

Application Number:	P/FUL/2025/04039
Webpage:	https://planning.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/
Site address:	Weymouth Bay Holiday Park Preston Road Weymouth DT3 6BQ
Proposal:	Removal of a telecommunications mast and associated structures and installation of bases for the siting of static holiday caravans with decking and associated access, landscaping, drainage and other related infrastructure works.
Applicant name:	Haven Leisure Limited
Case Officer:	James Lytton-Trevers
Ward Member(s):	Cllr O'leary and Cllr Dickenson

1. Reason application is going to committee:

1.1 This application is being re-reported to the planning committee due to the decision by members to defer the application at the planning committee meeting on 15 July 2026 for a committee site visit. That committee site visit took place on 2nd September 2026.

2. Summary of recommendation:

A) To delegate authority to the Service Manager for Development Management & Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager Southern & Western Team to grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report and the completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (S106 agreement) to secure:

- A contribution of £43,500 towards enhanced facilities at westbound and eastbound bus stops on the A353 by Weymouth Bay access and at Fisher Bridge;
- A contribution of £10,900 towards a Beryl bike bay and the purchase of 4 new bikes;
- The additional recreational enhancement measures as set out in paragraph 4.7 of the submitted document ref 31473/04/JFB/HAR and the annotated drawing of the proposed Footpath and Dog Walking Routes (Ref 106/09 February 2026) including footpath signage, 12 information boards, welcome pack and 5 rubbish bins (including dog waste);
- A Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan to secure the maintenance and monitoring of the BNG for 30 years;
- Advance planting (at least 2 years in advance) Mixed species native advance stock and feathered trees planted between caravans and at the edges of development and areas of native scrub around the edges of area G and south of area E shown on plans AP01D, AP02D & AP03E;

B) Refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below if the S106 agreement is not completed by 17 January 2027 or such extended time as agreed by the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager Southern & Western Team. The reasons for refusal relating to the failure to secure the necessary obligations are set out in full at the end of this report.

3. Key planning issues

Issue	Conclusion
Principle of development	The proposal would comply with local plan Policy ECON7, Neighbourhood Plan (NP) policy W41 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This is subject to site specific consideration.
Landscape and appearance – Dorset National Landscape	The proposals are considered to partially comply with local plan policies ENV1, ENV3, ECON7, DNLP Policies A1d, Policy A2a and the NPPF. These are considerations in the planning balance at the end of the report.
Landscape and appearance – World Heritage Site (WHS)	The proposal is considered to partially comply with local plan policy ENV1 and NPPF policy N4. These are considerations in the planning balance at the end of the report.
Heritage assets	The proposal would not fully comply with local plan Policy ENV4 or Neighbourhood Plan Policy W45, as it would not conserve the significance of heritage assets. However, the identified level of harm is limited and, subject to the consideration of public benefits, may be capable of being justified in accordance with policies H4 & HE6 of the NPPF.
Biodiversity	The proposal is considered to partially comply with local plan policy ENV2, ENV3, NP policies W02, W03, W04, W05 & W07 and the NPPF. These are considerations in the planning balance at the end of the report.
Flood risk & drainage	Subject to conditions and detailed design of the swales and attenuation basin the proposal is considered to comply with local plan policy ENV5 and the NPPF in respect of surface water drainage. Whilst the sequential test has not been passed the proposal is considered to pass the exceptions test and subject to conditions would not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere and safe access and egress can be achieved in the event of a flood.
Trees and hedgerows	The proposal is considered to avoid damage or significant loss of trees, woodland, orchards or hedgerow and will be replaced with new planting. It

Issue	Conclusion
	would comply with local plan policy ENV5, NP Policy W06 and the NPPF.
Highway safety	The proposal is considered to not lead to an unacceptable impact on highway safety and would comply with local plan policy COM7, NP policies W41, W46 and W47 and the NPPF.
Amenity	The proposal is considered to safeguard amenity. The proposal would comply with local plan policy ENV16 and the NPPF.
Economic consideration	In light of local plan policy ECON7 and NPPF policies E4 and S5 support, there would be economic benefits which are considerations to be weighed in the planning balance.
Environmental Implications	It is considered that the proposal would go some way towards meeting the aims of NP policy W000 in so far as a development of this type for caravans.

4. Description of site

- 4.1 The proposed development site occupies a group of pastoral fields to the south and east of the existing Weymouth Bay and Seaview holiday parks and the north and west of Waterside Holiday Park. The settlement of Overcombe lies to its west, Preston and Sutton Poyntz to its north, Osmington further to its east and the town of Weymouth further to its southwest.
- 4.2 Access to the Site is provided from Preston Road (A353) to the north. This provides the singular vehicular guest access to the existing Park. Gated service access to the Park is provided from Church Road.
- 4.3 Informal pedestrian access at the southwest of the Site, is available from Forehill Close. This gated access also provides vehicular access for maintenance operators to a telephone mast within the existing Park.
- 4.4 The River Jordan runs through the centre of the site marking its low point at approximately 10m AOD with ground levels then rising within the site to 50m AOD in the southwest and northeast. Some parts of the site are within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and some parts of the site are at high risk of flooding from surface water.
- 4.5 The fields which make up the site are mainly bounded by hedgerows with occasional hedgerow trees though there are some larger trees and shelter belts around the fields in the central portion of the site and within the neighbouring holiday parks.
- 4.6 The site lies in the Dorset Ridge and Vale Landscape Character Type (LCT) and the Weymouth and Portland Osmington Ridge and Vale Landscape Character Area (LCA).

- 4.7 The site lies within an area of identified as Land of Local Landscape Importance within the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan.
- 4.8 The boundary of the Dorset National Landscape (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, AONB) lies just to the north and east of the site. The coastal strip to its south is within the Dorset and Northeast Devon World Heritage Site (WHS), and also within the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs Special Area of Conservation (SAC), and the South Dorset Coast Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).
- 4.9 Two Scheduled (Ancient) Monuments (SAM), the remains of a Roman Temple and a Roman Villa, lie just to the south and north of the site respectively and there are a cluster of listed buildings including the Grade II* Church of St Andrew just to the north of the site within the Sutton Poyntz Conservation Area. Chalbury Hillfort SAM lies to the northwest of the site on higher ground and there are numerous SAMs along the chalk ridge/escarpment to the site's north including the Osmington White Horse.
- 4.10 There are a number of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) within the site and on its boundaries and a network of PRoW on the higher ground to its north and along the Coastal Strip to its south. The Hardy Way runs through the centre of the site and the South West Coast Path and The Monarch's Way King Charles III footpath run to its north along the chalk ridge/escarpment and both to its south along the coastal strip respectively. The public footpaths are S1/19, S1/18, S1/87 (leading to S1/86); and S1/26 (leading to S1/20). There are further informal footways within the site, for example to the southern boundary of the existing Park. Local residents have been allowed to use some of the connections from the adjacent residential areas to the public rights of way on a permissive basis.
- 4.11 The site contains associated services and entertainment facilities which include:
- 750 static caravans, of which c.60% are owned and 40% are retained by Haven as part of its rental fleet;
 - Adventure Village, including high ropes course and climbing wall;
 - Adventure golf;
 - Indoor pool, outdoor pool and lazy river;
 - Three distinct food and beverage facilities;
 - Entertainment venue and Show Bar;
 - Outdoor play area; and,
 - Creative studio, including pottery.
- 4.12 The Park employs c.100 full-time staff all year round. It employs an additional 100 part-time staff during the low season and a total of 330 part-time staff in the high season. All staff live in Weymouth and the surrounding area.

5. Description of development

- 5.1 This is a full planning application proposing the installation of 241 no. static caravans and associated decking, the relocation of 5 No. static caravans, and associated infrastructure including Sustainable Urban Drainage (SuDs), an attenuation basin, foul water drainage, internal access roads and car parking spaces, footpaths and hard and soft landscaping as well as the removal of an existing telecommunications mast and associated infrastructure.

5.2 The proposed development comprises:

Installation of bases for the siting of 241 static caravans, with associated decking, located at:

Area B (to the southeast of Weymouth Holiday Park): 56 bases;

Area D (between Weymouth and Seaview Holiday Parks): 31 bases;

Area E (to the south of Seaview Holiday Park): 99 bases; and,

Area G (to the southwest of Weymouth Holiday Park): 55 bases.

Relocation of bases for the siting of static caravans to elsewhere in the existing park:

3 from the west of St Andrew's church;

1 from the west of Area D;

1 static caravan from the north of Area E;

Associated infrastructure, to include but not limited to:

Level for level flood compensation;

Attenuation basin and related sustainable drainage systems;

Foul drainage system;

Internal access roads and car parking spaces;

Formal and informal footpath routes; and,

Hard and soft landscaping.

Removal of a telecommunications mast and associated infrastructure from Area G.

5.3 In line with the existing site licence for the Park, it is intended that the scheme will provide holiday accommodation between 1 March in any one year and 14 January in the following year.

5.4 The development is "EIA development" for the purposes of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES).

5.5 The application is supported by the following documents:

The ES & Addendum, which includes sections on:

Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA);

Ecology;

Heritage;

Transport;

Drainage;

Cumulative Assessment; and,

Mitigation & Monitoring.

5.6 Other supporting documents, including:

Plans;

Socio-economic Assessment;
Planning Statement & Addendum;
Statement of Community Involvement;
Design & Access Statement;
Exterior Lighting Design Proposals;
Biodiversity Statement;
Tree Survey & Impact Assessment;
Biodiversity Net Gain Statement;
Transport Assessment;
Geophysical Archaeology Report; and,
Archaeological trenching.

- 5.7 The applicant, Haven Leisure Ltd, part of the Bourne Leisure Group, owns and operates Weymouth Bay Holiday Park under the “Haven” brand. Established in 1964, Bourne Leisure operates a total of more than 50 holiday sites. Bourne Leisure is the largest owner/operator of holiday parks in the UK and employs some 3,500 full time staff and 8,700 seasonal/part time staff. The business now generates some £1 billion turnover and has a leisure asset base in excess of £2.5 billion. Nationally, Bourne Leisure’s parks attract over 3.5 million visitors per year.

6. Relevant planning history

94/00233/FUL - Decision: REFUSED - Decision Date: 29/06/1994

Extension to caravan park and provision of sports field and sports pitch.

Reasons: Loss of important greenspace, archaeology, flood plain and expansion which were restricted under the local policy at the time.

06/00018/FUL- Decision: REFUSED & APPEAL DISMISSED- Decision Date: 01/03/2006

New static caravan community comprising 30 bases relates to Seaview Holiday Park, which is adjacent to, but not part of Weymouth Bay Holiday Park.

Reason: Harm to character and appearance of the area on account of the lack of screening at the time, reasons which were upheld on appeal.

WP/20/00570/PRE - Decision: RESPONDED - Decision Date: 02/02/2021

Pre Application consultation: Proposed Masterplan development at Weymouth Bay and Seaview Holiday Parks. Site meeting (Covid-19 restrictions permitting) and write up.

P/PAP/2023/00379 - Decision: RESPONDED -Decision Date:
22/09/2023

Masterplan for expansion of Weymouth Bay and Seaview Holiday Parks

P/ESC/2024/07573 - Decision: RESPONDED & EIA required -Decision Date: 09/01/2025

Request for EIA screening opinion

P/ESC/2025/01127 - Decision: RESPONDED & EIA required -Decision Date: 06/03/2025

Request for EIA Screening Opinion under Regulation 6 (The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended)) for installation of 240 bases for the siting of static caravans, relocation of 5 static caravans and associated infrastructure.

7. List of constraints

Grade: II Listed Building: GROUP OF 4 MONUMENTS APPROXIMATELY 4 METRES NORTH WEST OF TOWER OF CHURCH OF ST ANDREW List Entry: 1135149;

Grade: II Listed Building: Lych gate to Church of St Andrew List Entry: 1135142;

Grade: II Listed Building: Northern section of churchyard wall Church of St Andrew List Entry: 1135145;

Grade: II Listed Building: Rooke Monument approximately 3 metres north of the vestry Church of St Andrew List Entry: 1135153;

Grade: II* Listed Building: Church of St Andrew List Entry: 1135140;

Grade: II Listed Building: Two monuments approximately 5 metres south of south door to aisle of Church of St Andrew List Entry: 1135156;

Grade: II Listed Building: Two monuments approximately 1.5 metres south of south aisle door to Church of St Andrew List Entry: 1135154;

Grade: II Listed Building: Group of 5 monuments approximately 10 metres south of aisle window to Church of St Andrew List Entry: 1135151;

Article 4 Directions

S106

Wessex Water Treatment Works Catchment

Rights of Way: Footpaths S1/19, S1/18, S1/87, S1/86, S1/26, S1/28, S1/20, S1/25 & S1/143

Medium pressure gas pipeline 12.5m or less from 12.5m Buffer on Regional Medium Pressure Pipelines (75 mbar – 2 bar)

Existing ecological network

Higher Potential ecological network

National Landscape (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty AONB): Dorset;

Special Area of Conservation (SAC) (5km buffer): Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs (UK0019861)

Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) impact risk zone;

Scheduled Monument: Preston Roman villa (List Entry: 1002704);

Scheduled Monument: Romano-Celtic temple and associated remains at Jordan Hill (List Entry: 1013371);

Scheduled Monument: Multi-period archaeological landscape centred on and including a slight univallate hillfort called Chalbury, two bowl barrows, part of a Bronze Age urnfield and a series of medieval strip fields (List Entry: 1002711);

Main River Consultation Zone

Flood Zones 2, 3, 3a & 3b

Risk of Surface Water Flooding Extent 1 in 30. 1 in 100 & 1 in 1000

Spatial Flood Defences

8. Consultations

All consultee responses can be viewed in full on the website. Following receipt of the ES Addendum there has been full re-consultation.

Consultees

Statutory:

- **Active Travel England** – No reply
- **Environment Agency** – No objection subject to condition.

The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) adequately demonstrates the level-for-level floodplain compensation scheme. The Technical Note addresses the matter of finished site and floor levels.

Condition requiring:

The development in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment.

- **Historic England** – No objection

The proposals affect the setting of several designated heritage assets: Preston Roman Villa, The Romano-Celtic temple and associated remains at Jordan Hill and the Grade II* Church of St Andrew.

