 Policy COM7 of the local plan says that development will not be permitted where the residual cumulative impacts on the efficiency of the transport network are likely to be severe. It goes on to say that development will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that it would not have a severe detrimental effect on road safety, or measures can be introduced to reasonably mitigate potentially dangerous conditions.
- 15.20 At the national level, paragraph 116 of the NPPF directs local planning authorities to refuse development that would lead to an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe. Paragraph 117 draws attention to the need to ensure that places are safe and designed to allow for the efficient delivery of goods and access by service and emergency vehicles.
- 15.21 The Local Highway Authority (LHA) responded with a 'defer' comment because of the lack of supporting information in respect of transport. The LHA cited numerous issues that were not addressed, including whether there is existing capacity for the displaced parking need and for the needs of the proposal; hours of business; whether there would be a booking system or carpark management plan; possibility of queues; details of active travel (walking, wheeling and cycling), sustainable travel and access for pedestrians/non-motorised modes; lack of detail on the submitted swept path drawing to show the type of vehicle and demonstrate an HGV can track through the proposed layout; arrangements for emergency services access; and visibility splays.
- 15.22 The agent has provided a rebuttal, which contains no technical information. The rebuttal was discussed with the LHA, and their concerns remain in terms of the lack of sufficient information on which to base an informed decision. For example, in relation to HGVs, the agent states, '*not many people will arrive with an HGV,*' but they nonetheless do not rule out HGVs accessing the site. They also say that HGVs could '*turn in the car park at the end of the industrial park,*' which implies land to the northeast. However, this land is in third-party ownership and therefore outside of the applicant's control.
- 15.23 Officers are of the view that it is reasonable and necessary for the LHA and Committee to understand whether an HGV could successfully enter the site, navigate it, then exit without risking safety. The agent's response does not provide any degree of certainty.
- 15.24 The agent says that the site is privately owned and not currently publicly accessible. They claim that '*any parking which currently takes place is done so on an informal and unlawful basis as it is not policed. We can arrange for the site to be locked if that would make the point?*'
- 15.25 Whether or not it is possible for the applicant to lock the gate under the terms of their lease arrangement with Dorset Council (the landowner), the fact is the site is an existing carpark that has been used for decades by businesses on the industrial estate. This application proposes to lose 39 of those spaces, which could displace parking elsewhere, so it is reasonable for the LHA to understand what effect this might have on the local area. Displaced parking could lead to congestion on local roads, potentially hindering access to the site itself. The loss of parking used by existing businesses could also affect their trade.

15.26 The agent suggests that many of the LHA's questions could be addressed through planning conditions. Whilst conditions can be appropriate in some instances, it is important to get a full understanding of the impacts of a proposal first and ascertain whether there would be any severe impacts needing mitigating. The lack of information means that it is impossible to fully understand the transport implications and therefore rule out/mitigate against any issues. Consequently, the Council needs to adopt a precautionary approach to this application and identifies conflict with Policy COM7 of the local plan and paragraphs 116 and 117 of the NPPF.

Ecology

- 15.27 Policy ENV2 of the local plan says that where significant harm to nature conservation interests cannot be avoided, it should be mitigated. Where avoidance or mitigation are not possible, compensation is required.
- 15.28 Policy CNP12 of the neighbourhood plan says that development should protect and, where practicable, enhance biodiversity. This should be through an understanding of the wildlife interest that may be affected by a development, and the inclusion of measures to ensure an overall biodiversity gain. It says that a certified Biodiversity Plan will be required for *'the development of any site in excess of 0.1ha.'*
- 15.29 At the national level, paragraph 193 of the NPPF contains the same hierarchy as Policy ENV2 in terms of avoiding, mitigating or compensating for impacts on biodiversity.
- 15.30 In this case, no ecological information has been supplied by the applicant, and the Natural Environment Team has responded to say they are unable to comment in respect of habitat loss or impacts on protected species.
- 15.31 The submitted application form and the applicant's supporting statement say that there is no onsite habitat. However, the development would involve removing approximately 27.5sqm of an existing, overgrown cycle store, and the site is overgrown elsewhere, particularly to the east, where vegetation is encroaching into the site and will likely require removal.
- 15.32 Although it was the case officer's suggestion to reposition the fencing and gates further east to within the existing planting along the frontage, it was always apparent that habitat might be affected under the originally submitted plans. Even before the site plan was superseded with a revised version, the proposal showed the existing chain link fencing along the pavement edge as being removed in favour of the new fencing in a different position, passing right through the existing vegetation. The applicant has never at any point supplied any information to show whether the original plans or the revised set would require the removal of any vegetation or if the enclosures can be accommodated successfully among it.
- 15.33 As required by Policy CNP12 of the neighbourhood plan, the applicant should have supplied a Biodiversity Plan with their application because the site exceeds 0.1ha in size. Had they complied with this requirement, the situation would have been clearer.
- 15.34 In the absence of any information, it is impossible for the Council to understand the baseline position; whether any habitat or species would be affected; and, if so, what mitigation/compensation and enhancements are required. Impacts on habitats and species therefore cannot be ruled out, and the proposal is in conflict with Policy ENV2 of the local plan; Policy CNP12 of the neighbourhood plan; and paragraph 193 of the NPPF.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

