

WESTERN AND SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 15 JULY 2026

Present: Cllrs 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

Apologies: None.

Also present: Cllr Simon Clifford

Officers present (for all or part of the meeting):

Lara Altree (Senior Lawyer - Regulatory), Penny Canning (Lead Project Officer), Hayley Caves (Councillor Development and Support Officer), Ann Collins (Area Manager – Western and Southern Team), Joshua Kennedy (Democratic and Governance Officer), James Lytton-Trevers (Lead Project Officer) and Robert Piggot (Planning Officer)

8. Apologies

No apologies for absence were received at the meeting.

9. Declarations of Interest

Cllr O'Leary declared an interest in application P/FUL/2025/04039 due to being pre-determined. He spoke as the ward member for that application and left the room during the debate and vote.

Cllr Dickenson declared an interest in application P/FUL/2025/04039 due to being pre-determined. He spoke as the ward member for that application and left the room when during the debate and vote. He also declared an interest in applications P/FUL/2025/06223 and P/ADV/2025/06228 due to his role on the Weymouth Town Council Planning Committee and left the room for the deliberation of those items.

10. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 08 June were confirmed and signed.

11. Registration for public speaking and statements

All public speakers were provided the opportunity to speak at the start of the meeting, Mark Ellis spoke in relation to application WD/D/20/002569. He raised concerns about the application in relation to safe pedestrian access to public rights of way, inadequate parking provision and road safety.

All other speakers chose to speak after the applications were presented and the details are provided below.

12. **WD/D/20/002569 - Land East of Chickerell and South of Coldharbour, Chickerell**

The Lead Project Officer presented the application and outlined the site location, which was shown on a map. Members were advised that the site fell within the Defined Development Boundary, outside the National Landscape designation, outside any Conservation Area, and outside the setting of Listed Buildings. Public rights of way crossing and adjoining the site were highlighted. It was explained that the site was steeply sloping and included areas within Flood Zones 2 and 3, areas susceptible to surface water flooding and groundwater flooding, and land adjacent to an electricity substation. National flood risk assessment maps were displayed, together with plans showing nearby uses, including a solar farm, battery storage facility, electricity substation and Wessex Golf Centre.

It was explained that the development was proposed to come forward in four phases. Phases A and D formed part of the detailed application, while Phases B and C, together with the proposed primary school site, were submitted in outline. Plans illustrating the different phases were shown. It was advised that amended plans had been submitted in March 2026 and that revised plans received in June 2026 had addressed a number of concerns. As consultation on the revised plans remained ongoing, the recommendation was to delegate authority to grant permission subject to no new material planning considerations arising in response to the consultation period. Members were advised to assess the application on the basis of the revised plans.

The proposed masterplan was presented, together with examples of house types, elevations, and floor plans, demonstrating a variety of designs and materials. Four apartment blocks were proposed, the largest of which would be three storeys in height. All dwellings would be constructed to Future Homes Standard requirements and would incorporate solar photovoltaic panels, electric vehicle charging points and heat pumps. Plans were shown which illustrated heat pumps across the development.

Detailed plans of the northern section of the site were shown, including parking arrangements to the front or side of properties and the relationship of development to the site's changing levels. Retaining walls were proposed to accommodate the steep topography, together with green corridors through Phase A. Visitor parking spaces would be incorporated within the streets and courtyards, including parking provision associated with the apartment blocks. Members were shown details of the proposed retaining structures, with northern retaining features consisting of walls with 1.8 metre fencing above and southern retaining features comprising 1.3 metre walls with 1.8 metre fencing. Illustrative images and sections demonstrated how these features would appear in practice and their relationship with

neighbouring properties. A landscape plan showed green corridors, street trees, structural planting and a drainage basin on the eastern side of the development. A rendered street scene was also displayed.

It was explained that all dwellings would be served by parking, supplemented by visitor parking spaces. The majority of properties would be two storeys in height, with the exception of the larger apartment block. It was acknowledged that the height of some retaining features would need to be weighed carefully in the planning balance. Further site sections were presented, including worst-case scenarios illustrating relationships with neighbouring dwellings and proposed apartment blocks.

