

WESTERN AND SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 10 SEPTEMBER 2026

Present: Cllrs Neil Eysenck (Chair), Ryan Holloway (Vice-Chair), Belinda Bawden, Simon Christopher (left at 12:30), Peter Dickenson, Paul Kimber, Craig Monks (left at 13:56), David Northam, Louie O'Leary, Pete Roper and Kate Wheller

Apologies: Cllrs David Taylor

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

Ann Collins (Area Manager – Western and Southern Team), Philip Crowther (Legal Business Partner - Regulatory), James Lytton-Trevers (Lead Project Officer), John Miles (Democratic Services Officer), Robert Piggot (Planning Officer), Megan Rochester (Senior Democratic & Governance Services Officer) and Darren Roger (Senior Planning Officer)

Officers present remotely (for all or part of the meeting): Susan Hetherington (Transport Development Liaison Manager)

21. Declarations of Interest

Cllr Belinda Bawden declared an interest to agenda item 8. It was agreed that she would speak as the Local Ward Member and would not take part in the debate or vote.

Cllr Louie O'Leary declared an interest to agenda item 7 in which he was pre-determined. He spoke on behalf of one of the residents who was unable to attend and spoke as the Local Ward Member for the application. He left the room during the debate and vote.

Cllr Peter Dickenson declared an interest in agenda item 7. He spoke as the Local Ward Member for that application and left the room during the debate and vote. He also declared an interest in agenda items 5 and 6. He left the room for the deliberation of those items.

22. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 15th July were confirmed and signed.

23. Registration for public speaking and statements

Representations by the public to the Committee on individual planning applications are detailed below. There were no questions, petitions or deputations received on other items on this occasion.

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

With the aid of a visual presentation, including plans and aerial photographs, the Case Officer identified the site and outlined the proposal. Members were shown the existing and proposed plans and elevations, and the relationship of the proposed balcony to neighbouring properties and the harbour.

The Case Officer highlighted that the site was within a conservation area and flood zone, with the works being to a and was a Grade II listed building, in the immediate setting of two adjoining Grade II listed buildings and a Grade II* listed terrace. It was explained that the proposal involved the removal of an existing upper-floor window and that, whilst there would be a minor loss of historic fabric resulting in less than substantial in a low degree of harm, this would be outweighed by the public benefits. The proposal was considered compliant with Policy SUS2, would not appear out of place on the rear elevation, and would preserve the significance of surrounding heritage assets and the wider conservation area. Members were advised that there would be no adverse impact on residential amenity and that flood risk was not considered to be an issue.

The officer recommendation was to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- A question was raised as to whether the proposed windows were timber framed.
- Clarification was sought regarding whether the rear elevation of the property would be visible from the quay.
- A request was made for a visual image showing the view of the properties from the surrounding area.
- A comment was made that the proposal represented a positive enhancement to the business without adversely affecting the historic value of the houses.
- Cllr Wheller expressed concern regarding a perceived lack of consistency in the approach taken to determining similar applications.
- the area was attractive and characterised by slight variations in the appearance of properties.
- It was noted that the Council had a duty to preserve and protect the character and appearance of the area.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representatives; and what they had heard at the meeting,

a motion to **APPROVE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Belinda Bawden, and seconded by Cllr Paul Kimber, subject to conditions set out in the officer report.

Decision: To grant for the reasons set out in Section 15 of the officer's report.

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

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

There were no technical questions or comments.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representatives; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to **APPROVE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Craig Monks, and seconded by Cllr Paul Kimber, subject to conditions set out in the officer report.

Decision: To grant for the reasons set out in Section 15 of the officer's report.

Cllr Peter Dickenson returned at 10:25

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

The Lead Project Officer presented the application with the aid of plans, aerial photographs and visualisations. Members were shown the application site within Weymouth Bay Holiday Park and were advised of its relationship to nearby heritage and environmental designations, including the Dorset National Landscape and the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site.

