

Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan

Summary of Responses

Introduction

The Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan was submitted to Dorset Council on 6 December 2024 and updated 15 January 2025. The regulation 16 consultation commenced on 24 January 2025 and was due to run until 7 March 2025. However, because of local concerns that not all late changes had been considered fully by Weymouth Town Council the submitted Neighbourhood Plan was reconfirmed by Weymouth Full Council on 26 February 2025. The Regulation 16 consultation was duly extended until 10 April 2025 to maintain a minimum six-week consultation period. For the avoidance of doubt, the reconfirmed Plan and all supporting documents remained unaltered.

All responses received are available to view in full on the Dorset Council website:

[Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan Responses - Dorset Council](#)

At the close of the public consultation 588¹ responses were received.

- 294 web form and 9 email responses including the Friends of Greenhill Gardens were received identifying the omission of Greenhill Gardens from the list of Local Green Spaces (W10) as a concern.
- 106 web form and 23 email responses including the Friends of Lodmoor Country Park raised concerns regarding the inclusion of Employment land at Lodmoor Old Tip (W23A) and / or sites W23B and W23C.
- 8 web form and 16 email responses including Preston Against Flooding raised concerns with the inclusion of Wyke Oliver Farm North (W20) allocation for residential development.
- 24 Organisations, Businesses or Groups commented on the Plan including a detailed responses from Dorset Council.
- 4 landowners or site promoters responded including Turley (W20), CG Fry (W21), Chapman Lily on behalf of Cobra Homes (W22) and Network Rail (W24) who wrote into support the inclusion of their land within the Plan.
- Chapman Lily on behalf of Bellway Homes noted the exclusion of their site (WNP28) from the Plan and the Redtale Group raised concerns around viability of the Affordable Housing Policy (W18).

A high-level summary of the response received is provided below, structured in accordance with the order of the Plan.

¹ The total was later reduced to 539 responses reflecting around 50 blank or duplicate submissions.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Plan Area

- Dorset Council: The Plan Area does not reflect recent parish boundary changes (e.g. Littlemoor Urban Extension). Recommendation to clarify and map the administrative boundary differences.
- Two Harbours Healthcare Ltd: Recommend expanding plan scope to include Chickerell, Portland, and all of Preston.
- Littlemoor Ward Councillor: Plan covers too large and diverse an area for a single neighbourhood plan. Outdated boundaries and lack of alignment with 2023 changes.
- Preston Against Flooding: The plan's boundaries were outdated and did not reflect recent changes, excluding areas like Bincombe Park.
- Public Comments:
 - This neighbourhood plan covers far too wide an area.
 - In favour of smaller localised plans such as that at Sutton Poyntz.

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan

- Public comments:
 - Weymouth Town Council has respected and included SPNP policies in the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan.
 - SPNP's importance is acknowledged in the Introduction and Appendix D.
 - Several SPNP policies are directly reflected in Weymouth policies (e.g. W10, W13, W48, W49)

Chapter 2: Weymouth Neighbourhood Area

- No major objections raised.

Chapter 3: Strategic Context

Weymouth Harbour and Esplanade Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management (FCERM) Scheme

- Public comment:
 - The plan appears confident that the Weymouth harbour and esplanade business case will secure full funding, but questions remain about how certain this is and whether the Town Council is contributing financially.

Chapter 4: Purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan

- Dorset Council: The plan period (2021–2038) is clearly stated and supported.

Chapter 5: Structure of the Plan

- This section of the Plan contained links to the Consultation Statement, Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment.

Consultation Statement

- Dorset Council: The Consultation Statement is comprehensive. Public concerns were raised about the alleged exclusion of 573 responses from the third engagement round. It was clarified that no responses were excluded, and a fourth consultation was held to address these concerns.
- Chapman Lily Planning Ltd (Cobra House Ltd and Bellway Homes): The Steering Group is praised for its evidence-based and consultative approach. The group maintained open and proactive communication throughout the process.
- Littlemoor Ward Councillor: Community engagement was notably poor, with minimal participation in walkarounds and drop-in events, lack of outreach in key areas, and feedback from residents often ignored—undermining the legitimacy of the plan.
- Preston Against Flooding: The views of 573 respondents were initially disregarded and only later included, while the consultation process itself was undermined by minimal engagement (just 30 participants), technical issues with SurveyMonkey submissions, and delayed publication of the final draft with Weymouth Town Council—raising serious concerns about transparency, legitimacy, and public scrutiny.
- Public comments:
 - Many residents were unaware of this proposal until recently, and there has been insufficient opportunity for the community to voice their concerns.
 - Criticism of consultation process and perceived lack of genuine engagement.
 - Concerns about the plan's complexity and accessibility.

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

- Dorset Council: The SEA is considered legally compliant.
- Public Comments:
 - Concern the SEA is flawed and does not accurately assess sites.

Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)

- Dorset Council: HRA concluded there would be no significant adverse effects on European sites. Some recommended policy wording changes (e.g. to Policy W19) were not fully implemented.
- Natural England: Agree with policy changes but recommend checking if water supply and recreational pressure conclusions are still valid.

Chapter 6: Vision, Aims and Objectives

- Natural England: Supported for setting positive environmental targets.
- Two Harbours Healthcare Ltd: Recommend embedding health objectives and facilitate collaboration. For example, the Weymouth & Portland Integrated Neighbourhood Team (INT) pilot currently underway.
- Public Health Dorset: Recommend stronger focus on mental health, CPTED, health inequalities, and inclusive design.
- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Concerns about underrepresentation of tourism and overly prescriptive environmental objectives.
- Turley on behalf of landowner Wyke Oliver Farm North: Support for the overall vision and aims, especially regarding environment, greenspace, housing, and economy.
- Weymouth Civic Society commended the safeguarding of landscape and heritage.
- Weymouth Climate Hub: Support many of the Plan Sections and Policies.
- Dorset Ramblers: Are supportive.
- Public comments:
 - Mixed views on the plan's scope—some say it's too broad, others praise its ambition.
 - Suggests adding “holiday destination” to vision statement.
 - Support for the plan's environmental and community focus, despite limitations.
 - The plan makes broad employment commitments but lacks clear actions, timelines, and enforcement to ensure delivery.

Chapter 7: Environmental Sustainability

- Dorset Council: Inconsistent references to Strategic Environmental Objectives across policies. Suggests consolidating repetitive references into a single overarching policy.
- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Targets are ambiguous and resemble policy; suggest reframing.
- Public Health Dorset: Recommend clearer links between climate and health benefits.
- Public comments:
 - Expresses support for sustainability but lacks enforceable standards.
 - No requirement to meet Dorset Council's Sustainability Checklist or Future Homes Standard.
 - Recommends mandating compliance with national and local environmental targets.

Chapter 8: Landscape and Greenspace

Policy W01 – Shoreline Protection

- Dorset Council: Policy W01 lacks guidance for adapting existing development at risk from coastal erosion.
- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Support policy as aligned with business and property protection.

Policies W02-W06

- Dorset Council: Natural Environment Team (NET). Overlap in biodiversity policies (W02, W03, W05); recommend consolidation.
- Natural England supports policies W02-W05 without any suggested changes.
- Turley on behalf of landowner Wyke Oliver Farm North: Concern that Policies W03 and W04 do not adequately reflect that some ecological networks overlap with residential allocations (e.g., Policy W20). Recommends cross-referencing residential allocations in W03 and W04 to reflect mitigation and enhancement measures.
- Public comments:
 - Strong support for protecting wildlife habitats, corridors, trees, and hedgerows.
 - Concerns about developments near Lodmoor Nature Reserve and other ecologically sensitive areas.
 - Requests for stronger policies to prevent habitat fragmentation and promote biodiversity.
 - Suggestions to include Greenhill Gardens and Lodmoor Bird Reserve in protected zones.