Preston Roman Villa & the Romano Celtic Temple benefit from far reaching views in almost every direction. A general sense of an isolated, coastal, rolling, rural landscape can still be appreciated. The current application would contribute to that gradual erosion of isolation and rurality, extending the caravan park in a southerly direction and bringing development closer to the monument and will be seen in the context of the existing park.

The views out from the church and back towards the church tower from within open countryside contributes to the appreciation and understanding of the origins of the church as a rural parish church and its close connection with the landscape. Whilst the proposals will contribute to the erosion of the surrounding rurality and connection with the agricultural landscape, visibility to the application site is limited.

There will be a low level of less than substantial harm to the significance (as contributed by their setting) of the Roman Temple and Church of St Andrew. That harm is drawn from the piecemeal erosion of their rural setting and, in the case of the temple - sense of isolation.

- **Natural England** – No objection subject to conditions/obligations.

The revised scheme provides for significant new permitted footpath routes along with additional recreational enhancement measures which would avoid adverse impacts through additional recreational use of land within the Isle of Portland to Studland Bay SAC to be secured by planning obligation.

The additional information provided includes a comprehensive invertebrate survey of the land holding to be secured for the duration of the scheme through a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP).

Loss of 5% of the existing reedbed would be enhanced to a higher ecological condition through targeted enhancement measures and new areas created to be secured by a LEMP and HMMP.

The enhanced habitat mitigation measures proposed would help to mitigate the loss of the extent of the natural habitats within the Bowleaze Gap ecological corridor which is well used by foraging bats and is likely to be used by migratory birds.

The proposals would benefit from significantly increased tree planting within both the existing Holiday Park as well as throughout the proposed extension to be secured by condition.

- **Jurassic Coast World Heritage** – Comments.

Taken in isolation the proposed development would not necessarily represent significant impacts to the setting of the World Heritage Site (WHS). However, concerned about the overall cumulative impact in this area following a number of changes and developments since 2001. This trajectory of development around Bowleaze is having the following effects;

Disrupting the visual connectivity between the coast and the ridge and vale character of the landscape;

Diminishing the transition from urban to undeveloped coast by increased urbanisation, changes in land use, and encroachment onto the WHS itself;

The proposed extension to Weymouth Bay Holiday Park introduces further loss of open, undeveloped land, reduces the important fragmented character of the urban fringe and impacts the transition to undeveloped open coastline and rural setting for the WHS.

- **Wessex Water** – No reply

External:

- **Dorset Fire & Rescue Service** – No reply
- **Dorset Police Architectural Liaison Officer** – No reply.
- **Dorset Wildlife Trust** – No reply.
- **Public Health Dorset** – No reply.
- **Ramblers Association** – Comment:

Concerned about the cumulative effect on the settings of the World Heritage Site and Dorset National Landscape;

Impact on local infrastructure, in particular local roads.

Internal (Dorset Council):

- **Arboricultural Team** – No reply.
- **Archaeology** - No objection subject to condition.
Remains that would be affected by the development should be recorded by condition.
- **Building Control West Team** – No comment.
- **Caravan, camping and park home sites** – No reply.
- **Conservation** – No objection
The scheme has been assessed on its effect toward identified designations.
- **Coastal Risk Management** - No comment.
- **Dorset National Landscape (AONB)** – No objection subject to conditions.

In consideration of the mitigation that is proposed the visual impacts within the National Landscape are not expected to be 'significant' from the outset and are expected to materially reduce in the medium-long term.

Conditions are recommended for:

Provision of the majority of planting;

Planting proposals close to and within the caravans;

Ongoing management of the proposed landscaping, i.e. a LEMP;

The scale and appearance of the caravans;

Control over the location and type of lighting for all external spaces, as well as any external fitting for the caravans.

The officer says they have not identified overriding harm and consider that the development's effects on Dorset National Landscape would not be significant at the outset and should reduce to relatively low levels in the long term, as proposed planting matures.

- **Economic development & Tourism** – No objection
The provision of additional accommodation in this location would be appropriate and beneficial to the local economy, plus supporting the council's ambition to increase visitor spend to Dorset by 5% by 2029.
- **Emergency Planning** – No reply
- **Environmental Assessment** – Comment:
Habitat Regulations Assessment prepared which concluded that adverse effects on the integrity of the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC designated site can be mitigated.
The application has not assessed alternative sites, an estimate, by type and quantity, of expected residues and emissions (such as water, air, soil and subsoil pollution, noise, vibration, light, heat, radiation and quantities and types of waste produced during the construction and operation phases).
- **Environmental Services – Protection** – No reply
- **Flood Risk Management** – No objection subject to conditions.

The information provided is adequate to address a surface water strategy based upon an assessment of site characteristics.

Recommend conditions:

A detailed surface water management scheme; and,

Details of maintenance & management of both the surface water sustainable drainage scheme and any receiving system.

- **Highways** – No objection subject to conditions/obligations

The new connection to Forehill Close;

Cycle parking; and,

Construction Traffic Method Statement.

A financial contribution of £43,500 towards enhanced facilities at westbound and eastbound bus stops on the A353 by Weymouth Bay access and at Fisher Bridge and £10,900 towards a Beryl bike bay and the purchase of 4 new bikes.

- **Housing Standards, Caravan Licensing Team** – Comment subject to conditions.

Planning and site licence (Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 & s5 Model standards 1989 Holiday Caravan sites) is for caravans to be for holiday use only with restricted occupancy between 1st March and 14th January.

If EV charging points are to be provided between units, consideration needs to be given in terms of fire risk.

Condition restricting use and occupation of the units to holiday use only.

- **Landscape** – No objection

Initially the proposed development would clearly have an adverse landscape and visual impact related to the caravans, but the coloured materials would mitigate this impact to some extent. Subject to establishment and with time, the proposed mitigatory planting would likely become the dominant landscape and visual feature and have a significant beneficial effect on the landscape and visual impact of existing development. The existing holiday related development surrounding the proposed development harms the character, special qualities, and natural beauty of the Dorset National Landscape and the heritage coast. In the context of this existing harm the development, as currently proposed, would be unlikely to result in additional harm to landscape character or visual quality of a great enough significance to warrant an objection.

- **Natural Environment Team/BNG** – No objection subject to conditions/obligation.

Implementation of the habitat creation;

Implementation of interior and external lighting;

Submission of a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEMP);

Submission of a Precautionary Working Method Statement (PWMS) for reptiles;

Submission of a Landscape and Ecological Management (LEMP).

Submission of a Biodiversity Net Gain Plan and Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP); and,

s106 to secure the maintenance and monitoring of the BNG for 30 years.

- **Policy - Urban Design** – No comment
- **Public Health Doret** – No reply

- **Rights of Way Officer** – No reply
- **Trees** – No objection subject to conditions.

Conditions for arboricultural Method Statement and tree protection.

Town & Parish councils:

- **Bincombe Parish Council** - No reply
- **Crossways Parish Council** – No reply
- **Osmington Parish Council** – Initial objection on following grounds (no comment following re-consultation):

Size;

Impact on local services especially during peak tourism dates.

- **Weymouth Town Council** – Initial objection on following grounds (responded to say they supported the application following re-consultation):

Traffic generation;

Previous planning and appeal decisions;

In a [National Landscape] Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

Amenity (overshadowing, loss of privacy, noise disturbance and loss of outlook for residents);

Loss of wildlife corridor;

Encroachment onto the historic landscape;

Density and layout.

- **Ward member Cllr O'Leary Littlemoor & Preston** – Objection:

Overlooking, noise, overshadowing and loss of privacy from Area G;

Loss of open green space enjoyed by local residents, tourists and deer;

Access and parking for an extra 400 vehicle journeys a day on this stretch of road along with a 3% increase in local traffic. There is already issues with parking on Halstock close and Cedar Drive from the park. No extra parking provision for the employees (the 100 extra jobs);

Drainage, sewage and flooding;

There is no plan for extra facilities to be built as part of this site;

Litter;

A 33% increase in the size of the camp that will greatly change the very character of the area affecting the visual appearance of the area which will have a negative impact on the tourism trade;

The economic benefits of this plan are far outweighed by the impact it will have on the natural environment, the landscape, and lives of the local residents nearest.

Representations received

Total - objections	Total - No objections	Total - comments
116	1	4

Petitions objecting	Petitions supporting
0	0

Summary of comments of objections:

The representations are nearly all from the local neighbourhood. Numbers in brackets represent the number of representations on each issue.

Main

Additional traffic/queues at entrance/danger to road users/use of Church Road (80)

Harm to wildlife (63)

Noise (from traffic, music, people, pets, car doors, gardeners, 'fairground' type attractions, construction work, etc) (58)

Loss of open space for recreation/dog walking/ambience (42)

Harm to character and appearance (and National Landscape) (40)

Excessive/overdevelopment/enough caravans/developer profiteering/community pays (33)

Flooding (surface water drainage impeded and collecting on proposed sites) (32)

Insufficient local infrastructure (GP surgeries, emergency services) (31)

Sewerage (unable to cope/overflows) (29)

Pollution (mainly light) (29)

Bus service unable to cope (18)

Overlooking (18)

Harm to heritage assets (15)

Antisocial behaviour (12)

Facilities on site insufficient (10)

Other

Litter (9)

Employment seasonal only (8)

No community/Weymouth benefits (8)

Overshadowing (5)

Insufficient parking (including for staff) (5)
Waste (4)
Water supply adequacy (4)
Access for emergency services (3)
Overbearing (3)
Crime (3)
Effect (negative) on house prices (3)
Gas pipeline (3)
Previous refusals (3)
Competition with other businesses (3)
The use of the gate via Cedar Drive and Forehill for works and access vehicles (3)
Foot traffic down Cedar Drive & Maple Close (2)
Dog fouling (2)
Telecom mast loss of phone signals (2)
Further precedent (1)
No cycle routes (1)
Need for higher quality accommodation not justified (1)
Safety from Calor gas tanks (1)
Trees inappropriate in this open landscape (1)
Wildfires (1)
Carbon footprint/sustainability (1)
Land reprofiling (1)
Loss of view (1)
Proximity of Area G & proposed footpath to Forehill Close (1)

Summary of comments of support:

Useful for visitors (1)
Additional planting (1)

9. Duties

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

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

Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000) requires Local Planning Authorities to seek to further the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of National

Landscape (formerly known as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) when making any decision which affects such land.

10. Relevant policies

Development plan

In this case the development plan comprises:

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

The following policies are considered to be relevant to this proposal:

- INT 1. PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
- ENV 1. LANDSCAPE, SEASCAPE AND SITES OF GEOLOGICAL INTEREST
- ENV 2. WILDLIFE AND HABITATS
- ENV 3. GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK
- ENV 4. HERITAGE ASSETS
- ENV 5. FLOOD RISK
- ENV 10. THE LANDSCAPE AND TOWNSCAPE SETTING
- ENV 15. EFFICIENT AND APPROPRIATE USE OF LAND
- ENV 16. AMENITY
- SUS 2. DISTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPMENT
- ECON 7. CARAVAN AND CAMPING SITES
- COM 7. CREATING A SAFE AND EFFICIENT TRANSPORT NETWORK
- COM 9. PARKING STANDARDS IN NEW DEVELOPMENT

Made Neighbourhood Plans

Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan 2021 to 2039 (made 29/01/2026)

- Policy W00: Environmental Objectives
- Policy W02: Conservation of the Natural Environment
- Policy W03: Wildlife Habitats and Areas 1.
- Policy W04: Wildlife Corridors
- Policy W05: Ecological Impact of Development
- Policy W06: Trees, Woodlands, and Hedgerows
- Policy W07: Rights of Way and Access to the Countryside
- Policy W14: Development Boundaries
- Policy W34: Sustainable Development
- Policy W41: Sustainable Tourism Development

- Policy W44: Design
- Policy W45: Heritage Assets
- Policy W46 Transport and Travel
- Policy W47: Public Transport
- Policy W48: Off-Street Parking
- Policy W49: Vehicle Charging Facilities
- Policy W50: Cycle Routes

Material considerations

Emerging draft Dorset Council Local Plan:

Policy DM4: Emerging development plan proposals of the NPPF provides that local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

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

The emerging Dorset Local Plan is being prepared in accordance with plan-making processes set out in the Levelling Up and Regenerating Act 2023 and Local Planning Regulations (2026). As the plan is still at an early stage of the plan making process, limited weight can be attached to it when taking decisions on planning applications. Decisions on planning applications should continue to be assessed against the policies in adopted development plans, national planning policy and any other relevant material considerations.

Local Nature Recovery Strategy

The Dorset Local Nature Recovery Strategy identifies local priorities for nature recovery and maps areas where action would be most beneficial. In planning decisions it is a material consideration, helping to ensure that development supports biodiversity enhancement and aligns with Dorset's agreed priorities for nature recovery.

National Planning Policy Framework 17 August 2026

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), published on 17 August 2026, sets out the Government's national planning policies for both plan-making and decision-making in England.

When determining development proposals decision-makers are required to take a positive and proactive approach and to seek to approve sustainable development where possible.