The proposal sought full planning permission for 241 holiday caravans across four areas of the site, together with associated infrastructure including access roads, footpaths, landscaping, sustainable drainage measures, an attenuation basin, the relocation of five existing caravans and the removal of a telecommunications mast. Access would be provided from the existing holiday park.

Members were informed that the principle of development was considered acceptable under Policy ECON7, which supported the expansion of existing holiday parks. An Environmental Impact Assessment had been undertaken and identified a range of impacts together with mitigation measures.

The Officer explained that the principal considerations were landscape and visual impact, effects on the Jurassic Coast World Heritage Site and heritage assets, ecology, flood risk, highways and neighbouring amenity. Whilst the development would introduce additional built form into the landscape and result in a degree of

harm to landscape character, the impact was assessed as being at the lower end of the scale and would reduce over time as the proposed landscaping matured. A degree of less than substantial harm to the setting of heritage assets and the World Heritage Site was also identified.

Ecological impacts, including habitat loss and potential recreational pressure on designated sites, were considered capable of mitigation through habitat creation, wildlife corridor measures, designated walking routes and other ecological enhancements. Flood risk and drainage matters were also considered acceptable, subject to mitigation and the proposed drainage strategy.

Members were advised that the Highway Authority had raised no objection, subject to conditions and contributions towards local transport improvements. The proposal would alter the outlook from some neighbouring properties, particularly those at Forehill Close, but was not considered to result in unacceptable harm to residential amenity.

In assessing the planning balance, the Officer noted that no statutory consultees had objected to the application. Significant weight was afforded to the economic benefits of the proposal, including investment, employment opportunities, support for the tourism economy and improvements to public access and sustainable transport infrastructure.

The Officer concluded that, on balance, the benefits of the scheme outweighed the identified harms and recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

Mr J Skinner's statement was read out by the Local Ward Member, who was unable to attend and objected to the application. He raised concerns regarding the impact of additional caravans on neighbouring properties, including loss of privacy, outlook and residential amenity, as well as increased noise, light pollution and traffic. Concerns were also expressed regarding residents' wellbeing, safety, and potential impacts on local wildlife. He urged the Committee to refuse the application.

Helen Ashby-Ridgway, speaking as agent, supported the application. She stated that the proposal had been carefully developed to address the sensitivities of the site and noted that the application was recommended for approval, with no objections from consultees. She highlighted the economic benefits of the scheme, including the creation of additional jobs and support for the tourism sector in Weymouth. Reference was made to community and environmental benefits, including the long-term protection and enhancement of a wildlife corridor, improvements to the site setting, acceptable access arrangements, and a sensitive lighting scheme. She concluded that the benefits of the development were not outweighed by any adverse impacts.

Councillor L O'Leary, as Local Ward Member, thanked Members for attending the site visit. He highlighted the proximity of the proposed development to

neighbouring dwellings and the resulting day-to-day impact on residents, noting that some properties would directly overlook the new area. Concerns were raised regarding the busy nature of the road, parking arrangements and the location of a nearby bus stop. He urged Members to refuse the application based on the concerns that had been raised.

Councillor Dickenson, as Local Ward Member, thanked Members for attending the site visit and stated that it had been helpful in understanding the relationship between the site and neighbouring properties. He noted that the existing dwellings had been built to overlook the field and expressed concern about the significant impact the development would have on residents' lives. He urged the applicant to reconsider or reduce the scale of the proposal to lessen its impact on neighbouring properties and asked Members to give due weight to residents' concerns when determining the application.