Policy W02 – Conservation of the Natural Environment

- Dorset Council: Clarify and separate the policy's focus on country parks (public access) and nature reserves (wildlife conservation), relocate site-specific proposals to relevant policies (e.g. W21), ensure mapping consistency, and update the policy text to explicitly reflect developer contributions and biodiversity net gain as referenced in the supporting text.
- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Wording is vague and duplicates national policy. Suggests clarification to avoid redundancy.

Policy W03 – Wildlife Habitats and Areas

- Dorset Council: Natural Environment Team (NET). Repword the policy to clearly reflect the hierarchy of international, national, and local wildlife sites with appropriate levels of protection.
- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Terms are undefined; maps lack site-specific analysis.
- Savills (on behalf of Dorset Healthcare): Object to inclusion of Westhaven Hospital; request map amendment.
- C G Fry and Son Ltd: Considered unnecessary and should be deleted or made consistent with National Policy.

Policy W04 – Wildlife Corridors

- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Map 6 is too broad; recommend using “wildlife connectivity” instead.
- Savills (on behalf of Dorset Healthcare): Object to policy wording and mapping inaccuracies affecting hospital site.

Policy W05 – Ecological Impact of Development

- Dorset Council: Natural Environment Team (NET). Revise Policy W05 as a standalone Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) policy, separating national legislation and species-specific enhancements into W03, and clearly state that while 20% BNG is an aspirational target aligned with local environmental objectives, it should only be sought where viable, with a statutory minimum of 10% BNG required.
- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Duplicates existing legislation; 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is misleading.
- Chapman Lily Planning Ltd (Cobra House Ltd & Bellwell Homes) & C G Fry and Son Ltd: Suggest deletion or alignment with national 10% BNG requirement.
- Turley on behalf of landowner Wyke Oliver Farm North: Concern about the objective in Appendix A requiring 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)—suggested to align with the 10% national requirement and make higher targets aspirational.

Policy W06 – Trees, Woodlands, Hedgerows

- Dorset Council: Recommends simplifying its wording and relying on existing detailed guidance in the Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol (2024) and Local Validation Checklist (2022), while suggesting deletion of Criterion 2 as it duplicates national protections for ancient and veteran trees.
- Natural England: Recommend adding a note to consider updated national guidance on species selection due to climate change.
- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Support tree protection but request clearer definitions and alignment with NPPF.

Policy W07 – Rights of Way and Access to the Countryside

- Dorset Council: Natural Environment Team (NET). The policy could be made stronger by stating that new developments should enhance PRow where appropriate to increase their inclusivity and accessibility for residents.
- Natural England: Suggest including bridleways, enhancing routes, and separating users in built-up areas.
- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Ambiguous terms; recommend clearer definitions and recognition of mitigation.
- Dorset Ramblers: Support inclusion; recommend referencing Defra Circular 1/09.

Policy W08 – Coastal Green Recreation Areas

- Dorset Council: Recommend excluding any land allocated for development under Policy WEY9 (e.g. Former QinetiQ Site).

Policy W08 – Coastal Green Recreation Areas (Bincleaves Open Space and Underbarn)

- Public comments:
 - Reopening a footpath through unstable land poses safety risks.
 - Path is a permissive route, not a public right of way.
 - Council allegedly ignored landowner concerns.
 - Offers alternative safer route for South West Coast Path.

Policy W08 – Coastal Green Recreation Areas (Bowleaze Coveaway)

- Public comments:
 - Recognition of coastal areas as vital for tourism and local recreation.
 - Specific support for protecting Bowleaze Coveaway green space.
 - Suggestions to extend Preston Beach wall for improved pedestrian access.
 - Concerns about beach erosion and its impact on tourism and economy.

Policy W08 – Coastal Green Recreation Areas (Redcliffe Coastal Access)

- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Area 5 includes private land; suggest removal or restriction to public rights of way.

Policy W09 – Green Gaps

- Dorset Council: Proposals within the green gap should demonstrate through a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) that they would not diminish the gap between settlements.
- Turley on behalf of landowner Wyke Oliver Farm North: Exclude residential development areas from Green Gap designation.
- Preston Against Flooding: The allocation of Site W20 directly contradicts Policy W09 by significantly narrowing the green gap to just 165 metres, threatening landscape character and promoting coalescence and urban sprawl, as confirmed by the SEA's red flag assessment.
- Public comments:
 - Strong public support for maintaining green wedges (e.g., Sutton Road to Puddledock Lane).
 - Concerns about urban sprawl and merging of distinct communities.

Policy W10 – Local Green Spaces

- Dorset Council: Several Local Green Space designations conflict with existing uses or designations (e.g., public park, highways land, conservation areas).
- Weymouth Civic Society: Strong support for preserving small open spaces due to housing pressure.
- Public Health Dorset: Emphasize the importance of walkable access to green/blue spaces, especially for non-car owners.
- Public comments:
 - Widespread public support for designating spaces like Hurdlemead. Emphasis on historical, recreational, and ecological value of these spaces.
 - Unclear where the 49 green spaces are located and whether they are maintained or usable.

Policy W10 – Local Green Spaces (Omissions)

- Public comments:
 - Land between Church Road and Bowleaze Cove way
 - Greenhill Play Gardens (Sluice Gardens)
 - Footway between Swannery Car Park and Westham Road
 - All relevant council owned parks and gardens (Friends of Greenhill Gardens)
 - Greenhill Gardens

Policy W10 – Local Green Spaces (Greenhill Gardens)

- Dorset Council: Greenhill Gardens could be designated if further justification is provided.
- Friends of Greenhill Gardens (FOGG)
 - FOGG and other local groups were not informed about the opportunity to nominate Greenhill Gardens for Local Green Space (LGS) designation.
 - FOGG expected Weymouth Town Council to nominate key parks like Greenhill Gardens, which did not happen.
 - The omission of Greenhill Gardens undermines the community-led nature of the Neighbourhood Plan process.
 - FOGG fears the Examiner may wrongly assume council-owned parks are already protected and exclude them from LGS status.
 - Recommend adding Greenhill Gardens and other council-owned parks to Policy W10 to ensure consistent and long-term protection
- Public comments:
 - Hundreds of residents and stakeholders object to the exclusion of Greenhill Gardens from the Local Green Spaces (LGS) list, calling for its immediate inclusion.
 - The gardens fulfill all National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) criteria for LGS designation—beauty, heritage, recreation, tranquility, wildlife, and accessibility.
 - The space supports biodiversity, mental and physical health, and community cohesion, aligning with sustainable development goals.
 - Established in 1872 and gifted to the town in 1902, the gardens are a cherished part of Weymouth’s Victorian heritage and coastal identity.
 - As a key attraction, the gardens contribute to the local economy through tourism, events, and nearby businesses.
 - The gardens are fully accessible and provide a safe, tranquil environment for all ages and abilities, including those with disabilities.
 - They serve as a green corridor supporting pollinators, birds, and urban ecology.
 - Without LGS protection, the gardens are vulnerable to future development, raising fears of a “backdoor” route to loss of public space.
 - Groups like Friends of Greenhill Gardens were not informed about the nomination process, undermining the plan’s community-led ethos.
 - Respondents urge the inclusion of Greenhill Gardens in Policy W10, visual representation on plan maps, and consideration under other protective designations like “Green Gaps.”