The landscaping strategy was outlined, including strategic planting to provide ecological connectivity, public open space linking rights of way, specimen tree planting, woodland planting and native shrub planting. An east-west green corridor through the site was proposed and was considered capable of serving both ecological and recreational functions. An Open Space Management Plan would be secured by condition. Additional areas of public open space, drainage features and land reserved for a future primary school were identified, with a design code for the school site proposed through condition.

Plans relating to Phases B and D, together with highway layouts for the central avenue and southern access, were presented. Members were shown extensive photographs from viewpoints across the site, illustrating access points, neighbouring properties, the significant changes in levels across the land, views towards the solar farm, and views from public footpaths around the site. Photographs also demonstrated the relationship between the proposed development areas and the surrounding landscape.

The key planning issues associated with the application were outlined. Concerns regarding design had previously been raised, but it was considered that the revised plans had significantly improved the scheme. The use of materials, building lines and boundary treatments was considered to create a more cohesive street scene. Previous concerns relating to embankments had been largely addressed, with conditions proposed to secure detailed design and construction information. While some concerns raised by the Urban Design Officer remained outstanding, particularly in relation to highways and the overlooking of parking courtyards, it was considered that these matters could be addressed by condition.

The impact on residential amenity was assessed, particularly in relation to the proposed retaining features, which could reach a maximum height of 4.8 metres. Whilst these features were not considered ideal, they would allow level gardens and access to dwellings and would avoid retaining structures being positioned directly at street level. It was noted that accommodating the site's levels in this way had resulted in a reduction in housing numbers, and that the impacts should be balanced against the benefits of delivering housing on the site.

Ecological matters were also addressed. Conditions were recommended to mitigate impacts on protected species and to retain dark corridors across the development. Although the Natural Environment Team had been unable to fully assess the likely effectiveness of some mitigation measures, additional wildlife

corridors were proposed to maintain ecological connectivity. Bat and bird boxes would be secured by condition, together with a minimum of seven wildlife tunnels. A dormouse bridge would also be provided, with its location and design secured through condition. It was concluded that, with these mitigation measures in place, ecological concerns relating to east-west connectivity could be satisfactorily addressed.

Flood risk considerations were discussed in detail. The proposed drainage basins were shown on plans, with modelling demonstrating post-development flood scenarios. It was explained that the drainage basins would have a permanent maximum water depth of approximately 0.3 metres and would not require fencing. Following assessment, it was concluded that the development would deliver an overall betterment in flood risk terms and would not increase flooding on third-party land. The proposal was therefore considered acceptable on flood risk grounds.

One matter raised by Sport England concerned the relationship between the development and the adjacent golf course. A golf strike assessment commissioned by the applicant had identified a risk from two southern tees affecting part of the site. Various mitigation options had been explored, resulting in the removal of all housing and public open space from the area identified as being at risk. A condition was proposed requiring a strategy to address golf strike risks, with the affected area remaining inaccessible to the public.

Environmental Health had raised no objections regarding noise. Noise and fire safety matters had been considered through the battery energy storage application process, and the proposed residential development was considered acceptable in these respects.

It was advised that highways officers had raised no objections subject to conditions relating to site access, bus stops and a travel plan. Landscape Officer concerns had been largely addressed through revisions to the scheme and the provision of more meaningful public open space. Conditions would require full landscaping details to be approved. Plans relating to public rights of way were presented, including proposed diversions and new connections. Although a representation had been received recommending enhanced pedestrian links to Granby Industrial Estate, this was not considered necessary. Chickerell Town Council had expressed an interest in taking responsibility for the future management of open spaces within the development.

It was confirmed that conditions relating to land contamination were proposed and that no harm would arise to heritage assets. A condition requiring a programme of archaeological investigation and recording was also recommended.

Details of the proposed infrastructure contributions were presented, including financial contributions towards NHS services, education provision, Weymouth Swimming Pool and Willowbed Hall.

The Lead Project Officer concluded by outlining the benefits of the scheme. The proposal would deliver 328 dwellings on an allocated site at a time when the Council could not demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. Significant weight was attached to the provision of affordable housing, with the scheme delivering the

policy-compliant level of 35%. Affordable housing would be distributed throughout the development and integrated with the market housing. Additional benefits included a new bus link, improved walking and cycling connections, enhanced connectivity with existing settlements and the provision of substantial and meaningful public open space. It was considered that the benefits of the proposal were not significantly or demonstrably outweighed by any adverse impacts.