The NPPF introduces a permanent presumption in favour of sustainable development, through Policies S3 to S5 (which replaces the former "tilted balance" contained in paragraph 11 of the previous NPPF) and sets out the principles for development within and outside settlements. The Framework also confirms that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Relevant NPPF chapters and policies include:

- Chapter 3: Decision making policies. DM3: Determining development proposals Local planning authorities should approach decision making positively, proactively and proportionately. They should work with applicants through pre-application engagement and consultations and aim to resolve concerns through planning conditions or obligations where possible to avoid delay and to enable an approval rather than a refusal. Applications that accord with the development plan, the NPPF and other material considerations should not be refused where they can clearly be approved.
 - DM3 Determining development proposals
 - DM6 Use of planning conditions and obligations
 - DM7 Relationship with other regulatory regimes
- Chapter 4: Achieving Sustainable Development. The objective of the policies in this chapter is to meet development needs through sustainable patterns of development, including by maximising the potential for growth on suitable land within settlements, enabling development which will support the rural economy, rural communities and the provision of infrastructure, and limiting development away from settlements to help safeguard the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
 - S3 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
 - S5 Principle of development outside settlements
 - S6 Neighbourhood plans and the presumption
- Chapter 5: Meeting the challenges of climate change. Planning decisions should support climate change mitigation and adaptation, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions, increasing resilience to climate impacts and directing development away from areas at unacceptable risk from flooding.
 - CC2 Mitigation of climate change
 - CC3 Adaptation to climate change
- Chapter 7: Building a strong, effective economy. Planning decisions should enable businesses to invest, expand and adapt in a way that reflects the opportunities, challenges and characteristics of different areas, and supports long-term economic growth both locally and nationally.
 - E2 Meeting the need for business land and premises
 - E4 Rural business development
- Chapter 14: Achieving well-designed places. Development should be high quality, respect and enhance local character, deliver sustainable and attractive places, and accord with relevant design policies. Proposals that demonstrate good design and place-making should be supported, while those that fail to meet established design standards should be refused unless clearly justified.
 - DP3 Key principles for well-designed places
- Chapter 15. Promoting sustainable transport. The objective of the policies in this chapter is to ensure that transport considerations are taken fully into account in the preparation of development plans and the evolution and assessment of development proposals; using a vision-led approach to embed the role that transport infrastructure and choices can play in creating well-designed, sustainable, inclusive and popular places.
 - TR3 Locating development in sustainable locations
 - TR6 Assessing transport impacts
 - TR8 Public rights of way

- Chapter 18: Managing flood risk and coastal change. Development proposals should minimise risks to development arising from all sources of flooding and coastal change, taking into account the impacts of climate change, by steering development away from areas of risk, ensuring that development will be safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and incorporating sustainable drainage systems where appropriate.

- F4 Assessing flood risk for decision-making
- F5 The sequential test
- F6 Development in areas at risk of flooding from rivers or the sea
- F7 Ensuring development is safe from flooding
- F8 Sustainable drainage systems and watercourses

Chapter 19: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment: Development should conserve and enhance the natural environment by protecting important landscapes, habitats, biodiversity and trees, while maximising opportunities for nature recovery, green infrastructure and biodiversity net gain. Proposals should avoid significant environmental harm, prioritise land of lower environmental value where possible, and be sensitively designed in protected landscapes and coastal areas. Development causing unacceptable impacts on designated sites, irreplaceable habitats or biodiversity that cannot be adequately avoided, mitigated or compensated for should be refused.

- In National Landscapes substantial weight should be placed on the importance of conserving and enhancing their natural beauty.
- Decisions in Heritage Coast areas should be consistent with the special character of the area and the importance of its conservation
- Improving the natural environment biodiversity is to be protected and encourage net gains for biodiversity.
- N2 Improving the natural environment
- N3 Trees in new development
- N4 Protected Landscapes
- N5 Maintaining the character of the coast
- N6 Areas of particular importance for biodiversity and geodiversity
- Chapter 20: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment – Great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets. Development that preserves or enhances designated or non-designated heritage assets should be approved. While any harm must be clearly justified and weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Proposals causing substantial harm to, or loss of, heritage assets should only be permitted in exceptional circumstances where overriding public benefits outweigh the harm.
- HE4 Securing the conservation of heritage assets
- HE6 Proposals affecting designated heritage assets
- HE8 World Heritage Sites

Other material considerations

National Planning Practice Guidance

All of Dorset:

Dorset AONB Landscape Character Assessment

The Dorset National Landscape Management Plan 2026-31 (DNLP)

Policy A1a Deliver landscape-scale nature recovery and habitat connectivity

Policy A1c Enhance coastal, river and wetland ecosystems for biodiversity and resilience
Policy A1d Expand sustainably managed woodlands and greater numbers of trees outside woodlands
Policy A2a Conserve and celebrate Dorset's historic environment
Policy A3a Implement nature-based solutions for climate adaptation and resilience

Dorset Council Interim Guidance and Position Statement Appendix B: Adopted Local Plan policies and objectives relating to climate change, renewable energy, and sustainable design and construction. December 2023.

Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance for the Weymouth and Portland area:
Weymouth & Portland Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (2002)
Landscape Character Assessment (Weymouth & Portland)

Other relevant statute

The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention Paragraph 112 describes the essential role that effective management of Setting plays in supporting a Site's Outstanding Universal Value.

"112. Effective management involves a cycle of short, medium and long-term actions to protect, conserve and present the nominated property. An integrated approach to planning and management is essential to guide the evolution of properties over time and to ensure maintenance of all aspects of their Outstanding Universal Value. This approach goes beyond the property to include any buffer zone(s), as well as the wider setting. The wider setting may relate to the property's topography, natural and built environment, and other elements such as infrastructure, land use patterns, spatial organization, and visual relationships. It may also include related social and cultural practices, economic processes and other intangible dimensions of heritage such as perceptions and associations. Management of the wider setting is related to its role in supporting the Outstanding Universal Value. Its effective management may also contribute to sustainable development, through harnessing the reciprocal benefits for heritage and society."

11. Human rights

Article 6 - right to a fair trial.

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

The first protocol of Article 1 protection of property.

This recommendation is based on adopted development plan policies, the application of which does not prejudice the human rights of the applicant or any third party.

12. Public Sector Equalities Duty

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

- Removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people due to their protected characteristics
- Taking steps to meet the needs of people with certain protected characteristics where these are different from the needs of other people

- Encouraging people with certain protected characteristics to participate in public life or in other activities where participation is disproportionately low.

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

In considering this application, the potential impacts on groups with protected characteristics have been identified as follows:

Disability and Mobility Impairment

The development includes the provision of accessible holiday accommodation, specifically two adapted caravans designed for people with mobility impairments. The internal layout, accessible bathroom facilities and potential use of assistive features (such as trapeze lift handles) within these units would contribute positively to inclusive access. There are 7 ‘accessible’ caravans at Weymouth Bay.

The layout of the development includes footpaths and routes, which subject to detailed design are intended to accord with inclusivity mobility principles, including gradients and rest areas. However, the site is relatively expansive and located on undulating land, which may present practical accessibility challenges for some users, particularly those with limited mobility or visual impairments. The degree to which accessibility is achieved will therefore depend on the detailed delivery of pathways, gradients, surfacing and internal transport arrangements.

Older Persons

Older Persons may benefit from increased availability of holiday accommodation and accessible units. However, the reliance on walking routes, gradients and distances within the park, and the wider location relative to services, may affect ease of use for older visitors, particularly those with reduced mobility or health conditions.

Families with young children / pregnancy and maternity

- The provision of safe pedestrian routes, open space and recreational opportunities would support family use.
- The extent to which the development is safely accessible for those with prams or pushchairs will depend on the detailed design and maintenance of footways and gradients across the site.

Access to services and sustainable transport

Some protected groups (including older persons and disabled persons) may be more likely to rely on public transport and local services within walking distance;

The availability and quality of sustainable transport options is therefore an important consideration in advancing equality of opportunity.

The site is served by bus stops on the A353 and has connections to Weymouth town centre and surrounding destinations.

Financial contributions are secured to improve bus stop facilities and real-time information, which may benefit users who rely on public transport.

However, the site remains a car-dependent location, particularly for day-to-day access to services, healthcare and shops, which are located primarily in Weymouth.

This may place those without access to private vehicles — including some disabled persons, younger people and older persons — at a relative disadvantage.

13. Public Benefits

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

What	Amount / value
Material considerations	
Beryl bike bay and purchase of 4 new bikes	£10,900
New planting, permissive paths, signage & dog waste bins.	Not known
Enhanced facilities at westbound and eastbound bus stops on the A353.	£43,500
The Park employs c.100 full-time staff all year round. It employs an additional 100 part-time staff during the low season and a total of 330 part-time staff in the high season.	59 new jobs
Contribution to tourism	Increase in visits to other attractions and facilities
Construction	Employment by specialist caravan fabricators and on-site contractors during the construction phase of the development.
Non material considerations	
The applicant, Haven Leisure Ltd, part of the Bourne Leisure Group, owns and operates Weymouth Bay Holiday Park under the "Haven" brand. Established in 1964, Bourne Leisure operates a total of more than 50 holiday sites. Bourne Leisure is the largest owner/operator of holiday parks in the UK.	The business now generates some £1 billion turnover and has a leisure asset base in excess of £2.5 billion. Nationally, Bourne Leisure's parks attract over 3.5 million visitors per year, according to the applicant.
Business rates	Not known

14. Planning Assessment

Environmental statement

- 14.1 The proposal is Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development for the purposes of The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and so this application is supported by an Environmental Statement (ES).
- 14.2 EIA is governed by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations, and the latest EIA Regulations came into force on 16th May 2017. The ES was prepared in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations).
- 14.3 The ES assesses the likely significant environmental effects of the development across a range of topic areas including ecology and biodiversity, landscape and visual impact, heritage, transport and drainage.
- 14.4 The ES identifies a number of potential adverse environmental effects, including:

- Short-term landscape and visual impacts, particularly during the early phases of development before mitigation planting has established.
 - Temporary disturbance to ecological receptors and loss of some grassland habitats during construction.
 - Archaeological impacts, including the potential loss of below-ground remains of local significance.
 - Increased activity and traffic associated with the operation of the extended holiday park.
- 14.5 The ES also sets a comprehensive package of embedded and additional mitigation measures, including:
- Extensive structural landscaping and advance planting to assimilate development into the landscape over time.
 - Habitat retention, enhancement and creation, supported by long term ecological management and Biodiversity Net Gain.
 - Construction and operational management plans (including Construction Environmental Management Plan and Framework Travel Plan).
 - Archaeological investigation and recording where necessary; and
 - Sustainable drainage measures to control runoff and protect water quality.
- 14.6 Subject to the implementation of these measures the ES concludes that residual environmental effects will not be significant in EIA terms, with some topics (notably biodiversity and landscape) expected to experience long-term beneficial effects as mitigation planting matures and habitat enhancements take effect.
- 14.7 The ES has neither considered alternative sites for the development, nor has it considered emissions as highlighted by the comments of the Environmental Assessment officer. Whilst these deficiencies are noted, taken as a whole it is considered that the ES is adequate and does not require amendment.
- 14.8 The conclusions of the ES are an important material consideration and are addressed in detail in relevant sections of this report, including those relating to landscape, heritage, ecology, highways and drainage.
- 14.9 The Non-Technical Summary and addendum of the Environmental Statement, plus the full Environmental Statement is available to view on the Council's website.

Principle

- 14.10 This is a full planning application proposing the installation of 241 no. static caravans and associated decking within four new areas immediately adjacent to the existing park known as areas B, D, E and G. A number of ancillary proposals are required to facilitate the development. Namely: the relocation of 5 No. static caravans and Sustainable Urban Drainage (SuDs), an attenuation basin, foul water drainage, internal access roads and car parking spaces, footpaths and hard and soft landscaping as well as the removal of an existing telecommunications mast.
- 14.11 Local Plan Policy ECON7 (Caravan and Camping Sites) provides in principle support for the proposed development, stating that, proposals for the expansion, intensification or reorganisation of existing sites *"must clearly demonstrate that the development forms part of a long term management plan to improve the quality and appearance of the accommodation and site"*. It also states that development proposals must include an

appropriate landscape scheme and provision for its ongoing maintenance. NPPF policy S5 recognises that certain forms of development should be approved outside settlements, including tourism. NPPF policy E4 supports facilities to support rural leisure and tourism. The applicant has made investment in relation to leisure facilities in the last five or so years, but aside from routine maintenance of the site and facilities and replacement of caravans at the end of their useable life, there has been no significant investment. The caravan pitches at the park are generally small and are laid out uniformly and densely usually just surrounded by grass with little other planting. The applicant states that this proposal would deliver 241 high-quality pitches set within landscaping and that this would then allow Haven to reinvest elsewhere across the park. This would form a long-term management plan for the park.

- 14.12 The proposal would form an expansion and partial reorganisation of an existing site. It includes a comprehensive landscaping scheme, with advanced planting ahead of development proceeding, which would also serve to improve the screening of the existing park. The ongoing maintenance of the landscaping has already been indicated. The site is already in a rural location adjacent to the existing town.
- 14.13 Therefore, in principle the proposal would comply with policy ECON7, NP policy W41 and the NPPF. This is subject to site specific consideration of other matters below.

Landscape and appearance

- 14.14 The site lies within an area of identified as Land of Local Landscape Importance within the West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan. The boundary of the Dorset National Landscape (formerly known as Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, AONB) lies just to the north and east of the site around 300m away.
- 14.15 Consideration is therefore given as to whether the proposed development would have a significant impact on or harm to the National Landscape's statutory purpose. Relevant to this is the duty on public bodies to 'seek to further the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the National Landscape when making any decision which affects such land (S85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, CROW, 2000). The Planning Practice Guidance confirms that this duty also applies to proposals outside the designated area but impacting on its natural beauty.
- 14.16 NPPF policy N4 recognises that development proposals within Protected Landscapes should be limited in scale and extent and sensitively located and designed to avoid harm to the statutory purposes and special qualities of the Protected Landscape. Substantial weight should be placed on the importance of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of these areas.

The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

- 14.17 To inform a decision on the impacts on landscape, the application is supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The LVIA has been undertaken by the applicant, including 22 viewpoints, 14 of which are within, or very close to the boundary of the Dorset National Landscape. These viewpoints were agreed with the council in order to be a representative sample.
- 14.18 Visualizations have been produced for viewpoint (VP) 9, VP13, VP15, VP19 & VP20. Overall, the range of viewpoints and selected photography is sufficient to appraise the

development proposals. The viewpoints are taken from all directions around the proposed site, from various distances away, and on high as well as low ground. The viewpoints are taken from publicly accessible locations. The information provided enables a reasonably good understanding of the likely extent and appearance of the expansion that is proposed, as well as an understanding of the effects of planted mitigation from the outset, at year 8 and at year 15, both in summer and winter seasons.

- 14.19 Concerning the approach of the LVIA to landscape and visual receptor sensitivity, the 'high' classification for the National Landscape Setting is appropriate. In terms of visual receptors, which are people engaged in various activities that bring them to see and potentially appreciate the landscape, the 'high' sensitivity has been applied to users of promoted walking routes (the South West Coast Path and South Dorset Ridgeway), whereas users of other footpaths and bridleways may have been ascribed a lower sensitivity. Therefore, a 'high' sensitivity has been allocated to receptors at some locations (VPs 2, 3, 4, 5, 8 & 20) and 'medium' at other locations (VPs 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11 & 19).