Policy W11 – Incidental Open Spaces

- Dorset Council: The policy restricts development in sustainable areas without justification, duplicating Local Green Space protections without formally designating them or aligning with NPPF guidance.

Policy W12 – Riversides

- Dorset Council: Consider whether this policy is necessary having regard to national planning policy relating to water compatible development and planning practice guidance relating to flood risk and coastal change.
- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Repeats national policy; recommend removing redundant clauses.

Policy W13 – Panoramas, Vistas and Views

- Dorset Council: Combine repetitive wording in Criterion 1 and revise Criterion 2. Developers to submit a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) where views may be affected, ensuring development does not compromise significant panoramas, vistas, or views, beyond simply adhering to design guidance.
- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Wording unclear; recommend re-consultation.
- Weymouth Civic Society: Support inclusion of additional views.
- Public comments:
 - Mixed views—some support, others fear over-constraining development.
 - Specific mention of Weymouth Peninsula needing protection for its scenic value.

Chapter 9: Development and Homes

Housing Requirement

- Dorset Council:
 - Weymouth faces a significant shortage of affordable housing, with current and committed supply unlikely to meet identified needs.
 - Updated housing supply (as of April 2023) totals 3,118 dwellings, slightly below the original requirement of 3,225 for the 2021–2038 plan period.
 - Neighbourhood Plan allocations (Policy W19–W22) propose 425 additional homes, including 212 affordable units, to boost delivery and address housing shortfalls.
- Turley on behalf of landowner Wyke Oliver Farm North: Notes that the housing requirement in the plan is based on outdated figures.
- Public comments:
 - Inflated housing demand figures misrepresent local need.
 - Overemphasis on 3- and 4-bedroom homes contradicts FOI and HNA data.
 - Only 7–9% of proposed homes meet the 64–68% demand for one-bedroom units.
 - AECOM’s modelling is based on outdated and non-local data.
 - The plan risks enabling speculative development that fails to serve local residents.

Viability evidence

- Dorset Council:
 - Viability testing for the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan was completed late and did not assess several final policy changes, including ambitious targets for affordable housing, biodiversity net gain, and sustainability standards—raising concerns about their deliverability.
 - Dorset Council recommends updating the viability evidence or revising policies to include flexibility, such as allowing exceptions where requirements would render development unviable, to ensure the Plan remains robust and implementable.

Policy W14 – Development Boundaries

- Dorset Council: Supported in principle. Updates to include new allocations considered appropriate.
- C G Fry and Son Ltd: Needs to explicitly allow for development identified in strategic policies.

Policy W15 – Extensions and Alterations

- Dorset Council: The phrase “highest sustainability standards” is vague and potentially onerous. Passive Haus and other standards referenced have not been viability-tested.

Policy W16 – Major Housing Sites

- Dorset Council:
 - Clarifications are needed on terms like “adequate” and “sufficient” in relation to cycle storage and open space.
 - Criteria should reflect national standards (e.g. M4(2) for adaptable dwellings), include accessible cycle storage and EV charging points, and ensure safe walking/cycling routes to amenities.
 - The concept of walkable neighbourhoods is supported but not referenced in the NPPF.
 - Site-specific documents, drainage impact assessments, and transport-related studies should align with the Council’s validation checklist and national guidance.
 - Highways Development Team. Travel Plans and transport assessments are required for developments generating significant movement.
- Network Rail: Suggests inclusion of improved walking and cycling links to Upwey and Weymouth rail stations.
- C G Fry and Son Ltd: References outdated Lifetime Homes Standards—should be replaced with M4(2) Building Regulations. Duplicates national validation requirements—criteria 3 and 4 should be deleted.
- Public Health Dorset:
 - Recommend including EV charging for all electric transport, not just cars (W16 1ii).
 - Suggest broadening “walking and cycling” to “all forms of active travel” (W16 2).
 - Propose minimum space standards and indoor air quality considerations

Policy W17 – Housing Mix

- Public Health Dorset: Recommend highlighting the importance of tenure blindness in mixed developments
- Preston Against Flooding & Public comments
 - The policy calls for housing mixes to be based on local housing needs, but this is not enforced.
 - The 2024 Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) shows a need for 66% 1-bedroom homes, but Policy W20 only includes 6%.
 - The language used (“should provide or contribute to”) is too vague and lacks enforceability.

- Developers may prioritise profitability over local needs due to lack of specific thresholds.
- The policy does not bind developers to the HNA findings, risking misalignment with actual needs.
- There is concern that viability assessments are being used to justify inappropriate housing mixes.

Policy W18 – Affordable Housing

- Dorset Council:
 - The policy introduces a lower threshold for affordable housing (2–9 units) without prior consultation or viability testing—this clause should be removed.
 - The proposed affordable housing targets (35% brownfield, 50% greenfield) are based on a narrow sample and lack robust viability support—these targets should not be applied generally.
 - Several criteria (2 ii & iv) simply repeat national policy (NPPF paragraph 64) and can be deleted to streamline the policy.
 - The 25% First Homes requirement may be outdated due to recent NPPF changes—consider reallocating this portion to shared ownership or other intermediate tenures.
- Redtale Holdings Ltd: Object to affordable housing contributions on small sites; cite viability and policy misalignment. The policy will reduce the overall number of new homes delivered, including affordable housing. The policy disproportionately affects small and medium-sized enterprises.
- Chapman Lily Planning Ltd (Cobra House Ltd and Bellway Homes): The Housing Needs Assessment is recognized as a robust and compelling document, especially regarding affordable housing.
- C G Fry and Son Ltd: Objection to 50% affordable housing requirement on greenfield sites. Not supported by robust viability evidence.
- Weymouth Civic Society: Especially support for the provision of affordable homes.
- Turley on behalf of landowner Wyke Oliver Farm North: Strong support for prioritizing affordable housing, citing significant local need (3,388 homes over the plan period).
- Preston Against Flooding & Public comments:
 - Ambitious targets (35% brownfield, 50% greenfield) lack enforcement.
 - Financial Viability Assessments (FVAs) allow developers to reduce delivery.
 - Even if targets are met, only 72 affordable homes/year would be delivered—far below the 242 needed.
 - No bedroom size requirements despite demand for smaller homes.

- Allows off-site contributions for small developments, missing opportunities for on-site affordable units.
- AECOM's housing mix again favours larger homes, misaligned with local need.
- Public comments:
 - Suggests shared ownership as a more viable solution than high-density, below-market-price housing.
 - supports policies and strategies that promote social and affordable housing for vulnerable groups (including young families and the elderly), and welcomes financial incentives for locals to access the private housing market (e.g. tax reductions, lower interest rates, zero deposit schemes).
 - More Affordable Housing would have been helpful bearing in mind low wage economy and very high property prices.
 - We need a mixture of housing including starter homes for single people.

Policy W19 – Site Allocations

- Dorset Council: Dorset Council: The recommended HRA wording to Policy W19 to address the effects of dust and water quality (from runoff) has not been included.
- Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group: Request corrections to map references and inclusion of protected sites.