Public representation was received in objection to the application from Esther Dadds. She expressed concern about the loss of greenspace in the area and the impact on wildlife and also believed that the proposal would result in the town of Chickerell extending to unacceptable levels.

The applicant, David Buczynskyj, spoke in support of the application. He noted that the proposal would provide homes on an allocated site, including a policy compliant level of affordable housing, equating to 115 affordable homes. The proposal also included community benefits, such as delivering key infrastructure, providing the site for a new school and generating investment into the area.

Cllr Clifford spoke as the ward member for the application. He expressed concern that the consultation period was still open and so statutory consultees could still object to the application. He also questioned whether new homes were needed in Chickerell specifically, given the Town Council and residents had concern that it was merging with Weymouth. Concerns were also raised about insufficient care given to protecting wildlife in the area and the lack of a health centre being provided by the scheme, which was the preference of the Town Council.

In response to public representations the Development Management Area Manager explained that parking provision on site was policy compliant; an application referenced by one speaker actually referred to the proposed allocation of the site in a previous Local Plan and since then the site had been allocated; in reference to the consultation period still being open, the committee would make a decision to delegate authority to officers to grant the application and if new planning considerations came forward the application would return to committee; there had been extensive engagement over ecology on the site and officers considered that concerns had been satisfactorily addressed through planning conditions.

In response to questions from members officers provided the following responses:

- No comments had been received from the NHS in reference to the provision of a new doctor's surgery.
- Condition 24 secured connectivity to the wildlife corridor for hedgehogs.
- An informal area of play as well as a Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) to include 12 pieces of equipment was included in the proposal and highlighted on plans of the site.
- The cycle paths on site would connect to the wider cycle network.
- If new planning considerations came forward during the consultation period a decision would be made by officers in consultation with the Chair to decide whether the application would need to return to committee.
- Maintenance for public open spaces was calculated through a formula and the Town Council had expressed they were keen to take on maintenance of the public open spaces on site.

- The southern access would be considered the main access into the site and no more than 100 dwellings could be occupied before the construction of the access road was completed.
- A condition was proposed that would agree timetables for the delivery of the phases of the development.
- The proposal included the land for a new school rather than the school itself and it could be delivered either by Dorset Council or the Department for Education. The design code for the school was recommended on the basis that it was on an elevated site.
- The attenuation ponds had been designed in relation to SuDS guidance and in this case because of the low level of permanent water on the site, fencing wasn't being recommended.
- Retaining features would restrict the movement of wildlife on the site, however it was considered that sufficient mitigation was provided in the form of wildlife corridors.
- Heat pumps and solar panels were included in the scheme.
- There had been no objection from the Lead Local Flood Authority and there was no detail about the siting of the buildings on the school site at this stage, however any future application for that site would have to be policy compliant.
- When the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) application was determined, future residents of this site were considered, and it was deemed acceptable.
- Parking for the dwellings would be allocated and there would be unallocated parking for visitors.
- All roads were designed to the standards that Highways would require and would accommodate two cars passing.
- The Wessex roundabout was outside of the application site and it was not considered necessary to provide improvements to the roundabout.
- Lower Putton Lane would provide a key pedestrian link to the site and there was a small section of that road without a footpath.
- A traffic-controlled junction would allow children to access the school without having to cross the Wessex roundabout.
- Permitted Development rights would restrict raised garden platforms and balconies.
- Officers understood that the school in Chickerell had been oversubscribed in the past, however in the most recent year had not been oversubscribed.
- A management company would maintain signage on site.
- Chickerell Town Council had expressed interest in taking on maintenance of public areas and there would be a fallback position to go to a management company.
- Drainage plans and flood risk data did take into account future projections of rainfall.
- The school would only be provided if there was the need for it and the site allocated for the school couldn't be used for any other use, unless a new application came forward.
- The application site falls outside of the dark skies area and the Dorset National Landscape, so it was not considered necessary to restrict lighting.

The committee agreed to extend the meeting beyond three hours.