Mitigation Measures Identified within the LVIA

- 14.20 The conclusions of the LVIA in relation to the setting of the National Landscape needs to be considered alongside the proposed mitigation measures, as described within section E5.0 of the LVIA, including:
- Comprehensive planted landscaping, as per the Landscape Masterplan and more detailed planting plans, including:
 - Mixed species native advanced stock and feathered trees planted between caravans and/or at the edges of development and areas of native scrub around the edges of area G and south of area E; and,
 - Areas of wildflower grassland in the two large pastoral fields on the eastern side of the site, to be managed as meadow grassland and areas of wildflower grassland/margins within the areas of proposed caravan development;
 - New hedgerows along the route to Bowleaze Cove and also to enclose area G.
 - Retention and protection of the majority of existing hedgerows and individual trees and the reinforcement of existing landscape boundaries;
 - Utilisation of muted-colour caravans with dark roofs; and,
 - Use of dark skies compliant lighting.

These measures are intended to reduce visual prominence and integrate the development into the surrounding landscape over time.

Assessment of Landscape Effects

- 14.21 The LVIA concludes that the potential effects on landscape receptors within the Dorset National Landscape during construction and initial years of operation would be adverse, reflecting the introduction of built form into currently open land and the extension of the influence of the existing holiday park development.
- 14.22 These effects are identified as generally 'minor' adverse reducing over time to 'minor to negligible' adverse in the medium term and 'negligible' adverse in the long term, as the proposed mitigation planting establishes which would notably soften the impacts of the development as perceived from locations within the designated area.

- 14.23 However, it is important to recognise that this assessment is dependent on the successful implementation and maturity of mitigation planting. In landscape terms, the development would result in a permanent change to the baseline character of the site, and the extent to which the effects are reduced over time relies on the effectiveness of the proposed landscape strategy.

Assessment of Visual Effects

- 14.24 Concerning visual impacts, the impacts appraised by the LVIA are considered below.
- 14.25 The LVIA assesses that impacts on longer distance views from the north, in the vicinity of the South Dorset Ridgeway and Osmington White Horse, will not exceed a minor level from the outset, considering the distance, the context of a broader area of mixed residential and leisure development and because only parts of the proposed development would be visible. Furthermore, it is anticipated that the initial impacts will reduce to some degree in the longer-term, due to factors including the maturing of proposed planting.
- 14.26 VP 9 reflects the view from the A353, outside of the National Landscape, but very close to its boundary. For travellers heading westbound, there is a sweeping coastal view, partly across the development site, toward the coast at Bowleaze and beyond to Portland (these coastal areas being outside of the National Landscape). The LVIA foresees a 'minor-moderate' adverse impact in the short term, reducing to 'minor' adverse in the medium-term and 'negligible' in the long-term.
- 14.27 VP 10 – 12 reflect a sequence of locations from footpaths within the coastal hinterland, close to the Eweleaze Farm seasonal campsite. The assessment notes that the proposed development is often partially or fully obscured by landform and vegetation, but it would sometimes be visible. The LVIA considers that the effects will not exceed a 'minor' adverse level from the outset, with this reducing in the longer-term, due to the landscaping.
- 14.28 VPs 19 & 20 reflect footpaths and open access land around Chalbury Hill Fort. The LVIA judges a range of effects in the short-term, ranging from 'negligible to minor' adverse, to 'minor-moderate' adverse, again reducing in the longer-term when landscaping matures.
- 14.29 These conclusions are broadly accepted. However, it is noted that the LVIA findings are predicated on the effectiveness of mitigation planting over time, and the initial introduction of development in this landscape would give rise to perceptible adverse effects, particularly in views from within and near the national Landscape. Whilst these effects are not assessed as "significant" in EIA terms, these nevertheless represent a change to landscape character and visual amenity which must be considered in the context of the statutory duty under section 85.

Consideration of the Dorset National Landscape

- 14.30 The proposed development is within the setting of the Dorset National Landscape (AONB). This designation reflects the high value and sensitivity of the landscape including its scenic quality, undeveloped character and cultural significance.
- 14.31 The site currently contributes to this setting as predominantly open land, albeit influenced by surrounding residential and tourism related development. The proposed development would extend the extent and influence of this built form into presently open land. This would

result in a further erosion of the undeveloped character of the site and its contribution to the setting of the Dorset National Landscape.

- 14.32 It is noted that the Dorset National Landscape Officer has considered the proposed development and concludes that, subject to a number of planning conditions regarding mitigation, they have not identified overriding harm and consider that the development's effects on the Dorset National Landscape would not be significant at the outset and should reduce to relatively low levels in the long term, as proposed planting matures.

Role and Limitations of Mitigation

- 14.33 The scheme incorporates substantial landscape mitigation, including advance planting, structural woodland belts and long-term habitat management. These measures would:

- Reduce visual prominence of the development;
- Introduce new landscape structure and ecological value; and
- Assist in integrating development into the surrounding landscape over time.

However, these measures are primarily mitigatory in nature and do not avoid the fundamental change arising from the introduction of development into open land.

- 14.34 The scheme incorporates a range of design measures intended to reduce the visual prominence of the development. In particular, the external appearance of the caravans would utilise a muted and recessive colour palette, including olive grey, medium grey, light grey brown and medium dark grey. This approach would assist in reducing contrast with the surrounding landscape when viewed from within and near the National Landscape.
- 14.35 Notwithstanding this in the initial stages of the development the visual impact would inevitably be influenced by the presence of static caravans and associated infrastructure and would represent a perceptible change in currently open views. The use of recessive colours would mitigate this impact to some extent but would not remove it.
- 14.36 Over time, and subject to successful establishment, the proposed structural planting and landscape mitigation would increasingly filter and soften views of the development. It is anticipated that as planting matures, vegetation would become the dominant landscape and visual features, thereby reducing the prominence of built form within the wider landscape.
- 14.37 Application of Section 85 Duty of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000
- 14.38 In applying the duty under Section 85, it is necessary to consider whether the proposal would conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the Dorset National Landscape in respect of its setting, given the site's location outside of the National Landscape.
- 14.39 The proposal would not conserve the existing character of the site. The introduction of additional caravan development would represent a continuation of the pattern of tourism related development and would further alter the landscape from its current pastoral character. Whilst the proposed planting and landscape strategy would, over time, soften the visual effects and introduce ecological and structural benefits, these would arise alongside the permanent change in land use and character, which would impact on the setting of the Dorset National Landscape.

Overall Conclusion on Dorset National Landscape Impacts

- 14.40 It is therefore concluded that:
- The proposal would result in short to medium term harm to the setting of the Dorset National Landscape. This harm would be characterised as moderate to minor adverse.
 - The harm would be reduced over time through mitigation planting but not entirely removed.
- 14.41 The extent of harm is moderated by the presence of existing development in the surrounding area, which has already altered the landscape baseline. In this context, the additional impact of the proposal is assessed as limited in scale and not significant in EIA terms. It is also noted that neither the Council's Landscape Officer nor the Dorset National Landscape Officer objects to the proposed development. They accept that there will be some impacts but that they would not be so significant as to warrant the refusal of the application.
- 14.42 The acceptability of this harm, and the degree to which it is outweighed by the benefits of the proposal is a matter to be addressed in the overall planning balance.

Cumulative Effects

- 14.43 Clearly the proposed development would have a cumulative impact in conjunction with existing development, including recent residential developments. Subject to its establishment and maturing, the proposed planting would mitigate this cumulative impact to a significant degree. However, this does not negate the incremental change in landscape character resulting from the continued expansion of tourism-related development in this location.
- 14.44 With reference to the year 15 visualisations, the proposed landscaping would have a significant beneficial effect on the landscape and visual impact of existing and proposed development. However, the development would change the landscape and visual character of the wider site from holiday related development within a pastoral landscape setting to holiday related development within a woodland setting. This change would not amount to an enhancement of landscape character and appearance but rather represent a change to landscape character.
- 14.45 The proposal would introduce development into the Green Infrastructure Network (Land of Local Landscape Importance) designated within the local plan. It was also identified in the document: Urban Wildlife Corridors and Stepping Stones: Weymouth & Portland Borough – Addendum (September 2020). This land was designated for both as an urban key wildlife corridor and nature conservation area, which is given separate consideration later in this report.

Securing mitigation

As many of the assessments rely upon the efficacy of mitigation measures, it is particularly important that these measures are secured. Conditions and legal agreement on the following would be required:

- Provision of the majority of planting, particularly the strategic landscaping, in advance of the caravan development, by s106. The overall approach to phasing of advanced planting shown within the Landscape Parameters Plan is broadly appropriate.
- Requirements for the indicated planting proposals close to and within the caravans to be implemented in a timely manner, following the construction of each phase of expansion.
- A condition to ensure the satisfactory ongoing management of the proposed landscaping, a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP).
- A condition to control the scale and appearance of the accommodation units (including decking). This should extend to materials and colours, which are understood to utilise colours such as olive grey, medium grey, light grey brown, and medium dark grey, as per the colour swatch plan.
- A lighting condition to maintain control over the location and type of lighting for all external spaces, as well as any external fitting for the caravans themselves. Dark skies compliant lighting is expected, i.e. minimising the amount of lighting, eliminating light spill beyond the horizontal axis, using sensors and controlling colour temperature so as not to exceed 3000K.

Summary

- 14.47 The proposed development would result in changes to the landscape character and visual amenity, including within the setting of the Dorset National Landscape.
- 14.48 As set out above, the proposal would give rise short to medium term adverse effects on landscape character and would contribute to an incremental erosion of the undeveloped character of the site and its wider setting. Whilst mitigation measures, including extensive landscaping would reduce these effects over time they would not entirely remove the underlying change in character.
- 14.49 In relation to the Dorset National Landscape, the development would not conserve the existing character of the site, albeit the site is outside of the Dorset National Landscape, and would not amount to an enhancement to the setting of the natural beauty of the National Landscape. The statutory duty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 has been engaged and given due regard in reaching this conclusion.
- 14.50 The extent of harm is moderated by the presence of existing development in the surrounding area and is not assessed as significant in EIA terms and is considered to be low to negligible harm in the longer term once mitigation planting is established and has grown
- 14.51 The proposal includes mitigation measures, including extensive planting, design controls and long-term management, which would reduce visual effects and provide some landscape and ecological benefits over time. These benefits do not necessarily outweigh or negate the harm identified, but are relevant to the overall planning assessment.
- 14.52 The proposal would not fully comply with ENV1(i) & (ii) as it would result in some harm to the character of the National Landscape and while it would detract from the local landscape character, it would relate to a site where existing development is of visually poor quality and provide opportunities to secure visual enhancements through landscaping. The proposal would comply with policy ENV1(iii) as appropriate measures would be taken to moderate the adverse effects of development on the landscape through landscaping.

- 14.53 The proposal would comply with policy ECON7(i) & (ii) as it would be well located in relation to existing facilities and it would form part of a long-term management plan. It would comply with policy ECON7(iii) as it would not have cumulatively a significant adverse impact on the distinctive characteristics of the area's landscape. The proposal would comply with policy ECON7(iv) as it would include an appropriate landscape scheme and provision for its ongoing maintenance.
- 14.54 The proposal would comply with DNLP policy A1d as it would expand sustainably managed woodlands and greater numbers of trees outside woodlands. The proposal would partially comply with DNLP policy A2a as it would conserve and celebrate Dorset's historic environment.
- 14.55 The proposal would not comply with s85 of the CROW Act which seeks to actively further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of National Landscapes.
- 14.56 NPPF policy N4 recognises that proposals for major development within Protected Landscapes should be refused other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. The proposal would partially comply with NPPF policy N4 as the scale and extent of development would be limited and sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts.
- 14.57 These matters are to be weighed in the overall planning balance, taking into account the identified harm to the setting of the Dorset National Landscapes, alongside the benefits of the proposal. Therefore, the proposals are considered to either fully or partially comply (as set out above) with policies ENV1, ENV3, ECON7, DNLP Policies A1d, Policy A2a, S85 of the CROW Act 2000 and the NPPF.

Consideration of the World Heritage Site

- 14.58 The coastal strip to the south of the proposals is within the Dorset and East Devon World Heritage Site (WHS).
- 14.59 The Dorset and East Devon Coast, known as 'The Jurassic Coast', lies on the South Coast of England. In 2001 the Jurassic Coast was inscribed as a World Heritage Site (WHS) by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) for the Outstanding Universal Value of its rocks, fossils, and landforms. It remains England's only natural World Heritage Site.
- 14.60 The setting of the Jurassic Coast is described in the Jurassic Coast Partnership Plan (2020 – 2025) and has dual definitions: an experiential setting and a functional setting as set out below:
- 14.61 The 'Experiential' setting should be regarded as the surrounding landscape and seascape, and concerns the quality of the cultural and sensory experience surrounding the exposed coasts and beaches... ... An assessment of landscape and seascape character provides a starting point for evaluation of the impact of change in the setting. The special qualities of the [National Landscapes] AONBs, such as tranquillity and undeveloped character of coast and seascapes, are important for helping to determine how people experience and enjoy the setting of the WHS.
- 14.62 The 'Functional' setting is in the context of a moving boundary that keeps pace with erosion, the setting is important because development and activity within it may sooner or later impact on the World Heritage Site itself... ...the Site, most notably the coastal landforms and processes, are defined and explained by past and present geomorphological and

hydrological systems that extend landward and seaward. Developments that impact on these systems may well have a resulting impact within the Site itself.

- 14.63 The Setting for the WHS can be helpfully interpreted using the description of the landscape character type of the area, Ridge and Vale, the key feature being the broad evenly spaced ridges and valleys which follow a west-east alignment. The landscape characteristics of the Ridge and Vale within the setting of the WHS therefore provide important context and wider visible evidence that supports and illustrates the geological features for which the coastline was inscribed.
- 14.64 Bowleaze Cove exists at the margin of Weymouth and is the last significantly developed area of the coast moving eastward until reaching Swanage. It therefore acts as an important transition point between the developed coastline outside of the WHS and the natural coastline within the WHS. The undeveloped nature of the WHS, and its characteristic of being defined by ongoing natural processes, is key to its presentation both in the quality of people's experience of it and in how they understand and appreciate it as a natural and dynamic environment, which itself is another key attribute of the Site's inscription. Taken in isolation the proposed development would not necessarily represent significant impacts to the setting of the WHS. In the opinion of the Principal Officer World Heritage consultation response, there has been an overall cumulative impact in this area following a number of changes and developments since 2001. Since 2001, eleven planning applications have been granted consent that, overall, have set a trajectory of increased urbanisation of the area around Bowleaze.
- 14.65 The view of the World Heritage Site officer is that this trajectory of development around Bowleaze is having the effect of disrupting the visual connectivity between the coast and the ridge and vale character of the landscape, diminishing the crucial visible relationship between the structural and stratigraphic attribute of the WHS and its wider context. In addition, diminishing the transition from urban to undeveloped coast by increased urbanisation, changes in land use, and encroachment onto the WHS itself. This trend has a negative impact to the overall presentation of the WHS, especially in regard to major access paths and routes towards it and views into and out of the site.
- 14.66 The proposed extension to Weymouth Bay Holiday Park introduces further loss of open, undeveloped land along a well-used access route to the WHS, reduces the important fragmented character of the urban fringe and impacts the transition to undeveloped open coastline and rural setting for the WHS. This will be weighed in the planning balance.