Common site allocation issues

- Dorset Council:
 - The Landscape & Urban Design team. Lack of masterplanning raises concerns about site capacity estimates.
 - CIL/S106 Team. Clarify infrastructure needs in policies.
 - The Highways Development Team. Any access and estate layout must meet current highway standards, ensure inclusive access, justify mitigation, and align with NPPF guidance.
 - The Transport Planning Team. There should be consistency for all site allocations regarding determining the need for a Transport Assessment / Statement and Travel Plan.
 - The Flood Risk Management Team. Address site-specific surface water management constraints as highlighted by the LLFA.
 - Emergency Planning Team. The developments proposed do not pose a significant threat to the MoD Operational Berth at Portland Port, and do not include any hazardous sites or developments that would pose long or very long-range impacts.

- Historic England: Site allocations should demonstrate conformity with overarching national and local policy for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment.
- National Highways: Acknowledge allocations; expect traffic assessments.
- Weymouth Civic Society: Concern over scale of development and protection of industrial land.

Omission Site: WNP24 South of Wyke Oliver Farm (Budmouth Avenue)

- Chapman Lily on behalf of Bellway Homes:
 - Disappointment expressed over removal of Budmouth Avenue (previously WNP24).
 - Bellway Homes conducted extensive technical assessments confirming deliverability.
 - Willingness to deliver 50% affordable housing, plus CIL and S106 contributions.
 - Proposal includes 23-hectare extension to Lorton Valley Nature Park for environmental enhancement.
 - SEA identified adverse impacts (biodiversity, community wellbeing, landscape, transport). Bellway argues mitigation measures were not adequately considered.

Policy W20 – Wyke Oliver Farm North

- Dorset Council:
 - The site is considered available. Viability testing shows it's only feasible with a reduced affordable housing output (43.6%), current policy target exceeds this.
 - Question site capacity without full understanding of site constraints.
 - Safe access via Wyke Oliver Road needs confirmation from Highways.
 - The Transport Planning Team. Cycle connectivity improvements are encouraged, especially linking Littlemoor Road to Oakbury Drive to support active travel.
 - The Natural Environment Team (NET). The site lies within the Lorton Valley wildlife corridor and an area of moderate-high landscape sensitivity, raising potential conflicts with policy W05 and ENV3.
 - The development is split by a dry valley—clarity is needed on whether the two parcels will be linked or remain separate.
 - The term “community focus” also requires definition.
 - The Conservation Team. The site is near a listed building and the World Heritage Site, but existing development provides some screening.
- National Highways: Welcome traffic impact assessment and travel plan measures.

- Turley on behalf of landowner Wyke Oliver Farm North:
 - Highlights the sustainable location of Wyke Oliver Farm North and its proximity to key services and transport. Suggest modifications to policy wording.
 - Highway Access and Capacity are being assessed.
 - Updating Policy W20 to reflect a capacity of approximately 270 dwellings (vs. 250) based on site density.
 - Adding a north-south access connection on Map 19.
 - Clarifying what is meant by “community focus” in Policy W19 to ensure proportionality.
 - Including flexibility in Policy W20 similar to Policy W18 regarding the 50% affordable housing target, to account for viability issues.
- Symonds and Sampson LLP on behalf of the Barnes and Legg family:
 - Strong resistance from landowners due to impact on their interests. Suitable arrangements for loss mitigation or compensation.
- Melcombe Regis Ward Councillor:
 - Supports the proposal due to Weymouth’s urgent housing need—especially for affordable homes—its potential to boost the local economy, limited viable alternatives due to environmental constraints, and strong community backing beyond a small area of opposition.
- Littlemoor Ward Councillor:
 - Limited road access; increased traffic would overwhelm local infrastructure.
 - Site is on a slope with a history of flooding due to natural springs.
- Preston Ward Councillor:
 - The Wyke Oliver Road site (W20) fails to meet the plan’s own walkability targets, being too far from essential services like shops, schools, and bus stops.
 - Most homes in W20 do not meet the plan’s sustainable transport criteria (Target 31), which sets specific distance thresholds for access to amenities.
 - The site includes areas in Flood Zone 3 and has a history of flooding; the SEA is outdated and doesn’t reflect the increased housing numbers now proposed.
- Preston Against Flooding:
 - The site lies in Flood Zone 3 with a history of flooding and lacks adequate drainage infrastructure.
 - The Strategic Environmental Assessment is flawed, underestimating housing numbers and omitting key environmental and transport impacts. Rated “uncertain” on multiple criteria, indicating unresolved risks.

- Development threatens sensitive habitats, wildlife corridors, and ecological connectivity, especially with the removal of WNP24. Dorset Wildlife Trust's support was contingent on land transfer, now uncertain.
- The site would cause significant visual harm and erode green gaps between distinct communities.
- The location is poorly connected by sustainable transport and distant from essential services.
- The Viability Assessment omits major costs, shows negligible profit, and the developer has withdrawn.
- Increased development risks worsening sewage discharge into protected waters, harming public health and the environment.
- Policy W20 contradicts numerous WNP policies on environment, infrastructure, housing mix, and sustainable development.
- The proposal faces overwhelming local opposition and fails to meet identified housing needs or planning objectives
- Public comments:
 - The site is ecologically sensitive, supporting diverse wildlife and lying close to protected areas like Lodmoor SSSI.
 - Flood risk is significant, with poor drainage, historical flooding, and no clear mitigation for climate-related rainfall increases.
 - Access and road safety are major concerns, with narrow, congested roads and dangerous junctions unsuitable for increased traffic.
 - Local infrastructure is overstretched, with limited healthcare, school capacity, and public transport options.
 - Viability concerns undermine affordable housing delivery, with the developer's report showing minimal profit and affordability targets unmet.
 - The site has a history of rejection, and the consultation process is viewed as flawed and dismissive of community feedback.
 - The proposal contradicts sustainability goals, increasing car dependency and failing to meet walkability and brownfield development targets.
 - Sewage and water systems are inadequate, risking pollution and further environmental degradation, including beach water quality.
 - Policy W20 may harm nearby protected habitats due to runoff and recreational pressure, with no mitigation measures proposed in the Habitats Regulations Assessment.
 - Residents advocate for alternative sites or conservation use, suggesting removal of Policy W20 in favour of more suitable locations.
 - Proposal for 250 homes on greenfield land prioritises housing numbers over community needs, lacks a balanced mix with no guarantee of smaller, affordable units, and requires a re-run of the viability assessment with at least 60% one-bedroom homes.

Policy W21 – Redlands Farm

- Dorset Council:
 - The site is considered available and has been subject to viability testing.
 - The estimated 150 dwellings may be optimistic without detailed assessment of site constraints—further capacity testing is advised.
 - Transport Planning Team. Safe vehicular, pedestrian, and cycle access needs confirmation; a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan should be required.
 - A drainage strategy is essential to address surface water flooding and prevent increased flood risk elsewhere.
 - The extent and management of the proposed 9.1ha wildlife site need clarification and alignment with Policy W02.
 - Conservation Team. Development must respect nearby heritage assets and green infrastructure, with appropriate screening, building heights, and mitigative design measures.
- National Highways: Recommend inclusion of traffic assessment and travel plan measures.
- C G Fry and Son Ltd: Strong support for site allocation. Suggested modifications to policy criteria.
 - Allow flexibility in housing numbers (e.g., “at least 150”).
 - Reduce affordable housing requirement to 25% unless justified.
 - Add flexibility to tree-lined road requirements.
 - Reword height and conservation area references for clarity.
 - Allow for diversion of public rights of way.
 - Delete reference to environmental targets (criterion 4xiv).
 - Remove requirement for a site-specific design code.
- Public comments:
 - The combined 490 homes from W21 and adjacent WEY12 would overwhelm local capacity and erode the Important Open Gap, contributing to urban sprawl.
 - The site's elevated position would cause significant visual intrusion, especially from conservation areas and key viewpoints like Dorchester Road and the Wey Valley.
 - The area is prone to flooding, with no comprehensive flood risk assessment or mitigation strategy provided, especially in relation to WEY12's impact.
 - Uncertainty remains over road access and infrastructure capacity, with no clear audit or delivery plan for supporting services.
 - The development would harm the setting of nearby conservation areas (Nottingham and Radipole) and lacks sensitivity to the historic environment.