The meeting adjourned at 12:38 – 13:25

Cllr Northam returned to the Council Chamber at 13:27, as he was not present for the full debate he did not take part in the rest of the deliberation of the application and left the Council Chamber at 13:31.

Several members raised concerns with the application, in particular the lack of the provision of a health centre, as they agreed with the Town Council that health provision in the area was insufficient. However, officers explained that the NHS had not requested a health centre be provided on the site and so it was difficult to condition and the application would make financial contributions to the NHS.

It was proposed by Cllr Christopher and seconded by Cllr Taylor that the application be delegated to officers in consultation with the Chair to grant planning permission, with additional conditions requiring heat pumps/air conditioning and fencing around the drainage basins, a local connection clause for the affordable housing in the S106 agreement and subject to the amendments to two conditions as per the committee update sheet.

Decision: That

- A) That authority be delegated 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 in the appendix to these minutes and the completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation under Section 106 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;
- Financial contribution of £12,000 towards the upgrading of footpath S16/21.

B) That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in the appendix to these minutes 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 Manager within 6 months from the committee resolution.

13. **P/FUL/2025/04039 - Weymouth Bay Holiday Park, Preston Road, Weymouth, DT3 6BQ**

Cllr Northam returned to the Council Chamber at 13:47.

The Lead Project Officer presented the application and identified the site location on a map of the area. Members were shown the extent of Weymouth Bay Holiday Park, with the application site outlined in red. An Ordnance Survey map was displayed identifying nearby heritage assets, including the Grade II* listed St John's Church and the Scheduled Monument comprising the remains of a Roman Temple. Contour mapping was shown, demonstrating that the site was separated from the sea by a rise in levels. It was noted that the Dorset National Landscape lay to the north of the site, while the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site was located to the east, although the application site itself did not fall within the World Heritage Site. The nearby Isle of Portland Special Area of Conservation and Site of Special Scientific Interest were also identified.

A bird's-eye view of the existing holiday park was shown from the south, illustrating the caravans already present on the site. Members were advised that part of the application area currently comprised grassland used for informal walking. Photographs of the site showed scrubby grassland with a mixture of worn footpaths and marshy ground.

It was explained that the proposal sought full planning permission for 241 holiday caravans across four separate areas of the site, together with associated decking, the relocation of five existing static caravans and supporting infrastructure. This infrastructure included sustainable drainage measures, an attenuation basin, footpaths, access roads, hard and soft landscaping works and the removal of an existing telecommunications mast. The accommodation would operate seasonally from March to January. Plans were displayed showing the four development areas and the River Jordan running through the site towards the sea. A link road from the existing holiday park would provide access to the new areas.

Further details of the proposal were presented, including the use of grey and brown external finishes for the caravans to reduce their visual prominence within the landscape. Photographs of typical caravans, including veranda areas, were shown. A typical cross-section of the site illustrated the relatively flat nature of the land. Members were also shown the proposed landscaping strategy, which included extensive structural planting intended to soften views of the development. Additional landscaping would be provided throughout the site, including planting between caravans to reduce their visual impact.

It was advised that site access had been improved to prevent vehicles queuing on Preston Road. The site was well connected by existing bus routes and a network of footpaths. A number of permissive walking routes were proposed within the development and adjoining open spaces, together with dog waste bins positioned along the paths.

The key planning issues were then summarised. The principle of development was considered acceptable, with Local Plan Policy ECON7 generally supporting the expansion of existing holiday parks. An Environmental Statement had accompanied the application due to the nature and scale of the proposal. The Environmental Statement identified a range of potential adverse impacts but also set out a comprehensive package of mitigation measures.

In relation to landscape and visual impact, it was explained that a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment had been submitted. Twenty-two viewpoints had been agreed, including views from elevated locations within the National Landscape and viewpoints looking towards it. It was noted that the development would often be more visible from longer-distance viewpoints than from locations immediately surrounding the site. Members were shown a selection of representative viewpoints demonstrating the proposal at its most prominent. These visualisations illustrated the effect of the proposed landscaping over time. At several viewpoints the caravans would be highly visible in the first year following construction, but by year eight the planting would begin to provide screening and, by year fifteen, the development would be substantially screened by maturing woodland and landscaping. While the development would introduce visible built form into the landscape and would therefore result in recognisable landscape harm, this harm was assessed as being at the lower end of the scale and only partially compliant with policy. It was advised that this impact would need to be weighed against the benefits of the scheme.

