

Planning Committee – Update Sheet

Planning Applications

Application Ref.	Address	Agenda ref.	Page nos.
P/FUL/2026/01894	13 The Esplanade Weymouth DT4 8EB	5	19 - 30
Reference is made in the report to Policy W45 of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan (WNP). It is considered that Policy W45 criterion 1 should be given very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies in the NPPF (2026) in respect of designated heritage assets. This is because Policy W45 states that “Development proposals must demonstrate, where relevant, that they respect, and will cause no harm to heritage assets and their setting” (underlining is officer emphasis for clarity) whereas Policy HE6 of the NPPF states that “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”. Whilst the intent of both the WNP policy and the NPPF policy is to limit harm to heritage assets the national decision-making policy does not require “no harm” to heritage assets in order for a proposal to be considered acceptable, rather it’s a case of weighing any identified harm against any public benefits resulting from the proposal. The above update in respect of the weight to be attached to certain aspects of WNP policy W45 is in light of paragraph 2 of Annex A of the NPPF (2026) which states that “Development Plan Policies (or parts of those policies) which are materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies in the Framework should be given very limited weight.” This update does not alter the officer recommendation.			
P/LBC/2026/01893	13 The Esplanade Weymouth DT4 8EB	6	31 - 37
Reference is made in the report to Policy W45 of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan (WNP). It is considered that Policy W45 criterion 1 should be given very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies in the NPPF (2026) in respect of designated heritage assets. This is because Policy W45 states that “Development proposals must demonstrate, where relevant, that they respect, and will cause no harm to heritage assets and their setting” (underlining is officer emphasis for clarity) whereas Policy HE6 of the NPPF states that “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”. Whilst the intent of both the WNP policy and the NPPF policy is to limit harm to heritage assets the national decision-making policy does not require “no harm” heritage assets in order for a proposal to be considered acceptable, rather it’s a case of weighing any identified harm against any public benefits resulting from the proposal.			

The above update in respect of the weight to be attached to certain aspects of WNP policy W45 is in light of paragraph 2 of Annex A which states that “Development Plan Policies (or parts of those policies) which are materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies in the Framework should be given very limited weight.” This update does not alter the officer recommendation.

P/FUL/2025/04039	Weymouth Bay Holiday Park Preston Road Weymouth DT3 6BQ	7	39 - 96
------------------	---	---	---------

Recommendation B on page 96 should refer to the **17th** January 2027 rather than 15th January 2027

Paragraph 14.85 replace “great weight” with “**substantial weight**” in accordance with NPPF Policy HE6.

At paragraphs 14.106 and 14.113 Policy W05 of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan (WNP) is referenced. Policy W05 of the WNP states at criterion 1 that “Development proposals should comply with national legislation and the requirements of the Local Planning Authority and, unless statutorily exempt, must contribute to the enhancement of the natural environment by providing for Biodiversity Net Gain of at least 10% with a target of at least 20% judged on a case-by-case basis”. The requirement for a target of 20% judged on case-by-case basis is materially inconsistent with Policy N2, 3 of the NPPF which states “Development proposals may incorporate biodiversity enhancements which exceed the statutory objective for biodiversity net gain, but this should only be a requirement where it is set out in up-to-date development plan policies for specific site allocations.” As there is no specific site allocation policy for the application site 20% BNG could not be required and as such development plan policy W05 criterion 1 of the WNP due to its material inconsistency with the national decision-making policy N2 should be given very limited weight in decision making.

Paragraphs 14.81 and 14.86 of the report refer to Policy W45 of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan (WNP). It is considered that Policy W45 criterion 1 should be given very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies in the NPPF in respect of designated heritage assets. This is because Policy W45 states that “Development proposals must demonstrate, where relevant, that they respect, and will cause **no harm** to heritage assets and their setting” (underlining is officer emphasis for clarity) whereas Policy HE6 of the NPPF states that “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”. Whilst the intent of both the WNP policy and the NPPF policy is to limit harm to heritage assets the national decision-making policy does not require “no harm” to heritage assets in order for a proposal to be considered acceptable, rather it’s a case of weighing any identified harm against any public benefits resulting from the proposal.

The above updates in respect of the weight to be attached to certain aspects of WNP policies W05 and W45 are in light of paragraph 2 of Annex A which states that

“Development Plan Policies (or parts of those policies) which are materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies in the Framework should be given very limited weight.”

Paragraphs 14.16 and 14.56 refer to the test for major development within National Landscape. The site is not within the Dorset National Landscape but is within its setting and therefore to be clear the test for such developments is set out at Policy N4, 4 of the NPPF which states “Development proposals within the setting of Protected Landscape should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the Protected Landscape”.

At paragraph 14.167 of the report “significant weight” should read “**substantial weight**” to accord with the wording of Policy E2 of the NPPF.

None of the above updates alter the officer recommendation.

P/FUL/2026/01805	Sailing Club Marine Parade Lyme Regis DT7 3JF	8	97-114
------------------	--	---	--------

Reason for refusal 1 refers to the NPPF as Aug 2027 when it should be **Aug 2026**

A late representation has been received **from the occupier of Flat 1 Cobb House**

The representation raises concerns regarding the visual impact of the proposed raised platform and sails on neighbouring residential amenity and the setting of Cobb House (Grade II Listed Building).

The representation considers that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm through loss of views, increased overlooking, and adverse effects on the significance and setting of a heritage asset.

They support the Conservation Officer's concerns regarding heritage impacts and question whether any historic restrictive covenants affecting development on the site require further investigation.