Summary

- 14.67 The proposed development would result in changes to the landscape character and visual amenity, including within the setting of the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site.
- 14.68 As set out above, the proposal would give rise to short to medium term adverse effects on landscape character and would contribute to an incremental erosion of the undeveloped character of the site and its wider setting. Whilst mitigation measures, including extensive landscaping would reduce these effects over time they would not entirely remove the underlying change in character.
- 14.69 In relation to the Dorset and East Devon Coast World Heritage Site, the proposal would not affect its Outstanding Universal Value directly, but would give rise to harm to its setting, particularly in respect of the experiential qualities of the landscape and the transition

between developed and undeveloped coastline. This harm is incremental but nonetheless material and must be afforded weight in the planning balance.

- 14.70 The extent of harm is moderated by the presence of existing development in the surrounding area and is not assessed as significant in EIA terms. However, these impacts remain important material considerations.
- 14.71 The proposal includes mitigation measures, including extensive planting, design controls and long-term management, which would reduce visual effects and provide some landscape and ecological benefits over time. These benefits do not outweigh or negate the harm identified but are relevant to the overall assessment.
- 14.72 The proposal is considered to partially comply with policies ENV1 and to comply with the NPPF policy HE8 in so far as it would not lead to substantial harm or loss. The Jurassic Coast Partnership Plan ended on 31 December 2025. However, the proposal would partially comply with policy R4 which seeks to protect elements of landscape character, seascape, seabedscape, natural beauty, biodiversity and cultural heritage that constitute the WHS's functional or experiential setting from inappropriate development. These are considerations in the planning balance at the end of the report. These matters are to be weighed in the overall planning balance, taking into account the identified harm to the World Heritage Site, alongside the benefits of the proposal.

Heritage assets

- 14.73 The proposals would affect the setting of a number of designated heritage assets. These are: Preston Roman Villa, The Romano-Celtic temple and associated remains at Jordan Hill, The Grade II* Church of St Andrew and potential archaeological deposits in the area surrounding these.
- 14.74 The Preston Roman Villa was likely the centrepiece of an agricultural economy and may be compared to rural estates. The villa has been partially excavated and found to contain both a north and western range (building) and a highly decorated mosaic. The archaeological finds recovered during those excavations suggest a 3rd to 4th century date for the occupation of the villa which is contemporary with the use of Roman temple on Jordon Hill to the south. Preston Roman villa sits within the main caravan park to the north of the application site and is surrounded on all but its western side by the existing caravan park. Indeed, caravans are positioned over the monument, as is a works yard. The increased capacity of the park will make no noticeable difference to the already significantly compromised setting of the Roman Villa.
- 14.75 The Romano Celtic Temple on Jordon Hill was likely built and used throughout the Roman period from the mid first century AD to the late fourth/early fifth century AD. Situated on the South Dorset Downs on Jordan Hill, a south-facing chalk ridge overlooking Weymouth Bay to the south. The temple benefits from far reaching views in almost every direction. Whilst modern residential development to the south has obscured the closest views of the sea from the temple, a general sense of an isolated, coastal, rolling, rural landscape can still be appreciated. This contributes to the significance of the monument. The Roman temple has far reaching views over the undulating landscape to the west of Weymouth. Whilst it is highly likely that the temple and villa have a contemporaneous relationship, there is no intervisibility between the two due to the topography. In northern views from the temple site an extensive array of static caravans can be seen in the distance, whilst these are visually distracting,

they are not yet overbearing. A sense of the rolling chalk hills can still be appreciated, as can the temples' isolated location on the coastal fringe. However, this sense of isolation will continue to be eroded as the caravan parks increase in scale, size, and progress towards the monument. The proposals would contribute to that gradual erosion of isolation and rurality, extending the caravan park in a southerly direction and bringing development closer to the monument. Due to the topography, the western extension will not be intervisible with the temple, and whilst the eastern extension will be more apparent, it will be seen in the context of the existing park.

- 14.76 The Church of St Andrew is a 14th century church with a 16th century tower within a churchyard and is a prominent landmark in the village of Preston. The views out from the church and back towards the church tower from within open countryside contribute to the appreciation and understanding of the origins of the church as a rural parish church and its close connection with the landscape. Whilst the proposals would contribute to the erosion of the surrounding rurality and connection with the agricultural landscape of the church of St Andrew, visibility to the application site is limited.
- 14.77 The site potentially has archaeological deposits, and investigation was carried out by the applicant. The trial trenching, which builds on the results of the earlier geophysical survey, has identified prehistoric settlement remains in the eastern part of the site. Trial trenches could not be excavated on part of the site because of the presence of hemlock. The prehistoric remains do not merit preservation in situ, but those remains that would be affected by the development should be recorded in advance, thus preserving these by record. The part of the site currently 'out of bounds' because of hemlock should be investigated archaeologically as well once it is safe to do so. The significance of these deposits is important in consideration of the evolution of occupation of this landscape.
- 14.78 The setting of St Andrew's Church has been compromised in the past by the location of 3 caravans immediately west of and adjacent to the church and church yard. The proposals would include relocation of these 3 bases for the siting of static caravans to elsewhere in the existing park.
- 14.79 Therefore, there would be impacts from the proposals on the setting of these heritage assets. The statements in Section 5.6 and 5.7 of the Cultural Heritage Statement, and F5.8 and F5.9 of Chapter F of the Environmental Statement, conclude that the proposals would result in harm on the significance of the Roman Temple and the Church of St Andrew.. It should be noted that Historic England and The Dorset Council Conservation Officer raise no objection.

Summary

- 14.80 Policy HE6 of the NPPF provides when considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). Development proposals which would have a positive effect on a designated heritage asset should be supported. Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal. Important public benefits can include securing the long-term reuse of a vacant or underused listed building, and enabling energy efficiency and low carbon heating measures to be employed. The Roman Temple and Roman Villa are Scheduled Monuments and therefore designated heritage

assets of the highest significance. The Church of St Andrew is also a designated heritage asset of high significance.

- 14.81 Local Plan Policy ENV4 requires that development should conserve and where appropriate enhance the significance of a heritage asset or its setting. Any harm to the significance of a designated or non-designated heritage asset must be justified. Applications will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Where harm can be justified, appropriate provision will be required to capture and record features, followed by analysis and where appropriate making findings publicly available. NP Policy W45 outlines that development proposals must not cause harm to heritage assets and their setting.
- 14.82 The proposed development would introduce additional built form into the setting of these assets, including the Roman Temple and the Church of St Andrew, which are currently experienced in a more open and pastoral context. This would result in a degree of harm to their significance through a change in their setting, including the erosion of openness and the extension of tourism-related development into views and surroundings which contribute to their appreciation.
- 14.83 There is harm identified, but. The assets themselves would not be physically affected, and the intervening landform, existing development and proposed mitigation planting would limit the extent of visual and spatial change.
- 14.84 The proposal includes mitigation measures including landscape planting, layout design, relocation of 3 caravans to the west of St Andrew's Church and archaeological investigation and recording, which would reduce the impact on the setting of heritage assets. However, these measures would not entirely remove the harm arising from the change in character of the site and its surroundings.
- 14.85 In accordance with the NPPF, great weight has been given to the conservation of these heritage assets. The harm identified must therefore be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
- 14.86 The proposal would not fully comply with Local Plan Policy ENV4 or Neighbourhood Plan Policy W45, as it would not conserve the significance of heritage assets. However, the identified level of harm is limited and, subject to the consideration of public benefits, may be capable of being justified in accordance with policy HE6 of the NPPF. These are considerations in the planning balance at the end of the report.

Biodiversity

- 14.87 The application has been supported by ecological assessments and is proposed to deliver 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. More than 34 ha of the application site would be used for landscape and ecological mitigation and enhancement, with 16.3ha providing new landscaping and planting, and 18.5ha remaining as existing and utilised for potential BNG delivery.
- 14.88 The proposals include measures such as wildflower meadow creation, enhancement of reedbeds, new tree and hedgerow planting, and the provision of ecological features including bird boxes, bug hotels and log piles.
- 14.89 New permissive paths and on-site recreational routes are proposed to manage visitor behaviour and mitigate potential recreational pressures on designated and non-designated heritage sites.

- 14.90 Whilst these measures provide ecological enhancements, it is necessary to consider the extent to which these offset the ecological impacts arising from the development, including habitat loss, fragmentation and changes to ecological connectivity.
- 14.91 The coastal strip to its south is within the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs Special Area of Conservation (SAC), and the South Dorset Coast Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

Recreational impacts on the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC

- 14.92 The application lies within easy walking distance from the SAC located at Bowleaze Cove and the neighbouring coastal slopes and headland. The beach itself and the adjacent vegetated coastal slopes are all likely to support SAC qualifying habitats or play a role in maintaining the structure and function (including typical species) of the qualifying natural habitats.
- 14.93 With regard to likely impacts, there are public rights of way and associated desire lines that connect Bowleaze Cove and adjacent coastal slopes and the headland from the Holiday Park and proposed extension. These existing footpaths provide a convenient circular route from the Holiday Park to the coastal headland to the east of the Bowleaze Cove and back via Bowleaze Cove. It is therefore likely that the proposals will lead to an increase in recreational use of these routes which includes formal and informal access routes through and into the SAC.
- 14.94 The revised scheme provides for significant new permitted footpath routes, along with additional recreational enhancement measures as set out in paragraph 4.7 of the proposed mitigation and enhancement measures (ref 31473/04/JFB/HAR) and the annotated drawing of the proposed Footpath and Dog Walking Routes (Ref 106/09 February 2026). These are:

New footpath signage.

Provide a circular route within the Park;
Encourage dog walkers to use this route;
Encourage walkers to keep dogs on leads;
Provide pedestrian access to Jordan's Hill;
Help keep all users on the designated routes.

12 no. information boards.

Wildlife on site and the wider park;
Sensitive species and habitats present on the nearby designated sites; and,
Connecting routes available landward of the coast path, to promote inland public rights of way.

Welcome pack information for all overnight visitors

Provided to owners when they purchase a caravan with reminders issued annually; and,
Guests on each and every visit.

5 no. rubbish bins (including dog waste)

Strategic points within the site
Across the wider park – where these are not already provided
Perimeter and exit points to reduce the risk of littering beyond the park boundary.

Staff Training

Managers, rangers, reception team and landscape team.

- 14.95 Natural England raises no objection to the assessment that with these submitted measures in place the additional accommodation enabled by the development would avoid adverse impacts through additional recreational use of land within the Isle of Portland to Studland Bay SAC. These measures would need to be secured through a s106 agreement.

Assessment of potential loss of Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC supporting habitats.

- 14.96 A key conservation objective for the SAC is to maintain, “The structure and function (including typical species) of qualifying natural habitats”. The habitats within the SAC include a range of specialist invertebrates which are functionally linked to the SAC. The applicant has carried out a comprehensive invertebrate survey. An “Additional Habitat Enhancement Strategy (v2)” has been provided in support of the application. The additional enhancement measures rely on a commitment to enhance the fields on Jordans Hill from ‘Moderate’ to ‘Good’ condition, as defined by the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Statutory Metric guidance, and the creation of significant new areas of scrub habitats which once established will help support the invertebrates. The area of woodland planting should be limited to that required to provide an adequate visual screen for the caravan park and the area of species rich scrub maximised and designed to create new edge habitats favoured by invertebrates.
- 14.97 The habitat enhancement measures proposed for the duration of the scheme would mitigate any adverse impacts on the SAC. A Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) would be required as part of the statutory BNG approval process and will be secured by a s106 agreement.

Priority Habitats – Reedbeds

- 14.98 Reedbeds are considered a priority habitat for conservation in the UK. They are listed as a UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP) priority habitat and also under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. This designation reflects their importance for biodiversity and the threats they face from habitat loss and degradation. The scheme will result in the loss of 5% of the existing reedbed. This loss of reedbed habitat is anticipated within the scheme in order to accommodate the required flood compensation area. It is stated that the retained reedbed habitats will “be enhanced to a higher ecological condition through targeted enhancement measures and monitoring, which will be prescribed within a LEMP and the HMMP”. Further, new areas of reedbed will be created to ensure an overall increase in reed bed habitat. The areas of new reed bed and grassland would be in the vicinity of the River Jordan corridor and north of Waterside Holiday Park to extend the retained high priority reed bed habitat west of Parcel B. This represents a replacement and enhancement strategy rather than avoidance of harm. The loss of established habitat is therefore material, notwithstanding that overall habitat extent and condition may improve over time.
- 14.99 The effectiveness of this mitigation is dependent on successful establishment, appropriate management and long-term monitoring, secured through a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) and Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP).