- Elevated housing would cause overlooking, loss of privacy, and visual intrusion for existing residents.
- The SEA identifies W21 as having the worst environmental impact among six sites, and it hasn't been updated since October 2023.
- The proposed 50% affordable housing is likely unviable, with developers suggesting 35% is more realistic and no validated viability evidence provided.
- W21 may conflict with the emerging Dorset Local Plan, and its allocation contradicts guidance in the Site Options and Assessment Report v4.
- Strategic nature of allocation inappropriate for Neighbourhood Plan. Deemed unsuitable in SHLAA 2024. Lack of coordination with Dorset Council.

Policy W22 – Beverley Road

- Dorset Council:
 - The site is considered available. Development is only viable with assumptions; sensitivity testing supports 36% affordable housing (15 market, 9 affordable).
 - Steep slope increases development costs; access via Beverley Road car park is uncertain and needs clearer evidence.
 - Northern part of site is prone to surface water flooding; a specific drainage strategy including SUDS is required.
 - Development would result in loss of well-used green space and mature trees within a Higher Potential Ecological Network.
 - Transport Planning Team. Existing diagonal path is at risk from proposed layout; policy should protect and enhance links to Upwey Station and NCN26.
- National Highways: Recommend inclusion of traffic assessment and travel plan measures.
- Chapman Lily Planning Ltd (Cobra House Ltd) supports the allocation of land off Beverley Road for residential development. Support for environmental enhancements and sustainable design. Suggests flexibility in housing numbers.
- Littlemoor Ward Councillor:
 - Site is enclosed with no suitable access routes; potential access through a shared car park is inadequate.
 - Known flood-prone area; natural basin with poor drainage.
 - Surrounded by existing homes and flats, leading to privacy concerns.
 - Littlemoor has already absorbed significant new housing; local services are under strain.

General Issues Across Policies W23A, W23B, W23C

- Public comments:
 - The proposals fail to comply with national policy and strategic planning conditions.
 - There is no sequential flood risk test or robust evidence base.
 - Ecological, contamination, and archaeological assessments are inadequate.
 - The site is identified as unsuitable in the SHELAA beyond WEY8.
 - High remediation costs and lack of demand undermine feasibility.
 - Development would harm wildlife corridors and biodiversity.
 - The area has rewilded and functions as an extension of the nature reserve.

Policy W23A – North Section (Employment Use)

- Dorset Council:
 - The Assets Team objects to employment allocation; site not available for this use.
 - The Commercial Waste and Strategy team confirm that any development on the former Lodmoor Landfill Site must assess and mitigate impacts on existing drainage infrastructure, leachate movement, and site stability due to changes such as hard standing.
- Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group:
 - The respondent requests that Policy W23A explicitly support horticultural and parks-related uses—such as equipment storage, polytunnels, and public garden operations—within the leased area of Lodmoor Old Tip North.
- Public Health Dorset: Suggest aligning W23a with environmental goals like other policies.
- Friends of Lodmoor Country Park:
 - Proximity to a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); potential harm to wildlife and residential amenity from noise, light, and traffic.
 - The site lies on a floodplain with a history of annual flooding affecting nearby homes.
 - Former municipal tip with known subsurface contamination, acknowledged in documentation.
 - Existing industrial areas like Jubilee Sidings are underused and more suitable for development.
 - Increased industrial traffic would endanger pedestrians accessing Lodmoor Country Park.

- Lodmoor Ward Councillors:
 - Support the plan overall but question the suitability of allocating Lodmoor Old Tip – North Section (W23A) for industrial use due to its Country Park designation and lease restrictions, suggesting biodiversity enhancement instead.
- Melcombe Regis Ward Councillor:
 - The site’s proximity to Lodmoor SSSI and its sensitive reed bed habitat, combined with its history as a municipal tip and location within an impact risk zone, raises serious environmental concerns about potential pollution and habitat degradation from industrial development.
- Public comments:
 - Weymouth Bay Avenue is too narrow and residential for industrial traffic.
 - Industrial use would increase noise, emissions, and light pollution.
 - The junction with Dorchester Road is already congested and unsafe.
 - Increased HGVs and deliveries would endanger children, pedestrians, and cyclists.
 - The site is adjacent to Lorton and Lodmoor nature reserves and supports diverse wildlife.
 - Development would fragment habitats and reduce biodiversity.
 - The site lies in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and is prone to flooding.
 - High flood risk makes it difficult for businesses to obtain insurance, discouraging investment and threatening the development’s economic viability.
 - Viability of site due to current pumping station and foul sewer running through the site.
 - It is a former landfill with potential contamination from methane and radon.
 - The area is popular for recreation and would lose public access and green space.
 - The proposal conflicts with Local Plan Policy WEY8 and national planning guidance.
 - Public rights of way and cycle routes would be disrupted.
 - Loss of privacy will impact on the local residents.

Policy W23B – Mid Section (Leisure Use)

- Dorset Council:
 - The Assets Team could support site W23B coming forward for leisure, recreation, or transport use.
 - The Commercial Waste and Strategy team confirm that Lodmoor Old Tip mid-section is a critical waste management site housing a well-used Household Recycling Centre and a leased Waste Transfer Station—both

of which are essential to Dorset Council's operations, with no plans for relocation.

- Public comments:
 - Development would disturb habitats and reduce biodiversity.
 - The site is part of a floodplain and regularly experiences flooding.
 - It is a former landfill with contamination risks.
 - The area is widely used for walking, running, birdwatching, and dog walking.
 - Leisure development could commercialise and degrade the natural environment.
 - Existing leisure facilities nearby already meet community needs.
 - There are calls to incorporate the site into the nature reserve with a café or viewing centre.

Policy W23C – South Section (Leisure Use)

- Dorset Council:
 - The Assets Team could support site W23C coming forward for leisure, recreation, or transport use.
 - The Natural Environment Team (NET) does not consider the Lodmoor Old Tip site to be a suitable location for employment use. The site borders nationally designated SSSIs and supports important habitats, making it unsuitable for employment or housing use under Policy ENV2 unless exceptional justification is provided.
 - The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) explain that while not directly at flood risk, surrounding areas are vulnerable to flooding and coastal realignment, with complex drainage interactions that could affect site viability and safe access.
 - The Commercial Waste and Strategy team confirm that as a closed landfill, the site may require costly contamination remediation and drainage redesign, impacting development feasibility.
- Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group: The inclusion of housing-related conditions contradicts the intended Leisure Use designation. Remove Condition 2 viii entirely from the Submission Plan.
- Weymouth Civic Society: Object due to landfill history and unsuitability for housing.
- Preston Against Flooding: Dorset Council, the landowner, has opposed development on this site.
- Public comments:
 - The site is adjacent to high flood risk zones and would need costly remediation.
 - It is a contaminated former landfill site.