Cllr Peter Dickenson and Cllr Louie O'Leary left the room at 11:16

Members questions and comments

- Sought clarification on the proposed landscaping scheme, including whether the existing hedgerows in the upper part of the site would be enhanced and the anticipated timescale for hedgerows and trees to establish sufficiently to provide effective screening of the caravans.
- Members queried how any archaeological discoveries made during development would be monitored and managed to ensure appropriate protection measures were implemented.
- Emphasised the importance of maintaining public rights of way and sought assurance that existing walking routes would remain accessible and unrestricted.
- Members raised questions regarding site security and noted that the development would create additional employment opportunities. It was also acknowledged that existing residents had a right to enjoy their homes and quality of life, and that these considerations should be considered.
- Members raised concerns regarding the potential increase in noise arising from the development and sought clarification on whether a noise assessment had been undertaken and what mitigation measures had been considered.
- Requested photographs taken from the site visit viewpoint and noted concerns that parts of the development would be located on rising ground. Concerns were expressed that the scale of the proposal was excessive for the site.
- Clarification was sought regarding the provision of dog waste bins, including the arrangements for their ongoing maintenance and emptying by the applicant.
- Concerns were raised regarding fire risk, noting that no comments had been received from the Fire Service. It was suggested that caravan developments could increase fire risk, particularly given the proximity of neighbouring residential properties.
- Members praised the site visit
- the Case Officer was thanked for the comprehensive report.
- Clarification was sought regarding the extent of the development located within the designated area referred to in the officer's presentation.

- Queried whether the caravans closest to neighbouring residential properties could be repositioned to reduce visual intrusion and impacts on residential amenity.
- Members welcomed the proposed enhancement to the nearby bus stop but noted that no lay-by was proposed. Clarification was sought as to whether the Highway Authority had assessed the implications of buses stopping on the carriageway, particularly during the peak summer season.
- Cllr B Bawden suggested the removal of one caravan pitch to facilitate a wider landscaping buffer, allowing for additional planting to enhance screening of the development and assist in mitigating potential noise impacts on neighbouring properties
- Cllr S Christopher referred to the comments made by the Local Ward Members and stated that, having attended the site visit, concerns remained regarding the cumulative scale of development in the area. It was considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable impacts on neighbouring properties and would have an overall negative effect on the locality.
- It was noted that the site sat within a natural hollow and that views of the development would largely be limited to higher ground. It was acknowledged that there were no objections from statutory consultees. However, concerns were expressed regarding the wider impact on nearby residents, notwithstanding the area's good public accessibility.
- One Member stated that they would support the removal of Area G from the proposal, citing concerns relating to environmental impacts, flood risk, effects on the wildlife corridor, and the impact on neighbouring residents.
- While recognising the merits of the proposed amendment, Cllr K Wheller considered that greater weight should be given to the site's designation and significance as part of the World Heritage Site. Reference was made to the relevant section of the officer's report, and it was argued that the benefits of the additional caravans did not outweigh the importance of protecting the World Heritage Site designation.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representatives; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to **APPROVE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Belinda Bawden, and seconded by Cllr David Northam, subject to conditions set out in the officer report, subject to the additional condition that the caravan shown in the identified location shall not be sited in that position and that planting be extended on the site. As well as the amendment to Condition 11 to secure the extension of planting and additional planting within Area G, and to amend Condition 26 to provide that the number shall be no more than 240.

Decision: To grant for the reasons set out in Section 17 of the officer's report, subject to the additional condition that the caravan shown in the identified location shall not be sited in that position and that planting be extended on the site. As well as the amendment to Condition 11 to secure the extension of planting and additional planting within Area G, and to amend Condition 26 to provide that the number shall be no more than 240, with the final wording to be agreed under delegated powers, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee.

Cllr Louie O’Leary and Cllr Peter Dickenson returned at 12:28

27. P/FUL/2026/01805 - Sailing Club, Marine Parade, Lyme Regis, DT7 3JF

With the aid of a visual presentation, including site plans, elevations, 3D images, aerial photography and site photographs, the Case Officer identified the application site and outlined the proposed development. Members were guided through the relevant planning history and policies applicable to the determination of the application.

The Case Officer identified the site location and highlighted the numerous listed buildings and heritage assets situated within the surrounding area. Existing plans were presented, including the current floor and roof layouts and the existing south, west, north and east elevations. A 3D image of the existing platform was also shown to provide context.