Ecological corridors and bat foraging habitats

- 14.100 The application site lies within the River Jordan Floodplain Corridor and Bowleaze Gap Corridor identified in the 'Urban Wildlife Corridors and Stepping Stones: Weymouth & Portland Borough – Addendum (September 2020)' report as the River Jordan Floodplain Corridor. The wildlife corridors identified in the report are considered important for bat foraging and also likely for migratory birds. The wildlife corridors comprise for the most part grasslands.
- 14.101 The loss of over two thirds of the identified wildlife corridor would result in a very significant narrowing of the corridor (from 140m to 40m). This represents a significant change to the spatial extent and functionality of the corridor and would result in a loss of ecological capacity and flexibility for future enhancement.
- 14.102 Whilst habitat enhancement measures including planting and management, would improve the quality of retained areas, they would not fully compensate for the reduction in width and the associated loss of openness and permeability.
- 14.103 Proposed mitigation measures include enhancement of the grasslands and significant new woodland planting, designed to help screen the proposals. This would be a 30 year on-site commitment to an Additional Habitat Enhancement Strategy to secure the long-term management of the east-west corridor. The light spill modelling prepared by Lumenata across the entire site has been provided to understand the effects on N-S and E-W connectivity for nocturnal species. This modelling demonstrates that post-development, light levels are acceptable in all areas considered suitable for bat habitat, which will reflect the request for a Dark Skies approach by National Landscapes.
- 14.104 The above measures would be secured by conditions and/or s106 and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) documentation. The conditions would secure implementation of the habitat creation and enhancement, lighting, a Construction Ecological Management (CEMP), a Precautionary Working Method Statement (PWMS) for reptiles, a Landscape and Ecological Management (LEMP) and a Biodiversity Gain Plan and Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan. A s106 would secure the maintenance and monitoring of the gains for 30 years. However, these measures are reliant on ongoing management and do not avoid the initial reduction in corridor extent. Natural England and the Dorset Council Natural Environment Team raise no objection to the proposed development and the mitigation proposed.

Summary

- 14.105 The principle of retaining and enhancing ecological networks is established in policy through policy N2 of the NPPF, and by Local Plan policy ENV2.
- 14.106 NP Policy W02 outlines that areas of benefit to nature and geological conservation must be retained and protected from detrimental negative impacts, and that development must not have an adverse effect on the integrity of Habitat sites. NP Policy W03 outlines that proposals that will have significant adverse effect on the integrity of habitat sites will not be supported (unless in exceptional circumstances). The policy requires impacts to biodiversity to be mitigated in accordance with the NPPF. NP Policy W04 requires development impacting Wildlife Corridors identified within the NP to accord with Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol (DBAP), enhance and extend the Wildlife Corridors where possible and minimise impact and undertake remedial action where Wildlife Corridors are impacted. NP Policy W05 requires

development to provide a minimum of 10% BNG, demonstrating provision of 20% BNG to be decided on a case-by-case basis, with ecological impacts considered from an early stage of design.

14.107 The proposed development would result in ecological impacts including:

- The loss of existing habitats, including a proportion of reedbed habitat.
- A significant narrowing of a recognised wildlife corridor, reducing its special extent and ecological functionality.
- Increased recreational pressure on nearby designated sites, including the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC.

14.108 These impacts represent harm to biodiversity and ecological networks. Whilst the level of harm is moderated by the existing use of the site and surrounding development, it is nevertheless material and must be acknowledged.

14.109 The proposal incorporates a comprehensive package of mitigation and enhancement measures, including habitat creation, long-term management, lighting controls and visitor management measures. These are expected to deliver biodiversity net gain and, over time improve the ecological value of the site.

14.110 Mitigation measures are proposed that fully mitigate for the impacts on the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC. In respect of the reed bed habitat and wildlife corridor the mitigation measures do not fully avoid or eliminate the identified harm, particularly in relation to habitat loss and fragmentation. The ecological benefits are, to a significant extent, dependent on the successful establishment and long term management of habitats.

14.111 On this basis, whilst the proposal is capable of delivering biodiversity gains and can be made policy compliant subject to mitigation and legal controls, it would result in residual ecological impacts which must be taken into account.

14.112 The weight to be given to these impacts, alongside the ecological benefits of the proposal, is a matter to be considered in the overall planning balance.

14.113 The proposal is considered to partially comply with local plan policy ENV2, ENV3, NP policies W02, W03, W04, W05 & W07 and the NPPF.

Flood risk & drainage

14.114 Flood risk and drainage have been considered through a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and supporting technical information. The site lies predominantly within Flood Zone 1 (low probability of fluvial flooding) with limited areas falling within Flood Zones 2 and 3, and parts of the site being identified as being at risk from surface water flooding.

Fluvial Flood Risk

14.115 In consideration of fluvial flood risk, the FRA demonstrates that development within areas at higher flood risk has been minimised, with the majority of built development located within Flood Zone 1. Where development is proposed within Flood Zone 3a (limited to 2 caravans), level-for-level flood compensation is proposed. This compensation would be provided prior to any associated raising of grounds levels, ensuing no loss of floodplain storage capacity. Subject to this approach, the development would not increase flood risk elsewhere and would not be unduly vulnerable to fluvial flooding.

Surface Water Flood Risk and Drainage

- 14.116 In consideration of surface water flooding, the proposal incorporates a sustainable drainage strategy designed to manage runoff and reduce flood risk both on and off site. This includes the use of attenuation features including a new attenuation basin, with discharge controlled to greenfield runoff rates.
- 14.117 The drainage strategy is informed by site investigation and demonstrates that a viable discharge route can be achieved. The proposals also show how existing areas of surface water flood risk within the site would be managed through layout, design and drainage infrastructure. Subject to detailed design secured by condition, the proposal is considered capable of managing surface water flood risk without increasing flood risk elsewhere. The latest surface water flooding information in the NAFRA2 has been reviewed and does not alter the conclusions reached.

Sequential test

- 14.118 Given that small parts of the site fall within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and areas of surface water flood risk, it is appropriate to apply the Sequential Test in a proportionate manner, in accordance with national policy. Caravans are a more vulnerable use under the vulnerability classification. The aim of the sequential test is to steer development to areas of the lowest probability of flooding.
- 14.119 The proposal comprises an extension to an existing holiday park and is operationally and functionally linked to that established use. As such, the scope for alternative sites is limited to land capable of accommodating an extension to the existing facility, including land that is suitably located relative to the existing park and its infrastructure.
- 14.120 In applying the Sequential Test, the key question is whether there are reasonably available sites at a lower risk of flooding that could accommodate the proposed development, having regard to its specific nature and locational requirements.
- 14.121 Given the need for the development to be physically and operationally connected to the existing holiday park, alternative sites elsewhere within Weymouth or beyond would not meet the functional requirements of the proposal and cannot reasonably be considered as sequentially preferable alternatives.
- 14.122 The FRA addresses the Sequential Test by suggesting that the site selected has the fewest constraints. Whilst it does not consider alternative locations beyond the site chosen, in applying the Sequential Test, consideration has been given to the availability of alternative sites within Weymouth. On this basis the applicant concludes that there are no reasonably available and suitable alternative sites at a lower risk of flooding capable of accommodating an extension to the existing holiday park. However, it does not consider if the two caravans within flood zone 3a could be located in an area of the site at lower risk of flooding. This is an omission on the part of the applicant's sequential test and therefore it cannot be said that the sequential test has been fully satisfied.

Exception test

- 14.123 Only a limited part of the site is affected by higher flood risk, and generally the more vulnerable elements of the development are located within areas of lowest flood risk. The part of the site where more vulnerable development remains affected is a small strip within flood risk zones 2 and 3 covering the outer extremity of Area B which would contain 2

caravans. These 2 caravans would only partially be within the flood zone. Access/egress to both caravans would not be affected by the flood risk zone.

- 14.124 The FRA demonstrates that, through site design, floodplain compensation and drainage measures, the development would be safe for its lifetime and would not increase flood risk elsewhere.
- 14.125 The proposal would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community in terms of the economic benefits of the development and environmental enhancements that are considered to outweigh the flood risk and the development would be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall in accordance with NPPF policy F6.
- 14.126 On this basis, the Exception Test is considered to be satisfied.

Residual Risk and Emergency Planning

- 14.127 Residual risks associated with extreme flood events would be managed through appropriate site design and emergency planning. A site-specific evacuation plan would be secured by condition to ensure safe access and egress for occupants and emergency services during flood events. The surface water management scheme would consist of swales and an attenuation basin immediately south of Area B. The swale and attenuation basin final details would form part of a condition which would also ensure that it would be safe for the public.

Infrastructure and Consultation

- 14.128 There is no evidence to suggest that the capability of the public sewerage system and mains water supply would not cope with the additional capacity. The proposals are in the Treatment Works Catchment of Wessex Water, which is the statutory undertaker. Whilst no comments have been received, Wessex Water does have a duty to provide for increased demand for its services.

Summary

- 14.129 The proposal has generally been designed sequentially to direct development to areas of lowest flood risk within the site and incorporates appropriate mitigation measures, including floodplain compensation and sustainable drainage systems.
- 14.130 Whilst parts of the site are affected by flood risk, this has been addressed through layout, design and mitigation. The sequential test is not considered to have been passed, but as set out above the exceptions test is passed. It is considered, that subject to conditions the development would be safe for its lifetime and would not increase flood risk elsewhere.
- 14.131 The proposal would satisfy policy F7 of the NPPF as the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient, it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, any residual risk can be safely managed and safe access and escape routes can be included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.
- 14.132 The Environment Agency and Dorset Council Flood Risk Management Team raise no objection

14.133 Subject to conditions and detailed design of the swales and attenuation basin the proposal is considered to comply with local plan policy ENV5 and the NPPF.

Trees and hedgerows

14.134 The proposal would encroach into adjacent areas of land that are predominantly scrub land of mixed species and hedgerows. The proposal would provide the planting of a minimum of 4,174 trees and result in the loss of only one tree, works to the crowns of 4 trees and removal of only 7 sections of hedgerow as set out in the table below

Table 3 - Details of tree/hedgerow loss

Schedule No	Description	Total length/area/unit	Length/area/unit removed	Percentage loss
6	Mixed broadleaf hedgerow	260 m	6 m	2%
8	Mixed broadleaf hedgerow	225 m	8 m	3.5%
19	Group of goat willow	501 m ²	150 m ²	30%
20	Mixed broadleaf hedgerow	942 m ²	306 m ²	32.5%
23	Mixed broadleaf hedgerow	320 m	6 m	1.8%
24	Mixed broadleaf hedgerow	255 m	6 m	2.35%
25	Group of hawthorn and blackthorn	1561 m ²	132 m ²	8.5%
26	Group of Monterey cypress	3 trees	1 tree	33.33%
51	Mixed broadleaf hedgerow	255 m	5.5 m	2%

14.135 The Keen Consultants, Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) ref: 2392-KC-XXYTREE-TreeSurvey-and-ImpactAssessment-RevC date: September 2025 and Tree protection Plan ref: 2392-KC-XX-YTREE-TPP01RevE have been supplied as supporting documents and would be acceptable. Conditions would be required for an arboricultural Method Statement and tree protection during development.

14.136 The tree Officer raises no objection.

Summary

14.137 The proposal is considered to avoid damage or loss of trees, woodland, orchards or hedgerow and where lost they would be replaced with new landscaping proposals elsewhere on the site. It would comply with local plan policy ENV5, NP Policy W06 and the NPPF.

Highway safety

- 14.138 Vehicular access would be taken from the existing primary access points for Seaview and Weymouth Bay holiday parks onto the A353 Preston Road. There are bus stops along the A353 and a number of footpath links head south towards the coast and into Weymouth town.
- 14.139 The proposal would add an additional 241 units, representing an increase of approximately a third above current operations. The applicant has provided trip generation data for a peak period at the holiday park, June 2022 (the platinum jubilee bank holiday weekend) and in October 2024, a neutral time, reflecting outside of the seasonal peak, both for the holiday park and on the highway network and August 2025. This forms the foundations to the Transport Assessment (TA).
- 14.140 The submitted transport assessment indicated the proposal would generate an extra 400 daily movements (an anticipated increase of 2.4% of road users during operation relative to traffic surveys undertaken in August 2025). Compared to the existing 2,200 daily movements at the Weymouth Bay access highlighted in the transport assessment, the proposed vehicular trip generation for an increase of a third appears to be on the low side. However, sensitivity testing is within the updated assessment that indicates the additional vehicle demand would have a modest impact on the surrounding highway network. In principle, and subject to measures to prioritise sustainable transport being provided alongside the development, this is acceptable.
- 14.141 It is understood that the additional units would be implemented incrementally over a number of years. This would help to both reduce the intensity of construction works but also giving the operator a chance to adapt and evolve how park arrivals operate in response to increasing demand to the site. Development is to be brought forward on a phased basis, over a period of approximately six years and six phases. Each phase would deliver between 28 and 56 bases and construction of the first phase would start between Autumn 2026 and Spring 2027. A condition would secure this.
- 14.142 Each caravan would be provided with 2 parking spaces. The existing car park at the entrance is managed by an attendant or gate staff and is adequate to cope with the increased demand for staff and visitors.
- 14.143 The proposals could increase demand, particularly for arrivals which are concentrated at particular times and have potential to queue onto the adjacent A353. The applicant has moved the check in point further into the site, which was approved as part of another application. This will provide increased capacity and resilience to deal with extra arrivals and it was recommended that this change to the access is implemented in advance of the submitted proposal.
- 14.144 The proposals would also increase demand for travel by foot, cycle and bus to and from the site. Existing bus stops are at times very well utilised, with insufficient shelter space to accommodate demand. To ensure sustainable travel is promoted, the following upgrades are being provided by the applicant:

Bus stops

- 14.145 Visitors and staff can use the local bus services to access Weymouth town centre and beyond to key coastal destinations. There is an opportunity to improve the bus stop infrastructure near to the development site to encourage visitors and staff to use the local bus services. Inclusion of real time information displays at bus stops can encourage bus journeys as it would provide passengers accurate information of when the next bus is arriving and make users aware of any delays. Therefore, the following are proposed:

- Weymouth Bay Access: Westbound stop including enhanced shelter facilities and provision of improved passenger information;
- Weymouth Bay Access: Eastbound stop. New real time passenger information;
- Fisher Bridge, Westbound to include a new shelter and passenger information.

These would be secured through a financial contribution to the sum of £43,500 to encourage public transport use by a s106 agreement.

Bicycles

- 14.146 Expansion of the bike hire network and promotion of opportunities to cycle in the local area would align with central government's vision for half of all journeys in towns and cities to be cycled or walked by 2030. Therefore, the following is proposed:
- Bike hire: A contribution towards the expansion of the e-cycle hire scheme, currently operated by Beryl Bikes. This would include a new station with 6 parking spaces and funding for four bikes. This would be secured by a contribution of £10,900, to be secured by a s106 agreement.
 - Cycle parking: While accepted that people will generally store their cycles at their car and/or caravan, there also needs to be provision for parking of these for trips across the site. The provision of two Sheffield stands, or similar.