The impact on the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site was also considered. Although the proposal would not directly harm the World Heritage Site, it would reduce the sense of openness and tranquillity experienced in some views. This harm was likewise assessed as being at the lower end of the scale of less than substantial harm.

Heritage impacts were also addressed. Archaeological investigations had been undertaken on the site through a programme of trial trenching. The proposals included enhancements to the setting of St John's Church through improvements along the church boundary and the relocation of three caravans away from the immediate area. Whilst these measures were beneficial, it was concluded that a degree of harm to the setting of nearby heritage assets would remain.

Ecological matters were considered in detail. Increased use of the nearby Special Area of Conservation had the potential to affect wildlife through recreational pressure. Natural England had agreed that designated dog walking routes and the provision of dog waste bins would assist in mitigating these impacts. It was explained that there would be some reduction in reedbed habitat associated with the River Jordan, although replacement and compensatory reedbed planting was proposed. Two important wildlife corridors, at Bowleaze Gap and along the River Jordan, would be narrowed by the development. Mitigation measures had been provided to maintain these ecological links. Whilst some habitat loss would occur, it was considered that the proposed mitigation could adequately control the impacts.

Flood risk and drainage proposals were also outlined. The sequential test had been applied and, with the mitigation measures proposed, including safe escape routes, the siting of caravans within flood risk areas was considered acceptable. It was concluded that the development could be made safe for its lifetime. An attenuation basin was proposed as part of the drainage strategy and was considered sufficient to address surface water flooding concerns.

Highway matters were discussed, with the Case Officer noting that a significant number of representations had referred to increased traffic, crowded bus stops and existing queues on Preston Road. However, the Highway Authority had not raised any objections subject to conditions securing contributions towards improvements to nearby bus stops and the Beryl Bike scheme.

The impact on neighbouring amenity was also assessed. Area G of the development would be located closest to existing dwellings at Forehill Close. An aerial view of the relationship between the proposed development and neighbouring properties was shown. It was acknowledged that residents' outlook would change substantially, with views that currently extended across open land instead looking towards landscaped woodland associated with the holiday park.

Economic benefits were identified as a significant consideration. The scheme was expected to generate approximately £19.6 million of capital investment over a three-year construction period, support the equivalent of 81 full-time jobs during construction, and generate an estimated £17.9 million Gross Value Added across the construction phase. Once operational, the development was anticipated to generate approximately £5.56 million in visitor expenditure each year and support in excess of 100 full-time equivalent jobs.

In concluding the planning balance, it was advised that no statutory consultee had objected to the application. Concerns had been raised by the Heritage Officer regarding impacts on the World Heritage Site and nearby heritage assets, and it was recognised that the proposal would result in a change to the character of the area. Whilst the relocation of caravans and proposed mitigation measures would provide some improvements, a degree of harm would remain.

The benefits of the scheme were considered to include improved access to public open space, contributions towards bus stop improvements and the Beryl Bike scheme, significant economic benefits and further support for the local tourism economy.

Public representation was received in objection to the application from Geoffrey Skinner, Trevor Lewis and Glenn van der Pas. They raised concerns about the application including; an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity, particularly to residents on Forehill Close, who would experience loss of privacy and outlook; increased noise, light and traffic pollution impacting existing residents; impact on wildlife in the area and concern about worsening flooding.

The representative of the applicant, Andy Bell, spoke in support of the application. He stated that Haven employed over 800 people across three parks in Weymouth and that this development would create more jobs. They recognised the concerns over the scale of the proposal, however noted that an independent assessment demonstrated significant economic benefits to the area and would also benefit the local tourism economy.

Cllr O'Leary spoke as one of the local ward members. He expressed concern around area G, which would place a large number of caravans close to a residential cul-de-sac in Forehill Close. In addition, he felt further improvements should be made to road and sewage infrastructure to ensure it could cope with the additional demand.