Members were presented with the proposed site layout, which included an extension towards the rear of the site and a modest increase in the height of the platform. It was explained that the space beneath the extended structure was intended for boat storage. Proposed floor plans, elevations and details of the detachable canopy sails were also displayed. Additional 3D visualisations demonstrated the appearance of the completed development, together with proposed roof plans showing the structure both with and without the canopy sails.

Google Earth imagery was used to illustrate the wider setting of the site, including the beach and harbour. Photographs taken from around the harbour identified the surrounding buildings and neighbouring catering establishments, whilst further images showed views from the harbour frontage, access arrangements to the site and conditions within the site itself.

The Case Officer advised Members that the premises operated under a premises licence and drew attention to the key planning considerations. It was explained that the proposal would result in moderate harm to designated heritage assets and that the identified public benefits were not sufficient to outweigh that harm. Whilst there were acknowledged economic benefits associated with the proposal, officers considered that the development would have a harmful impact on residential amenity.

Members were advised that no adverse impacts had been identified in relation to highways, ecology, flood risk or coastal risk management matters.

Having assessed the proposal against the relevant development plan policies and material considerations, the Case Officer confirmed that the officer recommendation was to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in Section 17 of the report.

In accordance with Procedural Rule 8.1 the committee voted to extend the duration of the meeting.

Public Participation

Matthew Dalton-Aram, speaking as agent, stated that the report did not adequately demonstrate harm arising from the proposal and argued that any impact would be limited. He noted the mixed-use harbour setting and that the platform was present when Cobb House was listed. He highlighted that the sailing club was a volunteer-run, non-profit organisation with around 400 members that hosted Lyme Regis Sea School, providing social, educational and economic benefits to the community. He considered that any limited harm was outweighed by the significant public benefits of the proposal and noted that the canopy was removable if required. He requested that the committee reconsider the officer recommendation and grant.

Councillor Philip May, speaking on behalf of Lyme Regis Town Council, expressed strong support for the application. He stated that the Town Council had considered the proposal and concluded that any harm to the conservation area would be limited and minor in nature. He noted that the sail canopies were removable and highlighted the educational, social and economic benefits provided by Lyme Regis Sailing Club, including opportunities for training, bursaries and support for young people. He also referred to the club's contribution to coastal tourism, the enjoyment of both residents and visitors, the hosting of major events, and the positive impact on local businesses. He concluded by emphasising the club's importance to the town and reiterated the Town Council's support for the application.

Councillor Belinda Bawden, as Local Ward Member, spoke in support of the application. She referred to the principles of sustainable development and noted that members had been offered to undertake a site visit. She expressed concern regarding the assumption that the proposal would harm the heritage asset, stating that she considered it would instead enhance the area. She noted that the proposed railings would be in keeping with the character of the locality and that the canopies were visually attractive. She further stated that there were no permanent residents within Cobb House, that the existing harbour environment was already characterised by a degree of noise and activity, and that the Sailing Club would not materially add to this. She considered licensing matters to be irrelevant to the determination of the application and emphasised the benefits the proposal would provide to the local community.

Cllr Belinda Bawden left the room at 13:02

Members questions and comments

- Referenced the Conservation Area Statement and sought clarification on how its findings and recommendations had been considered in the assessment of the application.
- Sought clarification regarding the specific aspects of residential amenity that were affected by the proposed development and the extent of any resulting harm.

- Queried what amendments would be required to make the proposal acceptable, specifically whether this would be achieved through the removal of the canopy, alterations to the decking area, or a combination of both elements.
- Members noted that the proposal would provide a community benefit by bringing increased activity and vibrancy to the area. Members considered that these benefits outweighed the identified harm to the conservation area and accepted the officer's conclusion that the development would result in less than substantial harm to heritage assets.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representations; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to **REFUSE**, was proposed by Cllr David Northam, and seconded by Cllr Craig Monks.