- 15.35 The Natural Environment Team has responded to say they are unable to comment in respect of BNG because of the lack of submitted information. The applicant's agent's stance is that BNG does not apply because the amount of vegetation removal would not breach the 25sqm threshold triggering BNG. However, officers are of the view that the combined areas of vegetation removal, plus any vegetation that would die or require removing to accommodate the fencing/gate, would exceed 25sqm. Nevertheless, despite this disagreement, BNG is a post-permission matter, and had the application been

acceptable in all respects, it would be subject to the statutory BNG condition. As such, the failure to demonstrate BNG is not a reason for refusal.

Impacts on Chesil and the Fleet Special Area of Conservation (SAC)

15.36 Impacts on this SAC arise through recreational pressures associated with new overnight accommodation. The proposed storage and distribution use is therefore acceptable without causing any likely significant effects on this habitat site.

Planning balance

- 15.37 The proposed development is in conflict with the development plan for the reasons discussed above. Under Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, decisions on planning applications must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 15.38 In this case, it is likely the development would lead to an economic gain through the use of the carpark for storage and distribution. However, the weight to be attached to this is diminished because it is currently unclear whether the productivity of other businesses would be affected through the reduction in parking. No weight can be given to job provision, as the applicant has stated that no jobs would be created.
- 15.39 The failure to understand or demonstrate highway safety weighs heavily against the proposal. Whilst paragraph 87 of the NPPF is supportive of storage and distribution uses, these need to be in '*suitably accessible locations*,' which remains unclear. Substantial negative weight is also attributed to the failure to understand or demonstrate whether biodiversity would be harmed. Indeed, paragraph 193 of the NPPF directs councils to refuse planning permission where significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided, mitigated for or compensated for. Again, this is currently an unknown.
- 15.40 In light of these factors, the identified conflict with the development plan is not outweighed by any material considerations.

16. Conclusion

16.1 The proposed development fails to demonstrate highway safety, and it fails to rule out impacts on ecology. It does not therefore accord with the relevant policies of the adopted local plan, the neighbourhood plan and the NPPF and is recommended for refusal.

17. Recommendation

17.1 Refuse for the following reasons:

1. The applicant has failed to supply sufficient information to allow for an accurate assessment of the transport implications of the proposed development. Adverse impacts on the local highway network and safety cannot therefore be ruled out or mitigated for, and the proposal is in conflict with Policy COM7 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2015) and paragraphs 116 and 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2025).
2. The application site contains a building that is currently overgrown with vegetation and is proposed to be partly demolished. Vegetation is also encroaching into the site in places, which will likely require removal. The new fencing and gates are proposed within existing areas of vegetation, but it is unclear whether this vegetation can be successfully retained. The applicant has failed to supply sufficient information to allow for an accurate assessment of any wildlife interest that may be affected by the development. This means it is impossible to understand the baseline position and assess what mitigation/compensation and enhancements are required. The proposal is therefore in conflict with Policy ENV2 of the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2015); Policy CNP12 of the Chickerell Neighbourhood Plan (2021); and paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2025).