- Development would sever ecological links with Lodmoor SSSI.
- There are concerns about increased CO₂ emissions and pollution.
- The area is currently used for overflow parking and recreation.
- Loss of green space would negatively affect community well-being.
- There are doubts about the affordability and suitability of housing here. If developed, there is a preference for social or affordable housing.
- The proposal contradicts NPPF guidance on flood risk and biodiversity.
- The site lies outside the defined development boundary.

Policy W24 – Jubilee Sidings

- Dorset Council:
 - The site is considered available; viability testing shows modest but positive land value, with potential for 100% affordable housing via grant funding.
 - The proposal supports WEY3's vision for a transport hub with active frontages and improved public realm.
 - Flood risk considerations (e.g. sequential/exception tests, safe access) are insufficiently addressed.
- Environment Agency: Note withdrawal of local flood risk advice (3.ii); recommend referencing national guidance.
- Weymouth Civic Society: Object to Jubilee Sidings use; prefer industrial or parking use.
- Network Rail:
 - Supports site allocation but urges consideration of the entire Network Rail land area (including Halfords/B&Q, car parks, and station building).
 - Recommends a masterplan for the station area.
 - Encourages development of a bus/rail interchange and transport hub, reducing reliance on Kings Statue.

Policy W25 – Mount Pleasant Old Tip

- Dorset Council:
 - The Assets Team supports development for employment, leisure, and transport uses as part of a multi-modal mobility hub.
 - The site borders Lodmoor SSSI & SNCI, requiring consultation with Natural England and Councils NET.
 - Leisure proposals over 1000sqm must pass sequential and impact tests.
 - Retention or replacement of the running track is locally important.
 - The site is a closed landfill, raising concerns about contamination, landfill gas, leachate, and drainage impacts.
 - The Highways Development Team. A Transport Statement/Travel Plan is recommended for future proposals.

- Renewable energy development should follow national PPG guidance, particularly for solar farms and visual impact mitigation.
- Natural England: Clarify that land north and east of the hardstanding is for nature conservation and unsuitable for solar panels.
- Public Health Dorset: Emphasize inclusive design for public access (W25 – 6v).
- Network Rail: Supports continued use as a Park and Ride facility. Potential for sustainable transport hub development.
- Public comments:
 - Threat to biodiversity in adjacent nature park and restoration area.
 - Fire safety risks from EV infrastructure not addressed.
 - Contradicts earlier assessments deeming site unsuitable.
 - Risk of unregulated long-term use by traveller communities.
 - Loss of valued community running track.
 - Traffic and safety concerns at nearby junctions.
 - Recommends limiting development to existing Park & Ride area.
 - Calls for full Environmental Impact Assessment and consultation with wildlife bodies.
 - Park and Ride system is ineffective due to distant bus stops and overcrowded buses.
 - Negative first impressions for visitors due to nearby bus and pod camps.
 - Proposes converting the Park and Ride site into a motorhome short-stay park with automated, membership-based access, offering £40-per-night stays to attract visitors and generate significant local revenue.
 - Overlooks ecological risks near Lorton Valley and Lodmoor. No requirement for baseline ecological surveys or mitigation of noise/light/hydrological impacts.
 - Recommend collaboration with Dorset Wildlife Trust and Natural England.

Policy W26 Self Build and custom-build housing

- Dorset Council: Support policy.

Policy W27 – Community Housing Schemes

- Dorset Council: Not aligned with NPPF; needs revision or deletion.

Policy W28 – Specialist Housing Provision

- Dorset Council: Supported with strong evidence base.

Policy W29 – Houses in Multiple Occupation

- Dorset Council:
 - The current 100m rule for HMO concentration is overly restrictive; consider using a percentage threshold within defined areas like LSOAs instead.
 - Many small HMOs (C4) are exempt from this policy unless an Article 4 Direction is in place; consider referencing this explicitly.
 - More research is required to justify restrictive policies, especially regarding small HMOs and actual impacts on the community and housing market.
- Public Health Dorset: Propose minimum space standards and indoor air quality considerations
- Public comments:
 - Concerns about poor standards and lack of community in large HMOs.
 - Support for Article 4 direction and limiting HMO size.
 - Objections to 100m spacing rule in town centre due to impact on vulnerable residents.

Policy W30 – Exception Site Development

- Dorset Council: Confusing structure; suggest splitting into two policies (First Home and Rural Exception sites).
- Natural England: Supported for protecting the National Landscape and promoting sustainable development.
- Preston Against Flooding:
 - Dorset Council policy requires 100% affordable housing on exception sites.
- Public comments:
 - Allows moderate-scale affordable housing outside DDB.
 - Lacks clarity on site size, infrastructure, and housing type.
 - Risks overdevelopment in sensitive areas.
 - Suggests social rent focus but lacks enforceable commitments.

Policy W31 – Principal Residence

- Dorset Council:
 - Weymouth MSOA 044 has only 3.75% second homes, which is not significant compared to areas like Abbotsbury or St Ives, weakening the justification for a blanket policy.
 - The 18% vacant homes in MSOA 044 are unusually high and may be the real issue, suggesting the policy should focus on vacancy rather than second homes.

- Other plans (e.g. Northumberland, Chesil Bank) use a 20%+ threshold for second/vacant homes to justify restrictions; Weymouth only meets this when combining both figures (21.75%).
- The proposed policy applies to LSOAs (044A, 044D, 044F) that don't meet the threshold, indicating a need to refine the geographic scope.
- Dorset Council's 100% council tax premium on second homes (from April 2025) may already address the issue, and the policy could impact development viability, especially for waterfront sites.
- Public comments:
 - Support for policy to prevent hollowing out of town centre by second homes.
 - Concerns about affordability and unintended consequences on regeneration.
 - Suggestions to apply policy selectively based on deprivation indices.
 - Ensure that properties are only used for year-round living and not as 'second' or 'holiday' homes.
 - Properties are often purchased as second homes, buy-to-let investments, or Airbnbs, leading to seasonal vacancies.
 - Blanket policy despite low second-home rate (3.2%). May overregulate without solving housing mix issues. Larger homes may remain unsold or go to out-of-area associations.

Policy W32 – Town Centre Car Parks

- Dorset Council:
 - The Transport Planning Team & Highways Development Team. The policy should support the Weymouth Town Centre Masterplan and Neighbourhood Plan Policy W39, with redevelopment backed by robust parking capacity analysis.
 - Surplus car parks may lack benchmark land value, but existing use as operational car parks should still inform valuation.
 - Criterion i should reflect NPPF guidance by promoting convenient, safe, and accessible parking, including pedestrian and cyclist access.
 - Criterion ii needs a clearer definition of “peak parking demand” and should allow for a wider range of solutions beyond park & ride.
 - The Transport Planning Team. Add a criterion requiring proposals to prioritise sustainable transport and offer genuine alternatives to car use.
- Weymouth Civic Society: Support revised policy but concerned about vulnerability to redevelopment.
- Public Health Dorset: Emphasize inclusive design for public access
- Public comments:
 - Objections to reducing car parks due to impact on local businesses.

- Suggestions to repurpose upper floors of buildings for residential use.
- Town centre congestion caused by drivers searching for affordable parking, affecting nearby residential areas.