Decision: That planning permission be granted contrary to the officer recommendation on the grounds that, whilst the proposal would result in harm to the setting and significance of the Conservation Area and the listed building, the economic and community benefits arising from the development, when considered within its marine and commercial setting, were considered to outweigh that harm.

Furthermore, whilst it was acknowledged that the proposal would give rise to some noise and disturbance for nearby residential properties, Members considered that this impact was acceptable in this location and was outweighed by the economic and community benefits associated with the scheme, subject to the following conditions:

- **Condition 1:** 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).

- **Condition 2:** The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - PP-14753929v1 Location Plan
 - LRSCSPPRO 1.2 Proposed Site Plan
 - LRSCPRO4 1.3 Proposed Floor Plan
 - LRSCPRO3 1.2 Proposed North & East Elevations
 - LRSCPRO2 1.2 Proposed South & West Elevations
 - LRSCPRO1 1.2 Proposed Roof Plan
 - LRSCPRO1v2 1.2 Proposed Roof Plan

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

- **Condition 3:** The extended raised platform hereby approved shall not be used outside the hours of 9.00am to 11.00pm on any day, and no amplified

or other music shall be played on the extended raised platform hereby approved.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties from undue noise and disturbance.

- **Condition 4:** Prior to the installation of the railings and sails to the decking hereby approved, details of their materials, finish and colour shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The railings and sails shall thereafter be installed in accordance with the approved details and retained and maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of the setting of the adjacent listed building and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

28. **P/FUL/2026/00983 - Former Vehicle Maintenance Building, Sec Depot & Southern Electric Depot, Westwey Road, Weymouth**

The Case Officer presented the application using plans, aerial photography and site photographs. Members were advised that the site was located within the Weymouth Town Centre Strategy area, with residential properties to the north and west and the former gas works site to the south.

The proposal sought the relocation of the existing highways depot from Lynch Lane and the change of use of the site and building to a sui generis highways maintenance depot. Members were informed of the site's planning history, including the grant of permission for 23 dwellings in October 2021.

The key planning considerations were the principle of development, flood risk and drainage. The Officer advised that a flood evacuation plan would be secured by condition. It was noted that the site already had an industrial character and, as no physical alterations were proposed, no harm would arise to the character and appearance of the area. No objections had been raised on highways grounds, with no concerns identified in relation to access, parking provision or highway safety.

Having assessed the proposal against relevant planning policies, the Officer recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

Members questions and comments

- Queried whether there should be a proposed fixed period of use and sought clarification on what consultation had taken place with the Council's regeneration team
- Members referred to the access arrangements set out in Condition 7 and requested that additional wording, as suggested by Councillor Kimber, be considered.

- Raised questions regarding contaminated land matters and sought confirmation that no additional contaminated land conditions would be imposed.
- Members discussed flood mitigation measures, with Councillor Bawden suggesting the inclusion of permeable surfacing as part of the scheme.
- Queried the comments within the report relating to public benefits arising from the development.
- Members expressed support for the proposal, noting that relocation to the new site would make use of Council-owned land and could reduce costs, whilst highlighting the importance of ensuring the development was future-proofed and did not result in substantial harm.
- Sought clarification as to whether the relocation of the site would result in financial savings for the Council.

Having had the opportunity to discuss the merits of the application and an understanding of all this entailed; having considered the officer's report and presentation; the written representatives; and what they had heard at the meeting, a motion to **APPROVE** the officer's recommendation to **GRANT** as recommended, was proposed by Cllr Kate Wheller, and seconded by Cllr Louie O'Leary, subject to conditions set out in the officer report and an amendment to condition no. 7 to allow for use of the site in the event of an emergency.

Decision: To grant for the reasons set out in Section 17 of the officer's report.

29. **Urgent items**

There were no urgent items

30. **Exempt Business**

There was no exempt business

31. **Update Sheet**

Decision List

Duration of meeting: 10.00 am – 15.22pm

Chairman

.....