

# **WEST DORSET, WEYMOUTH & PORTLAND LOCAL PLAN**

## **MATTER NO 6: ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE**

**ON BEHALF OF THE ERNEST COOK TRUST**

### **Pegasus Group**

Pegasus House | Querns Business Centre | Whitworth Road | Cirencester | Gloucestershire | GL7 1RT  
T 01285 641717 | F 01285 642348 | W [www.pegasuspg.co.uk](http://www.pegasuspg.co.uk)

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | East Midlands | Leeds | Manchester

Planning | Environmental | Retail | Urban Design | Renewables | Landscape Design | Graphic Design | Consultation | Sustainability

---

## CONTENTS:

Page No:

<b>6.</b>	<b>MATTER 6 – ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE</b>	<b>1</b>
6.1	Large parts of West Dorset are covered by environmental designations. Does the Plan balance the need between growth and protection in the most effective way?	1
6.2	Is Green Infrastructure policy comprehensive and practicable?	2
6.3	Does the Plan provide a reasonable balance between protection and the positive use of heritage assets?	3
6.4	Is the stance on flood risk and protection sufficiently comprehensive?	4
6.5	Has adequate consideration been given to the consequences of climate change?	5

**6. MATTER 6 – ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE**

**6.1 Large parts of West Dorset are covered by environmental designations. Does the Plan balance the need between growth and protection in the most effective way?**

6.1.1 The Ernest Cook Trust does not have any comments on this question.

**6.2 Is Green Infrastructure policy comprehensive and practicable?**

6.2.1 The Ernest Cook Trust does not have any comments on this question.

**6.3 Does the Plan provide a reasonable balance between protection and the positive use of heritage assets?**

- 6.3.1 The Ernest Cook Trust considers Policy ENV4 at subsection ii includes correct reference to the NPPF at Paragraphs 132-134 in that it recognises that, where harm to a heritage asset is less than substantial, this harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
- 6.3.2 However, Subsections iv, v and vi of the Policy, when read in isolation do not include the above required NPPF consideration. The Trust therefore considers that these references are not required as the approach to the assessment of development affecting heritage assets is suitably covered at subsections i, ii, and iii.
- 6.3.3 The Trust therefore considers subsections iv, v and vi be removed from the policy to ensure the approach is clear, with the provisions for each type of heritage asset referred to in the supporting text.
- 6.3.4 Subject to this amendment, the Trust considers the Plan would provide a reasonable balance between protection and positive use of heritage assets.
- 6.3.5 With regard to the supporting text to be read alongside Policy ENV4, the Trust considers this does not suitably reflect the NPPF requirement in all cases.
- 6.3.6 Paragraph 2.3.11 of the Plan considers adverse impacts on features in conservation areas and states these will not normally be permitted. This provision does not provide a suitable balance as it omits to mention the balancing exercise required by the NPPF at Paragraph 132-134.
- 6.3.7 Furthermore, the approach for assessment in relation to historic parks and gardens at Paragraphs 2.3.18 and 2.3.20 is not outlined. Again, the proportionate approach should be included here.

**6.4 Is the stance on flood risk and protection sufficiently comprehensive?**

6.4.1 The Ernest Cook Trust does not have any comments on this question.

**6.5 Has adequate consideration been given to the consequences of climate change?**

6.5.1 The Ernest Cook Trust does not have any comments on this question.