Cllr Dickenson spoke as a local ward member. He stated that the 241 additional caravans would represent a significant change in the character of the area, due to increased traffic, change in the landscape and community impacts. He recognised the economic benefits from the applicant's assessment, however did not feel that concerns from residents had been appropriately addressed. He suggested that area G be reduced in size to mitigate amenity impacts on neighbouring residents.

Cllr O'Leary and Cllr Dickenson left the Council Chamber at 15:00.

In response to questions from members, officers provided the following responses:

- A condition would require a landscape planting scheme to be submitted for approval, so the size of the trees planted could be controlled.
- Discussions had taken place with the applicant about the size of area G, however the applicant had not reduced the size.
- The economic figures had not been independently assessed and had been taken from the applicant on face value.
- There was a distance of 17m between the nearest proposed caravan to dwellings on Forehill Close, which was considered a sufficient separation distance and there was not considered to be any right to a view in planning terms.

- Weymouth Town Council had initially objected to the application but had since supported the application following re-consultation.
- Condition 6 required details to be submitted and approved by Dorset Council about any caravans being installed, which would ensure that any replacement caravans would have to meet the desired standard.

Cllr Bawden and Cllr Wheller left the meeting at 15:05.

One member raised a concern about the visual impact of the development on the National Landscape and its impact on the World Heritage Site.

It was proposed by Cllr Monks and seconded by Cllr Taylor, to defer the application to allow the committee to conduct a site visit to Forehill Close and area G, in order to better understand the visual impacts of the scheme.

Decision: That the application be deferred to allow members to conduct a site visit.

14. **P/FUL/2025/06223 - Pavement opposite 32 The Esplanade, Weymouth**

The meeting adjourned from 15:33 – 15:41.

Cllr O'Leary returned to the Council Chamber at 15:37.

The Planning Officer presented the full planning and advertisement consent applications for the installation of a BT Street Hub. The site location was shown, identifying the proposed position to the west of the existing sand sculpture. Photographs of the existing payphone kiosk were provided, together with images of a similar BT Street Hub installed elsewhere in the area.

It was advised that the site was located on Dorset Council-owned land, within the Conservation Area and within the setting of nearby Listed Buildings. The proposal involved the removal of the existing kiosk and its replacement with a BT Street Hub. It was explained that the proposed structure would be slightly taller and wider than the existing kiosk, although it would be thinner in profile. Visualisations of the proposed hub were displayed.

The key planning considerations were summarised and it was advised that the principle of the development was supported by Policy SUS2. The proposal would provide public benefits, including free Wi-Fi provision and enhanced 5G connectivity. It was further noted that there would be no adverse impact on residential amenity and that the Highway Authority had raised no objections. Concerns relating to crime and anti-social behaviour had been considered, and it was concluded that the proposal would be no worse in this respect than existing street furniture, with a management plan proposed to address such issues.

The impact on visual amenity and heritage assets was then assessed. It was explained that the location was particularly sensitive, being within the Conservation Area and the setting of Listed Buildings. The proposed hub was considered to have a notable visual impact due to its height, mass and colour. It was also noted that the structure would sit alongside LED advertising panels

installed relatively recently, contributing to the proliferation of illuminated displays along the Esplanade.

Whilst the harm to heritage assets was assessed as less than substantial, it was considered to be towards the higher end of the less than substantial scale. In considering the advertisement consent application, the Planning Officer advised that public safety and highway safety impacts were acceptable. However, the impact on visual amenity was considered unacceptable, and the identified public benefits were not considered sufficient to outweigh the harm arising from the proposal.

It was proposed by Cllr Taylor and seconded by Cllr Roper that the application be refused.

Decision: That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the appendix to these minutes.

15. **P/ADV/2025/06228 - Pavement opposite 32 The Esplanade, Weymouth**

It was proposed by Cllr Taylor and seconded by Cllr O'Leary that the application be refused.

Decision: That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the appendix to these minutes.

16. **P/FUL/2026/01894 - 13 The Esplanade Weymouth, DT4 8EB**

The application was deferred due to time constraints.

17. **P/LBC/2026/01893 - 13 The Esplanade Weymouth, DT4 8EB**

The application was deferred due to time constraints.

18. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items.

19. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business.

20. **Update Sheet**

Decision List

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am - 3.55 pm

Chairman

.....