Footpaths

- 14.147 The Footpath and dog walking proposals (drawing 106/9) indicate a footway connection from Area G through towards to Forehill Close. The proposed development is also likely to increase demand on this link. This is acceptable in principle, subject to full details and being secured by a s106 agreement.
- 14.148 There are a number of Rights of way across the site and a linked footpath to David Bellamy Way. These are not affected by the proposals.

Construction

- 14.149 To ensure that the negative impacts of construction are minimised, details would be required by condition of a construction and traffic management programme (CTMP).
- 14.150 Dorset Council Highways Team raise no objection.

Summary

- 14.151 Local plan policy COM7 concerns creating a safe and efficient transport network. NP policy W41 requires development to result in no harmful impacts on local services, roads and other infrastructure. NP policy W46 requires development to identify the realistic level of traffic generated from the development, maximise active travel opportunities and support public transport schemes and infrastructure where possible and NP policy W47 demonstrates that proposals that improve public transport infrastructure and services without unacceptable harm will be supported.
- 14.152 The proposal is considered to not lead to an unacceptable impact on highway safety and would comply with local plan policy COM7, NP policies W41, W46 and W47 and the NPPF.

Amenity

- 14.153 Whilst a significant majority of the proposals would be distant from neighbouring dwellings, area G would be located within proximity to a number of dwellings in Forehill Close, the closest being 14-22 Forehill Close (even numbers) & 27. These dwellings are houses with an orientation that varies, although the gardens directly overlook the open space to the south and east where the proposals would be located. The principal rear elevations of 14-22 also directly overlook this open space, while the side elevation of 27 faces the open space but has outlook from the front elevation across it. Clearly, the proposals could potentially have implications for the amenity of occupants both from within the houses as well as using their gardens in terms of overlooking, overshadowing, overbearing and loss of view. This is considered below.
- 14.154 The proposals would seek to address the amenity of the occupants of these dwellings by providing a buffer zone between the houses and the caravans. This buffer would comprise landscaping varying in width from 10m - 20m between the nearest three caravans lying on the outer edge of the proposals and the houses (not the gardens). It would also contain a footpath link to Forehill Close which would make use of an existing field gate access which leads onto the open space between the park and the sea. This footpath would be to provide access to the proposed footpaths and dog walking route in the open space.
- 14.155 The nearest caravan would be 17m from 27 Forehill Close and 33m from 22 Forehill Close. The footpath would be nearer to 14 – 22 & 27 Forehill Close than the caravans occupying a route from the access, described above, southwards. The footpath would extend further southwards across the open space along the rear of houses in Forehill Close, Maple Close, Sandbourne Road and Overcombe Drive. Whilst these are the principal roads facing the open space, potentially any dwelling within proximity to the open space could potentially be aware of the proposed footpath.
- 14.156 The landscaping proposed would, in the fullness of time, screen the caravans from these dwellings. The landscaping would potentially reduce the impact on the outlook from some of the houses and their gardens. The landscaping would not be to such an extent to overbear or overshadow although there would be inevitably a loss of view. There is no absolute right to a view within the planning system.
- 14.157 The caravans and the footpaths would bring a degree of activity within proximity of the existing houses. It is noted that the amount of activity directly attributable to occupants of the caravans would most likely amount to the three nearest to houses. It is also noted that the existing caravan park extends close to the rear boundary of 27 Forehill Close bringing with it a degree of noise from activities thereon. With the degree of separation proposed, it is expected that the potential intrusion of occupants of caravans in terms of noise from outdoor activity, coming and going and overlooking would not be to such an extent as to warrant an unacceptable loss of amenity for occupants of the houses.
- 14.158 It is noted that the access from Forehill Close onto the open space is already well used by walkers. It is not a public right of way, but used nonetheless. The route is not delineated clearly on the ground. It is not considered that continued use by walkers accessing the open space would lead to significant intrusion as users would be transitory and limited in number, the majority seeking access to Forehill Close to reach services in Preston Road and the vicinity of it.

- 14.159 A large number of representations have been raised about potential noise and general disturbance (from traffic, music, people, pets, car doors, gardeners, 'fairground' type attractions, construction work, etc). The area is already characterised by caravan park activity, not only from Weymouth Bay Park, as well as (amongst other things) activity from those using the open space between the park and the sea and those visiting Bowleaze Cove for recreation. The proposal, with the exception of area G described above, are located well away from residential development. Given these factors, it is not considered that the proposals would give rise to additional undue loss of amenity for existing residents and users of the open space in terms of noise and general disturbance.
- 14.160 There are concerns about the loss of open space for recreation including dog walking. There are no adopted public rights of way directly affected by the proposals. Area G would occupy land that is currently used informally, but an alternative route to the south is proposed as part of the proposals. Areas A, D and E are much less used and alternative routes would be provided.
- 14.161 The proposals would not be likely to directly lead to an increase in antisocial behaviour and crime (including wildfires) in whatever form and wherever it takes place. The proposal would be within the extended park where staff would actively patrol and where there would be natural passive surveillance by occupants of caravans. There is already a lack of surveillance within the open spaces. It is considered that with the more distinguishable footpaths proposed in the open space, natural surveillance by other users would be improved.

Summary

- 14.162 The proposal is considered to safeguard amenity. The proposal would comply with local plan policy ENV16 and the NPPF.

Economic Considerations

- 14.163 Consideration is given to the benefits of the proposal. There are potential economic and social benefits. The applicant has provided supporting information within the Socio-economic assessment in the ES. This is outlined below.
- 14.164 The proposed development would attract significant new private investment, support new jobs and generate additional visitor expenditure at an existing holiday park, which the applicant has set out as follows:
- A capital investment of c.£19.6 million to be spent on a three-year construction period;
 - The creation of 81 direct full time equivalent (FTE) jobs per annum through the build period. These would support a further 97 indirect/induced FTE jobs per annum;
 - The generation of c.£17.9 million (direct and indirect) Gross Value Added (GVA) per annum across the construction period, comprising £7.9 million direct GVA and £10.0 million indirect GVA which equates to a total of £53.8 million direct and indirect GVA across the construction period;
 - c.£5.56 million (on and off-site) visitor expenditure per annum and c.£3.56 million indirect expenditure per annum equating to a total of £9.12 million spending per annum, plus a total of £423,000 in maintenance expenditure per annum;
 - The creation of 103 direct FTE jobs, comprising 59 jobs on-site and 44 jobs off-site, which would support the creation of an additional 66 indirect and induced FTE jobs; and,

- The increased expenditure associated with the additional lodges will support a total of £6.2 million (direct and indirect) GVA per annum.
- The nature of the new jobs would reflect the economic profile of the area, which relies on the tourism industry, and will help to increase the economic contribution of this sector.

- 14.165 In addition to the economic benefits outlined above, the proposed development would provide social and community benefits through the provision of training, job and career opportunities. This provision is particularly important for Weymouth Bay in order to support the retention of young people in the area, given the context of the ageing population in Dorset.
- 14.166 Support for the proposal was received from the Economic Development Officer from a tourism development point of view. The provision of additional accommodation in this location would be appropriate and beneficial to the local economy, plus supporting the council's ambition to increase visitor spend to Dorset by 5% by 2029.
- 14.167 Local plan policy ECON7 supporting text recognises that caravan and camping sites are key components of the area's stock of self catering tourist accommodation. It provides support in principle subject to considerations made in relation to the principles set out in this report. NPPF policies E4 and S5 recognise the importance of businesses that support tourism. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development.
- 14.168 In light of local plan policy ECON7 and NPPF policies E4 and S5 support, there would be economic benefits which are considerations to be weighed in the planning balance. It is acknowledged that economic benefits will take time to accrue as the proposals would be developed in phases over a period of years.

Other matters

- 14.169 Concerns have been raised that the proposals would be excessive, overdevelopment, there are enough caravans, the developer is profiteering and the community pays. The quantum of development is that sought by this application and assessment has been made as to whether the quantum can be accommodated in this location having regard in this report to impacts on landscape, biodiversity, flood risk and so on. It is considered that 'need' and a developer's profit (or loss) are not planning considerations. Consideration can be given to whether the need and thus the provision of additional caravans would support tourism and other businesses and services, which are valid planning considerations. Consideration of 'betterment' in so far as the comments made that the 'community pays', house prices may be affected and competition with local businesses are not planning considerations.
- 14.170 The additional visitor numbers that would be likely generated from the proposal would potentially require support from local infrastructure (GP surgeries, emergency services, etc). Owing to the relatively infrequent and transitory nature of demand, it would not be expected that any additional demand would be onerous or unmet by existing services.
- 14.171 The existing facilities on the park would be sufficient to support the additional users. Some extensions to the main entertainment complex where the amusements, café and pool are located are planned with planning permission. More recent improvement has been seen in the outdoor activity areas. The proposals also include new footpaths with information boards which would add to the facilities on offer, as well as visitor enjoyment.

- 14.172 Additional bins are proposed within the open space which would help reduce littering and dog fouling.
- 14.173 The proposals would lead to an increase in employment including for seasonal workers. Seasonal employment is considered to be beneficial to the economy.
- 14.174 The mains gas pipeline which travels south of the park would not be affected.
- 14.175 It is noted that there have been previous applications for additional caravans refused planning permission (see planning history above). These decisions were made in different circumstances (such as the policy at the time) and in different locations and do not bear significantly in consideration of the proposals now being considered.
- 14.176 The mobile phone mast that would be removed is operational, but the lease has expired.
- 14.177 Health & Safety, including safe storage of Calor gas tanks and electric vehicles, is covered by specific legislation and licencing that governs these matters. The current site licence on record for this site is Ref HO/TO/TE/83/89/1995/1/PAL dated 4th April 2000 and has a restricted occupancy between 1st March and 14th January.
- 14.178 As the caravans are required for holiday use and would not be designed to be permanent dwellings and the impacts of the development have been assessed as such, a condition ensuring holiday use only and stating no use as a person's sole or main place of residence would be required.

15 Environmental implications

- 15.1 The proposal would lead to additional CO2 emissions from the construction of the proposed development and from the activities of future residents and occupiers.
- 15.2 The construction phase would include the release of CO2 emissions from workers vehicles during the construction process. CO2 emission would be produced as a result of the production and transportation of the building materials and during the construction process.
- 15.3 This has to be balanced against the benefits of providing holiday accommodation in a broadly sustainable location and should be offset against factors including the provision of electric car charging. At this stage, details of low-carbon and/or renewable energy technologies have not been specified.
- 15.4 NP Policy W000 (Environmental Implications) requires development should aim to meet 4 environmental objectives. The objectives fall within categories: Carbon Neutrality, Resource efficiency, Biodiversity Net Gain and Climate Change Management. Within each target there are a list of individual measures that should be taken.
- 15.5 It is considered that the proposals would go some way towards meeting the aims of policy W000 in terms of these objectives where applicable and in so far as a development of this type for caravans.

16 Summary of issues and the planning balance

- 16.1 The proposal would give rise to identified harm to the setting of the Dorset National Landscape. The proposal would give rise to short to medium term adverse effects on landscape character and would contribute to an incremental erosion of the undeveloped character of the site and its wider setting. Whilst mitigation measures, including extensive landscaping would reduce these effects over time to a low level they would not entirely remove the underlying change in character. The development would not amount to an enhancement of natural beauty. The statutory duty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 has therefore been engaged and given due regard in reaching this conclusion. It is noted however that whilst the landscape officer and the officer for the Dorset National Landscape acknowledge the low

level of residual harm in the longer term neither of them object to the proposed development due to the level of harm being so low it does not, in their view, warrant the refusal of the application. The level of harm identified to landscape character and the setting of the Dorset National Landscape is afforded some weight in the planning balance.

- 16.2 The proposal would not directly affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site, but would give rise to harm to its setting, particularly in respect of the experiential qualities of the landscape and the transition between developed and undeveloped coastline. This harm is incremental but nonetheless material and must be afforded weight in the planning balance.
- 16.3 The proposed development would introduce additional built form into the setting of designated heritage assets, including the Roman Temple and the Church of St Andrew, which are currently experienced in a more open and pastoral context. This would result in a degree of harm to their significance through a change in their setting, including the erosion of openness and the extension of tourism-related development into views and surroundings which contribute to their appreciation. Harm is identified, but the assets themselves would not be physically affected, and the intervening landform, existing development and proposed mitigation planting and removal of caravans in proximity to St Andrew's Church would limit the extent of visual and spatial change.
- 16.4 Residual ecological harm: The proposed development would result in ecological impacts including:
- The loss of existing habitats, including a proportion of reedbed habitat.
 - A significant narrowing of a recognised wildlife corridor, reducing its special extent and ecological functionality.
 - Increased recreational pressure on nearby designated sites, including the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC.
- These impacts represent harm to biodiversity and ecological networks. Whilst the proposal is capable of delivering biodiversity gains and can be made policy compliant subject to mitigation secured by condition and legal agreement it would result in residual ecological impacts which must be taken into account.
- 16.5 Against these impacts, the proposal is considered to deliver moderate economic benefits through tourism and employment. The proposals would bring public benefit in the provision of holiday accommodation which would support tourism in the Weymouth area. The Dorset Council Economic Development & Tourism Team support the proposals stating that the proposals in this location would be appropriate and beneficial to the local economy, plus supporting the council's ambition to increase visitor spend to Dorset by 5% by 2029.
- 16.6 The proposal would provide limited infrastructure improvements through the provision of additional footpath access to open space and enhancements to sustainable transport options.
- 16.7 The proposal would bring enhancement to the appearance of the existing park through the additional landscaping and the removal of caravans adjacent to St. Andrew's church.
- 16.8 The above public benefits are considered to outweigh the harm to heritage assets which has been identified.

- 16.9 The proposals would be acceptable in all other respects including in terms of flood risk, highway safety, amenity and other material considerations subject to the completion of a s106 legal agreement and planning conditions.
- 16.10 The benefits of the proposals need to be balanced against the identified harm. The proposals would be sustainable development bringing social, economic and environmental benefits. There would be a number of public benefits in the provision of new tourism accommodation, provision of footpath access within the open space, sustainable transport options including a bus shelter and Beryl bikes and provision of planting which would benefit the screening of the existing development from public viewpoints.
- 16.11 Whilst finely balanced it is considered that the benefits of the proposed development outweigh the identified impacts and the proposals are considered to constitute sustainable development when assessed against the development plan as a whole. For these reasons, the proposal is considered to comply with the policies of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan, the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan and the NPPF when taken as whole and material considerations do not indicate otherwise.

