

## Supplementary Statement to WDDC/WPBC Local Plan Examination

### Re Matter 9 Peripheral Weymouth Localities

#### Supplementary Statement of Richard Burgess MA .MSc., MRTPI on behalf of:-

-Mr & Mrs L. O'Neill (ID No 781)

-Mr E. Whettam (ID No 919)

-Icen Farm (ID No 705)

#### 9.1 Does LITT1 offer the best opportunity for accommodating future development needs and has the need to develop in the AONB being fully justified in accordance with the NPPF?

We have already submitted in evidence and in response to the Examination Agenda questions the view that there is a substantial underprovision in terms of the housebuilding rate proposed for the Weymouth area, over-reliance on difficult, expensive brown-field sites, unsuited to family housing and which will fail to deliver the maximum possible nos. of Affordable Housing, and underallocation of green field sites. We have also expressed disappointment that the LPAs response to the issues raised by the Inspector at the February prehearing meeting is one of retrenchment and justification of their existing positions rather than allocation of additional sites.

That being the case we consider that

- (a) There is a need for additional green field sites such as that at Southdown Farm as set out in the representations under (ID 919). Furthermore had the LPA taken a more positive approach to the matter they could have taken advantage of the offer made jointly by the owners of Southdown Farm and Wyke Oliver Farm to develop a masterplan for the area proposing a comprehensive approach to the Southdown Ridge area, limited residential development and the permanent protection of the highest and most sensitive areas in landscape terms. Given that this area is within reach of all main community facilities and services and is thus 'sustainable' we would urge the Inspector to endorse that approach and recommend that the Plan be modified accordingly.
- (b) We consider that LITT1 is justified given the need for a Major Urban Extension in the Weymouth area and that indeed with the improved access afforded by the Weymouth Relief Road the Littlemoor north location is the logical and indeed only place for such a major urban extension. It is suggested that the flat lands to the north of Littlemoor Rd while pleasant in landscape terms are dominated by the existing housing development to the south and do not contribute significantly to the views of or from the Ridgeway (which is the essence of the AONB designation in the area) Given the location of the western part of LITT1 adjacent a main junction on the Relief Road it is also a logical place for the location of Weymouths' next major employment site.
- (c) Indeed the opportunity exists to correct the current imbalance at Littlemoor which has been developed as a major residential area over the last 30 years without any nearby employment and as a result make the community more 'sustainable'.
- (d) It is also the case that the AONB boundary in this area does not actually reflect either the current extent of development (with part of the 'Finches' Estate already being in the AONB or the areas topography. It is accepted that the break of slope marking the division between the steep slopes leading up to Bincombe village and the Ridgeway and the almost flat land on the north side of Littlemoor Rd is generally the 40mAOD contour (although part of the land at Bincombe Marsh Dairy included in LITT1 is actually above that contour and quite prominent).

- (e) Thirdly it is accepted that the allocation of land at Icen Farm for employment purposes is logical and reflects both the existing use of many of the former farm buildings (established by the grant of Certificates of Lawful Use)
- (f) The result of this however is that my clients (ID 781) home and land adjacent but not actually within LITT1 and adjacent LITT2, and which is within the 40m contour, is likely to be between two major employment areas (assuming that, as indicated, the western part of LITT1 is to be used for employment purposes). My clients have therefore moved from a situation where they lived down a very quiet country lane (prior to the opening of the Relief Road) on one where they live adjacent to a major intersection, beside an existing employment site and with the prospects of another in front of them.
- (g) Since originally (and repeatedly) objecting to their exclusion from the allocation my clients have also made a submission under the SHLAR. This resulted in a recognition by the officers that the house and outbuildings were suitable for development (subject a policy change –whatever that means) but that their fields were not.
- (h) The basis of this position seems to be the preconception (formed we would suggest before the Relief Road was even built) that the bottom of Icen Lane is quiet and rural and appropriate to the AONB. This in our submission
- ignores the substantial changes brought about to the areas by the Relief Road
  - Ignores the substantial change to be brought to the area by the implementation of LITT1 as currently conceived
  - Ignores the fact that this is in fact a sustainable development location with both bus, train and cycleways being close by and with all community facilities within easy walking distance –and as such the advantages of LITT1 as a location for an major Urban Extension are enjoyed at least equally by my clients land.
  - Ignores the fact that the landscape at this point is in fact dominated by electricity transmission pylon lines and that if LITT 1 is justified in terms of effect on the AONB a small extension of it to include the land at the Willows is equally justifiable.
  - Disregards the fact that my clients have offered to participate in the production of a Masterplan for the area, including consideration as to the use of part of their land for community uses
  - Ignores our submission that in fact a better landscaped boundary between the proposed development and the AONB could be achieved by a landscape belt on the northern boundary of my clients land and just below the break of slope marked by the 40mAOD contour.

In our submission the Inspector should recommend a Modification to the submission plan to include Land at the Willows in LITT1.

## 9.2 Similarly, is redevelopment of LITT2 a sound proposal given its prominent siting in the landscape and its location in the AONB?

As indicated above LITT 2 is a reflection of the existing Lawful Use of most of the former Icen Farm site for employment purposes and its convenient location adjacent the main Relief Road junction. Again it sites below the 40m contour and with appropriate landscaping (and some has already been carried out) will not be visible form key visual receptors within the AONB eg the footpaths and bridleways to the north.

9.3 How serious are the constraints identified by various parties to development at Chickerell?  
How will a masterplan for the area be developed and taken forward?

No comments

RJB 3.11.14

**Richard Burgess Associates Ltd : Planning & Development Consultants**

Richard Burgess MA; MSc; MRTPI

179 Preston Rd Weymouth DT3 6BG

(T) 01305 834429

Email [rjkaburgess@btinternet.com](mailto:rjkaburgess@btinternet.com)

Richard Burgess Associates Ltd is registered in England and Wales: Registration No7278390.  
Registered office as above.