Policy W33 – Timing of Infrastructure

- Dorset Council:
 - Reads more like an objective than a decision-making tool and may be better placed in the objectives section
 - The CIL/S106 Team. Terms like “logically” and “unacceptable” are too ambiguous for enforcement and should be replaced with clearer, measurable language.
 - The CIL/S106 Team. The plan should outline infrastructure priorities and provide a clear strategy for spending increased CIL Neighbourhood Proportion funds.
- Chapman Lily Planning Ltd (Cobra House Ltd & Bellway Homes): Needs more detail. Should include logical phasing and trigger points to ensure clarity and viability.
- Public comments:
 - The plan lacks detailed strategies for scaling healthcare, education, and transport.
 - No phased development approach to align infrastructure with housing growth.
 - Recommends comprehensive infrastructure strategies and monitoring mechanisms.
 - Calls for stronger infrastructure planning (healthcare, schools, utilities).

Policy W34 – Sustainable Development

- Dorset Council:
 - Criteria 2 i) and ii) should be clearer and allow viability concerns to be demonstrated through appraisal.
 - Terms like “sustainable construction,” “SuDS,” and “renewable energy predominance” need clearer definitions or examples to ensure effective implementation.
 - Criterion 2 iv) duplicates existing Building Regulations and can be omitted.
 - The Transport Planning Team. Add a criterion requiring proposals to demonstrate how they promote low-carbon travel options.
- Public Health Dorset: Recommend EV charging for all appliances (W34 – 2v).
- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Policy lacks flexibility and duplicates Local Plan. Revisions suggested.
- C G Fry and Son Ltd: Objection to requirements exceeding national Building Regulations. Align with Building Regulations and delete Appendix A targets.

Chapter 10: Jobs and Local Economy

- Turley on behalf of landowner Wyke Oliver Farm North:
 - Supports the plan’s focus on economic regeneration and diversification.
 - Emphasizes the link between affordable housing and retaining the younger workforce.
 - Agrees that housing and employment opportunities are critical to Weymouth’s future.
- Public comments:
 - More practical measures to pro-actively support existing small businesses and encourage new ones to start in order to regain the lively and diverse town centre and provide interest for visitors, services to locals, and employment opportunities for the young.
 - Lack of infrastructure and low consumer spending due to low wages hinder business relocation to Weymouth.
 - Increasing road congestion, especially on routes to and from Portland, with no visible improvement plans.

Policy W35 – Loss of Business Premises

- Dorset Council:
 - W35 should incorporate exceptions similar to Local Plan Policy ECON3, allowing redevelopment for community benefits where appropriate.
 - The term "employment land and premises" needs a clear definition to avoid ambiguity about what uses qualify.
 - Reduce the required marketing period from 18 to 12 months, and provide detailed guidance on what constitutes appropriate and sustained marketing.
 - Introduce flexibility in the marketing requirement, allowing alternative evidence of non-viability and adding wording like “or other agreed period”.

Policy W36 – New Business Development

- Dorset Council:
 - Criterion 1(iii) may be overly restrictive compared to Local Plan Policy COM7; consider aligning the language to avoid unnecessary conflict.
 - Criterion 1(iv) lacks clarity on the sequential test and town centre planning principles; “over-provision” is not a valid concern in such locations.
 - Criterion 3 is vague; the policy should clarify what constitutes acceptable homeworking, including scale and types of business (e.g., B&Bs, shops).
 - Criterion 4 highlights only select assessments; consider broadening to include heritage, traffic, landscape, and biodiversity impacts.

Granby Industrial Estate

- Business comments:
 - Granby Industrial Estate is a key commercial area supporting local and international businesses. The estate plays a major role in job creation and economic stability in Weymouth.
 - Chickerell link road has improved access to the estate. Recommends further improvements: better public transport and consistent road maintenance.
 - Advocates for incentives for new businesses and grants for innovation. Suggests support for business expansion and networking/training initiatives.
 - Encourages adoption of green technologies and environmentally friendly practices in future developments.
 - Recommends regular consultations with business owners to ensure their needs are reflected in planning decisions.

Policy W37 – Mixed-Use Employment Schemes

- Dorset Council:
 - The relationship between W37 and draft Policy W35 (loss of business premises) needs clarification to avoid conflicting interpretations.
 - The proposed 30% job retention and 50% affordable housing targets diverge from Local Plan Policy ECON2 and require justification, especially in terms of viability.
 - References to retail uses should include requirements for compliance with national town centre policies, such as sequential and impact tests.
 - The policy's stance on conversion vs. full redevelopment is unclear and should confirm that reconstruction is generally acceptable within the DDB.
 - "Employment" is undefined; clearer definitions and supporting evidence (e.g. for affordable housing viability) are needed.

Policy W38 – Higher and Further Education and Skills Provision

- Dorset Council: Support policy.

Policy W39 - Weymouth Town Centre

- Dorset Council:
 - The policy aligns well with Local Plan Policy WEY1 and the adopted masterplan, supporting the evolving role of Weymouth Town Centre.
 - Criterion 2 iv) should be redrafted to reflect that housing may not be suitable in all cases, and affordable housing targets should align with Policy W18 (35% for brownfield sites).

- Criterion 4 needs clarification on when and how alternative uses will be considered — e.g., timeframe, location, or marketing evidence.
- Criterion 6 is positively received for its emphasis on assessing impacts on both designated and non-designated heritage assets.
- Network Rail: Notes reference to the Town Centre masterplan but stresses it must include the rail station.
- Public Health Dorset: Encourage stronger policies to support access to healthy, affordable food.
- Public comments:
 - Doubts about the creation of new leisure jobs given ongoing shop closures and the recent cinema shutdown.
 - Car parking is more expensive than in nearby Dorchester, discouraging visitors.
 - General perception that the town centre is deteriorating.

Policy W40 – Temporary Activities and Uses

- Dorset Council: Planning Policy for short-term activities should focus on managing impacts through mitigation rather than arbitrary time limits, use “seasonal” for recurring events to avoid confusion with temporary permissions, and recognise that many such activities may only require licensing, not planning consent.
- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Community support clause is ambiguous; suggest removal.
- Public Health Dorset: Encourage stronger policies to support access to healthy, affordable food.

Policy W41 – Sustainable Tourism Development

- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Support but recommend removing vague and duplicative clauses.
- Public comments:
 - Support for sustainable tourism and community energy schemes.
 - Requests for stronger measures to mitigate noise, litter, and anti-social behaviour.
 - Suggestions for indoor leisure facilities for year-round use.

Policy W42 - Offshore Renewable Energy Projects

- Natural England: Supported, but W42 should mention both marine and terrestrial biodiversity.
- Public Health Dorset: Emphasize early and open communication to reduce mental health impacts
- Public comments:

- Fails to acknowledge past project rejections (e.g., Navitus Bay).
- Grid infrastructure in Dorset is already constrained.
- Visual and ecological impacts on marine life and tourism.
- Offshore wind is costly and poses navigation risks.
- Recommends focus on SMRs, microgeneration, and energy efficiency.
- Calls for feasibility studies and community consultation.

Policy W43 - Community Energy Schemes

- Dorset Council:
 - Technical feasibility (e.g., wind resource, water source, transport access) must be considered for each energy technology type.
 - Community ownership of 33% is not a legal requirement but can be justified as a local policy objective to promote community benefit.
- MOD: Support in principle but raise concerns about development interfering with defence assets.

Chapter 11: Communities

- Turley on behalf of landowner Wyke Oliver Farm North: Broad support for policies promoting: Sustainable and affordable travel. Protection of community facilities. sports and recreation. Heritage conservation. Public space enhancement.