17. Recommendation

Recommendation A:

To delegate authority to the Service Manager for Development Management & Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager Southern & Western to grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out at the end of this report and the completion of a Section 106 Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (S106 agreement) to secure:

A contribution of £43,500 towards enhanced facilities at westbound and eastbound bus stops on the A353 by Weymouth Bay access and at Fisher Bridge;

A contribution of £10,900 towards a Beryl bike bay and the purchase of 4 new bikes;

The additional recreational enhancement measures as set out in paragraph 4.7 of the submitted document ref 31473/04/JFB/HAR and the annotated drawing of the proposed Footpath and Dog Walking Routes (Ref 106/09 February 2026) including footpath signage, 12 information boards, welcome pack and 5 rubbish bins (including dog waste);

A Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan to secure the maintenance and monitoring of the gains for 30 years;

Advanced planting: Mixed species native advanced stock and feathered trees planted between caravans and at the edges of development and areas of native scrub around the edges of area G and south of area E shown on plans AP01D, AP02D & AP03E; and,

subject to the following conditions:

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

106/01 C Site location plan

106/05 G Proposed site plan
 106/06 Existing & proposed site levels & cross sections
 106/07 Existing & proposed site levels & cross sections
 106/08 Proposed site levels
 2392-KC-XX-YTREE-TPP01 E Tree protection plan
 MP01 N Landscape masterplan
 AP02 D Advanced proposals - Area 2
 LP02 F Landscape proposals - Area B
 LP03 F Landscape proposals - Area D
 LP05 J Landscape proposals - Area G - West
 LP06 G Landscape proposals - Area G - East
 LP04 F Landscape proposals - Area E
 LP01 M Soft landscape parameters plan
 LPP01 H Landscape phasing plan
 AP01 D Advanced proposals - Area 1
 AP03 E Advanced proposals - Area 3
 FP01 G Footpath plan
 106-09 Footpath & Dog walking route proposals

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

2. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 3 No development shall commence until a phasing plan for the development has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved phasing plan.

Reason: To allow the development to proceed on a phased basis.

4. The caravans hereby approved shall be occupied for holiday purposes only; shall not be occupied as a person's sole, or main place of residence; and the owners/operators must maintain an up-to-date register of the names of all owners/occupiers of the caravans and of their main home addresses, and must make this information available at all reasonable hours at the request of a duly authorised officer of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that approved caravans are not used for unauthorised permanent residential occupation.

5. The following shall be removed and the land made good in accordance with a scheme which shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consideration of the relevant phase of the development:

3 caravans and bases from the west of St Andrew's church;

1 caravan and base from the west of Area D;

1 caravan and base from the north of Area E; and,

The telecommunications mast and associated infrastructure from Area G.

Reason: To secure the improvements to the appearance of the development.

6. Prior to the siting of the first caravan on any of the bases hereby permitted, parameters for the caravans shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Thereafter, any caravan sited must comply with the parameters agreed. The parameters shall include the external dimensions, finish and colour of the walls and roof of the caravan including details of all decking.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the development.

7. No development of any phase of development shall commence unless and until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This scheme shall cover archaeological fieldwork together with post-excavation work and publication of the results. Thereafter the development shall proceed strictly in accordance with the agreed programme.

Reason: To safeguard the archaeological remains in and around the site.

8. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (prepared by Thinkurban, Issue D dated January 2026) in conjunction with the Technical Note (prepared by Thinkurban, dated 25th November 2025), and the following specific details:

1. Finished site levels shall be set at least 300mm above the design flood level including climate change.

2. Caravan finished floor levels shall be set at least 600mm above the finished site level.

3. Caravans shall be "anchored" to the finished slab.

4. Compensatory floodplain storage shall be provided as shown in FRA Appendix H (drawing 172854_BL_SK_006 Revision D). The compensatory storage shall be completed prior to commencement of the associated proposed floodplain infill (western end of Area B).

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation of the development and in accordance with the scheme's timing/phasing arrangements. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants and to prevent increased flood risk elsewhere by ensuring that compensatory storage of flood water is provided.

9. No development of any phase of development shall commence unless and until a Flood Warning and Response Plan (FWRP) which must include an emergency evacuation plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development thereafter shall be carried out in accordance with the approved FWRP and shall be and managed and maintained in accordance with it.

Reason: In order to safeguard and minimise the risk posed to the site and its users from flooding.

10. Prior to the commencement of development, a Landscape Management Plan, detailing management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all proposed landscaped areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the Landscape Management Plan shall be implemented as approved and the landscaping managed and maintained in accordance with it and any trees or plants which, within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development, die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure that due regard is paid to the continuing enhancement and maintenance of amenity afforded by landscape features of communal, public, nature conservation or historical significance.

11. No development of any phase of development shall commence until details of the proposed planting and a timetable for planting implementation for the soft landscaping works detailed on the following approved drawings has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

Landscape Masterplan dwg MPO Rev N

Advanced proposals dwgs APO1 rev D, APO2 rev d, APO3 rev E

Soft Landscaping Parameters Plan dwg LPO1 rev M

Landscape Phasing Plan dwg LPPO1 rev H

Landscape proposals Area B dwg LPO2 rev F

Landscape proposals Area D dwg LPO3 rev F

Landscape proposals Area E dwg LPO4 rev F

Landscape proposals Area G dwg LPO5 rev J

Landscape proposals Area G dwg LPO6 rev G

The planting proposals shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and timetable for implementation and prior to development commencing for each phase.

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

12. No development of any phase of development shall commence unless and until details of the hard surfacing/paving, fences and other external structures shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for that phase. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory hard landscaping of the site and appearance of the development.

13. No development of any phase of development shall commence unless and until a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) for that phase shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement shall include details of how the existing trees are to be protected and managed before, during and after development and shall include information on traffic flows, phased works and construction practices near trees. The development shall thereafter accord with the approved statement.

Reason: To ensure thorough consideration of the impacts of development on the existing trees.

14. No development of any phase of development shall commence unless and until, all existing trees and hedges shown on approved plan 106/05G for that phase to be retained, shall have been fully safeguarded in accordance with BS 5837:2005 (Trees in relation to construction - recommendations) or any other Standard that may be in force at the time that development commences and these safeguarding measures shall be retained for the duration of construction works and building operations. No unauthorised access or placement of goods, fuels or chemicals, soil or other material shall take place within the tree protection zone(s).

Reason: To ensure that trees and hedges to be retained are adequately protected from damage to health and stability throughout the construction period and in the interests of amenity.

15. No part of Area G shown on drawing no. 106/09 shall be occupied until details of the footpath connection to Forehill Close has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall be at a scale of not less than 1:50 showing the access layout, appropriate signage and any fencing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and the footpath shall be provided and be open for use prior to the occupation of any part of area G and shall be maintained and retained as such thereafter in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure safe and suitable access is provided onto Forehill Close.

16. No development of any phase of development shall commence unless and until a Construction Traffic Management Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. This shall include:

- a programme of construction works and anticipated deliveries.

- construction vehicle details (number, size, type and frequency of movement).
- a framework for managing abnormal loads (if applicable).
- location of construction site access.
- details of how construction plant and vehicles will, as much as possible, be contained within the site.
- contractors' arrangements (compound, storage, parking, turning, surfacing and drainage. If applicable).

The development must be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved Construction Traffic Statement.

Reason: To minimise the likely impact of construction traffic on the surrounding highway network and prevent the possible deposit of loose material on the adjoining highway

17. The development hereby permitted must not be first occupied or utilised until a scheme showing precise details of the proposed cycle parking facilities for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme must be constructed before the development is occupied and, thereafter, must be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purpose specified.

Reason: To prioritise sustainable transport modes.

18. Before the development of each phase is occupied or utilised details of Electric Vehicle charging infrastructure for each caravan for that phase shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and the infrastructure shall thereafter be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.

Reason: To ensure the proper construction of the EV facilities and to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes.

19. The development shall strictly accord with the detailed biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement strategy set out within the following measures:

The habitat creation and enhancement as described in the Additional Habitat Enhancement Strategy (v2) (Baker Consultants, 12th November 2025) and in 4.27 of the Environmental Statement (ES) Addendum (Lichfields, March 2026) .

The development hereby approved must not be first brought into use unless and until:

- i) the mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures detailed in the approved measures have been completed in full, in accordance with any specified timetable, unless any modifications to the approved measures as a result of the requirements of a European Protected Species Licence have first been issued to the Local Planning Authority in writing, and
- ii) evidence of compliance, including photographic evidence, in accordance with section F of the approved Biodiversity Plan has been supplied to the Local Planning Authority prior to the substantial completion, or the first bringing into use of the development hereby approved,

whichever is the sooner. The development shall subsequently be implemented entirely in accordance with the approved Biodiversity Plan and thereafter the approved mitigation, compensation and enhancement/net gain measures must be permanently maintained and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To mitigate and compensate for impacts on ecological receptors, and to provide biodiversity gains.

20. The detailed biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement strategy set out within the following measures:

The interior and external lighting as set out in the Exterior Lighting Design Proposals document (Lumenata, 12th November 2025);

must be strictly adhered to during the carrying out of the development and retained thereafter.

Reason: To mitigate and compensate for impacts on ecological receptors, and to provide biodiversity gains.

21. No development shall commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved CEMP.

Reason: In the interests of the environment, ecology and biodiversity.

22. No development shall commence until a Precautionary Working Method Statement (PWMS) for reptiles, to be informed by the recommendations in Chapter D: Ecology of the Environmental Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved PWMS.

Reason: To mitigate and compensate for impacts on ecological receptors, and to provide biodiversity gains.

23. No development shall commence until a Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (LEMP), to be informed by the recommendations in the Chapter D: Ecology of the ES; has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved LEMP.

Reason: To mitigate and compensate for impacts on ecological receptors, and to provide biodiversity gains.

24. No development of any phase of development shall commence unless and until a detailed surface water management scheme for the site, based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, and including clarification of how surface water is to be managed during construction and a timetable for implementation, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The detailed design of the surface water management scheme shall be in accordance with the National Standards

for SuDS. The surface water scheme shall be fully implemented in accordance with the submitted details including the timetable for implementation.

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

25. No development of any phase of development shall commence unless and until details of maintenance & management of both the surface water sustainable drainage scheme and any receiving system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details. These should include a plan for the lifetime of the development, the arrangements for adoption by any public body or statutory undertaker, or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

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

26. The development hereby approved shall not exceed the installation of a total of 241 no. static caravans and associated decking.

Reason: For clarity over the extent of the planning permission.

Informatives:

1. In addition to this permission, the applicant is advised that any works to the vehicle crossing to Forehill Close (that is, the area of highway land between the nearside carriageway edge and the site's road boundary) must be constructed to the specification of the Highway Authority in order to comply with Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980. The applicant should contact Dorset Highways by telephone at 01305 221020, by email at dorsethighways@dorsetcouncil.gov.uk, or in writing at Dorset Highways, Dorset Council, County Hall, Dorchester, DT1 1XJ, before the commencement of any works on or adjacent to the public highway.

2. This permission is subject to an agreement made pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 dated ## ##.

3. Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission would be Dorset Council.

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. These are listed below.

Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because none of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements listed below are considered to apply.

Read more about Biodiversity Net Gain and Biodiversity Gain Plans at

<https://www.dorsetcouncil.gov.uk/w/biodiversity-net-gain> and

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/submit-a-biodiversity-gain-plan>

4. Statutory Exemptions and Transitional Arrangements in respect of the Biodiversity Gain Plan

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.

3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and

(i) the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or

(ii) the application for the original planning permission* to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;

ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or

iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:

i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and

ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not

an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;

ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and

iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.6 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.

* “original planning permission means the permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates” means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

5. The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit to be obtained for any activities which will take place:

On or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal)

On or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culverted main river (16 metres if tidal)

On or within 16 metres of a sea defence

Involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert

In the floodplain of a main river if the activity could affect flood flow or storage and potential impacts are not controlled by a planning permission.

For further guidance please visit <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activitiesenvironmental-permits> or contact our National Customer Contact Centre on 03708 506 506. The applicant should not assume that a permit will automatically be forthcoming once planning permission has been granted, and we advise them to consult with us at the earliest opportunity.

6. In accordance with Policy DM3 of the NPPF the council, as local planning authority, takes a positive approach to development proposals and is focused on providing sustainable development.

The council works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

- offering a pre-application advice service, and

- as appropriate updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application and where possible suggesting solutions.

In this case:

- The applicant/agent was updated of any issues and provided with the opportunity to address issues identified by the case officer.
- The applicant was provided with pre-application advice.

Recommendation B:

Refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below if the s106 agreement is not completed by 15 January 2027 or such extended time as agreed by the Service Manager for Development Management and Enforcement or the Development Management Area Manager Southern & Western:

1. In the absence of a suitable s106 agreement to secure financial contributions of £43,500 for bus stops on the A353 and a contribution of £10,900 towards a Beryl bike bay and the purchase of 4 new bikes; the proposal would fail to contribute to the provision of sustainable transport options (active travel) for those staying and working at the site which would therefore likely result in a significant increase in the use of and reliance on travel by car, having regard to the location of the site, contrary to the environmental objectives of sustainable development. This would be contrary to West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) policies INT1, ECON7 and COM7, Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan (2025) policies W00 and W46 and policies DP3, TR3 and TR4 of the NPPF (2026).
2. In the absence of a suitable s106 agreement to secure provision of the recreational mitigation measures and ecological/biodiversity enhancements the proposal would fail to provide adequate mitigation for the recreational impacts of the development on the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliff Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the ecological impacts of the development contrary to West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) policies INT1 and ENV2, Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan (2025) policies W00, W02, W03, W04, W05 and W41 and policies N2 and N6 of the NPPF (2026).
3. In the absence of a suitable s106 agreement to secure advanced planting the proposal would fail to provide adequate landscape mitigation such that the development would have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the area, landscape character and the setting of the Dorset National Landscape contrary to West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan (2015) policies INT1, ENV1 and ECON7, Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan policy (2025) W41 and policies N2 and N4 of the NPPF (2026).