Policy W44 – Design

- Dorset Council: The policy needs clearer wording to avoid inadvertently supporting poor design.
- Chapman Lily on behalf of Bellway Homes: Vague and prescriptive requirements may hinder innovation and site-specific design.

Policy W45 – Heritage Assets

- Dorset Council:
 - Not fully aligned with national legislation and the NPPF.
 - The Conservation Team clarify, the principal objective, in heritage conservation terms, is that all proposed development should be aligned to causing no harm to heritage assets and their setting
- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Policy conflicts with NPPF; recommend deletion.
- C G Fry and Son Ltd: Should be deleted or revised to reflect NPPF's balanced approach to harm and benefits.

Policy W46 – Transport and Travel

- Dorset Council: The Transport Planning Team. Include that proposals with severe cumulative highway impacts won't be supported
- Lichfields on behalf of Haven Leisure Ltd: Policy wording is more onerous than the NPPF; suggest alignment and simplification.
- Network Rail: Recommends including public transport improvements, especially links to rail stations.
- C G Fry and Son Ltd: Should be deleted or revised to align with paragraph 115 of the NPPF.
- Public comments:
 - Concerns about traffic congestion and lack of infrastructure planning.
 - Suggestions for electric delivery vehicles and better parking management.

Policy W47 – Public Transport

- Dorset Council: The Transport Planning Team advise, the paragraphs associated with this policy should refer to rail, in addition to buses.

- Network Rail: Criticised for lacking reference to the railway network.
- Public comments:
 - Encourages sustainable transport but lacks specific developer obligations.
 - No criteria for proximity to transport or contributions to public transport infrastructure.
 - Recommends mandating developer investment in transport and coordination with Transport Authorities.

Policy W48 – Off-Street Parking

- Dorset Council: The word “minimum” should be discouraged, and the policy should support forms of lower car development where appropriate, especially in town centres.
- Public Health Dorset: Poorly managed parking can hinder active travel and cause local conflict

Policy W49 – Vehicle Charging Points

- Dorset Council: Transport Planning Team. Criterion 1 is considered unnecessary.
- Public comments:
 - Scepticism about installing more electric vehicle charging points given the low number of EVs in the area.

Policy W50 – Cycle Routes

- Dorset Council: The Transport Planning Team is broadly supportive of wording.
- Dorset Ramblers: Support with emphasis on walker safety and appropriate path widths.
- Network Rail: Recommends adding reference to linking walking and cycle routes with Weymouth and Upwey rail stations.
- Public comments:
 - Support for improved cycle routes and public transport.

Policy W51 – Traffic Impact

- Dorset Council: The Transport Planning Team are supportive of proposals outlined in this policy.
- National Highways: Support the requirement for traffic assessments and mitigation for large-scale developments.
- Network Rail: Finds the Policy wording unclear and ineffective. Suggests better integration with public transport and sustainable travel goals.

Policies W52–W57 – Community Facilities

- Public comments:
 - Support for protecting existing community buildings, pubs, and allotments.
 - Requests for better leisure facilities, especially for children and teenagers.
 - Suggestions for entertainment centres like Jurassic Fun Centre.

Policy W52 - Existing Community Buildings

- Dorset Council: W52 adds little to Local Plan policy COM3; to improve it, consider adding criteria for local engagement and proportionality, and remove Criterion 1 iv. as it's outside planning law.

Policy W53 – Public Houses

- Dorset Council: Recommend reducing the marketing period from 18 to 12 months and removing the vacancy requirement, as the current policy risks long-term property neglect and visual harm to the street scene.
- Public comments:
 - Aims to protect pubs but lacks clear viability criteria.
 - No independent review or community consultation.
 - Recommends standardised viability tests and third-party reviews.

Policy W54 – Sports and Recreation

- Dorset Council: Supported.
- Sport England: Strong support; recommend updating PPS and incorporating Active Design Guidance.
- Public Health Dorset: Highlight the role of inclusive participation in reducing health inequalities
- Public Comments:
 - Expand and improve indoor and outdoor leisure facilities to better serve year-round residents, with a focus on inclusive, family-oriented amenities for all age groups.

Policy W55 - Public Spaces

- Public Health Dorset:
 - Recommend more detail on climate adaptation features like shading and green infrastructure.
 - Suggest CPTED principles, public amenities (toilets, benches), and inclusive design.
 - Broaden “pedestrian routes” to include all active travel modes

Policy W56 – Allotments and Community Gardening Provisions

- Dorset Council: Supported.
- Public Health Dorset: Strongly support W56 for its mental health and food security benefits; suggest strengthening point 11.69

Policy W57 – New Burial Grounds

- Dorset Council: Consideration should be given to local need, landscape and suitable access as part of the policy criteria

Chapter 12: Monitoring and Reviewing the Neighbourhood Plan

- Public comments:
 - No clear frameworks for tracking policy compliance.
 - Relies too heavily on developer-led viability assessments.
 - Recommends establishing indicators, regular reviews, and community oversight panels.

Chapter 13: Weymouth Community Aspirations

- Dorset Council: The CIL/S106 Team ask if the neighbourhood plan could identify specific items of infrastructure and projects that could be funded by the developer contributions both the CIL neighbourhood proportion and S106.

Appendix A: Supporting Environmental Targets

- Dorset Council:
 - Raised concerns that Appendix A may create confusion by introducing a second checklist, potentially increasing administrative burdens and discouraging development.
 - Specific targets (23–25) require clearer wording and better alignment with existing Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol guidance, especially regarding biodiversity net gain and habitat management.
- C G Fry and Son Ltd: Duplicates or exceeds national standards. Lacks viability evidence to support higher environmental requirements.

Appendices B–D: Mapping and Cross-Referencing

- Dorset Council: Cross-referencing between policies and maps is effective.
- Public Comment: Dorset Council’s support for retaining the Sutton Poyntz Character Area map is welcome. I hope similar mapping is used elsewhere in future reviews.

Plan Process & Democracy

- Littlemoor Ward Councillor:
 - Concerns have been raised about political bias in the steering group's composition and leadership, including exclusion of Conservative councillors, activist affiliations, and perceived targeting of Conservative-held areas for major development.
- Preston Against Flooding:
 - The Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan (WNP) is criticized for being politically driven by Weymouth Town Council (WTC), particularly the Liberal Democrat leadership.
 - The plan is described as top-down, lacking genuine community engagement, contrary to the government's bottom-up approach for Neighbourhood Plans.
 - The Steering Group (SG) operated in secrecy, with limited transparency and accountability.
 - The SG allegedly ignored significant public opposition, especially regarding Policy W20.
 - The Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan was opposed by WTC but later accepted by Dorset Council, highlighting internal political conflict.
 - Requests for meetings with SG by concerned residents were refused, undermining democratic dialogue.
- Public comments:
 - The Town Council did not properly announce the Neighbourhood Plan and failed to keep the public informed, with poorly advertised meetings and limited engagement.
 - The consultation process was inadequate and unrepresentative, with only 288 responses from a population of 53,000 and a nearly even split in support.
 - The group lacked planning expertise, was disconnected from the community, and made key decisions with narrow vote margins.
 - The Plan is seen as aspirational and unclear, with questionable enforceability and timing ahead of the updated Local Plan.
 - Allegations include ignoring brownfield priorities, misrepresenting community support, and holding an unlawful council meeting.