

Comments across the whole Plan via Citizen Space

Objector name / organisation

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Alan Frampton | 15. Jim Goodey (2) | 29. Phillippa Dine |
| 2. Alice Dye | 16. Jon Quilter | 30. Rebecca Holmes |
| 3. Andrew Nineham | 17. Lara McMahon | 31. Rob Cheeseman (individual) |
| 4. Bashir Mohammed | 18. Lucy Bailey | 32. Ronald Glynn |
| 5. Bridget Betts | 19. M.Teitge | 33. Stephen Crowe |
| 6. Cllr David Civil | 20. Mark Deverell | 34. Stephen Rewse |
| 7. Cllr David Northam (Individual) | 21. Michele Williams (individual) | 35. Stephen Vitali |
| 8. Colin Anthony Marsh | 22. Miranda Robinson | 36. Steve Elsworth |
| 9. Dipan Shah | 23. Mr Wills | 37. Susan Davies |
| 10. Elizabeth O'Connell | 24. N Connell | 38. Terence G Blake |
| 11. Ella Cane-Mould | 25. Neil Cogdell | 39. Terence Robinson |
| 12. Jane Church | 26. Penny Quilter | 40. Tia Roos |
| 13. Jean-Philippe Stanway | 27. Peter Dye | 41. Warwick Brown |
| 14. Jim Goodey (1) | 28. Peter Groves | |

Comments across the whole Plan via Citizen Space

Objector name / organisation	Please write your comments / representation in the box below - Comments
Alan Frampton	<p>Whilst the plan does acknowledge the intent to continue to provide coastal defences to achieve the shoreline management plan policy to hold the line, it does not highlight the likely consequence of doing so as likely leading to a loss of beach as sea levels rise. This is highlighted for example in the Weymouth Beach Management Plan (2019) available on Dorset Council's website. A consequence of less to no Beach by end of the century will be a reduced attraction for visitors to the area which will impact the economy. As such, I think there is opportunity in this plan to highlight this risk and further add to policies around diversifying the local economy and supporting new Higher skilled businesses that are not reliant on Beach tourism.</p> <p>Also, the plan seems to be confident that the current Weymouth harbour and esplanade outline business case will be able to secure all necessary funding. How certain is it that the required funding will actually be achieved? Is the town Council putting forward contributions to the total costs?</p>
Alice Dye	<p>I write in support of the proposal to assign Hurdlemead & its adjoining field as a local green space. Designating the land as a Local Green Space does not preclude its continued use for farming but ensures its preservation for both agricultural productivity while protecting the rural character and heritage of Upwey for future generations.</p> <p>Special to the Community/Historical significance:</p> <p>The frequent use by walkers, families, and wildlife enthusiasts, as well as its location in the heart of Upwey, makes the field integral to the daily lives of residents.</p> <p>In the Weymouth Neighbourhood Steering Group Walkabout Summary, it is noted that on 4th December 2021 25 members of the public attended the walkabout and voiced "Strong feelings" that the Hurdlemeade open space on the south side of Elwell Street "should be retained as an important open gap."</p> <p>The field has been a continuous meadow since at least 1889, as shown by Ordinance Survey maps, contributing to the historical landscape of Upwey.</p> <p>Between 1920's – 1950's the Upwey Big Affair was held on several occasions in the field and the community used the field again in 1997 during Upwey's Open Garden's event.</p>

	<p>Beauty:</p> <p>The field's setting within Upwey, bordered by historically significant cottages and hedgerows, makes it a vital part of the area's aesthetic. Eric Ricketts' 1977 published study of Weymouth's historic buildings underscores its role in preserving the heritage of Upwey.</p> <p>Recreational Value:</p> <p>The recreational value of the field is evident from its use by dog walkers, families, and the wider community. While public access is restricted to footpaths, these pathways enable meaningful interaction with the landscape. The presence of five footpath entrances which have remained intact for over 130 years establishes the regular enjoyment of this field by the local community. The proximity of this field to the village enhances its accessibility and value to residents.</p> <p>Richness of Wildlife:</p> <p>The field's thick hedgerows provide valuable habitat for local wildlife, including deer and pheasants, as well as smaller mammals, birds, and insects. Hedgerows are known biodiversity hotspots, and their preservation supports local ecosystems. The field's location adjacent to the village provides a vital ecological corridor.</p> <p>While broad policies in the NO/LP may safeguard general farmland, they may not adequately recognise or prioritise the unique role that fields like this play in daily lives, heritage, and well-being of the local community which is why the local green space designation is vital.</p>
Andrew Nineham	<p>1. I am generally in support of most of this plan however the plan is far too large to truly be a neighbourhood plan and I will therefore comment on only the areas which I have a good understanding of and is pertinent to my locality (neighbourhood). It should be noted by the Inspector that in future, neighborhood plans in the Weymouth area should represent smaller localised plans such as that at Sutton Poyntz,.</p> <p>2. Concerning the location of proposed areas for the development of housing (Section 9 page 73 onward) I object to the land at Wyke Oliver Farm North (page 94) being included within the plan on the grounds that environmentally it would be disastrous. The area where the development is proposed is on a slope and any run off and increased sewage will overwhelm the existing water course and only significant engineering work (and a reversal of climate change!) will overcome this. Climate change is unfortunately inevitable and the area of Preston is likely to be significantly affected by rising water levels. By 2030 when it is said that the Preston Beach Road could be under water. A development at Wyke Oliver Farm would only exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>3. Further to (2) above, I oppose the Wyke Oliver Farm Site (page 94) on the grounds that the figure 50% of the properties built should be affordable, is unachievable. The track record of developers shows that they will never be able to achieve this figure. A viability study on the scheme has shown that there would be virtually zero profit in such a scheme providing 50% affordable housing. There is nothing</p>

	<p>in this plan (that I can see) that makes it legally binding for a developer to keep to the agreed percentage of affordable housing which is what Weymouth needs.</p> <p>4. Further to (2) and (3) above, I oppose the Wyke Oliver Farm Site (page 94) on the grounds that it will change the character of the area and that the area is unable to support a development of this size. If a significant number of affordable houses are to be built on the site it would be out of character for the area it being practically 100% owner occupied. The figure of 250 new homes would attract potentially 500 cars and together with vehicles used by the existing population, it will make it difficult to navigate (a relatively narrow Wyke Oliver Road which would be difficult to widen) during busy periods of the day. This would have the effect of changing a relatively quiet area of Weymouth into a busy, congested and much less desirable neighborhood.</p> <p>5. Further to (2) and (3) above, I support the proposal to include (9.67 page 95) the transfer of ownership of 23ha of land to a suitable public body, such as Dorset Wildlife Trust, as part of Lorton Valley Nature Park.</p> <p>6. I believe that the Wyke Oliver Farm site (page 94) should be removed from the plan and that the plan would still be viable with the other development sites remaining.</p> <p>7. It is noted that under the section of 'Green spaces' (page 55 onward) that no mention is made of Greenhill Gardens on the Weymouth seafront. This should be included in the plan (along with the other facilities nearby i.e. bowling, tennis and putting) it being a hugely important leisure facility in the area. It is used by hundreds of people daily during the summer season and very many all year round. This resource should be protected at all costs.</p>
Bashir Mohammed	I believe the plans do not Meet the basic conditions and as such I strongly object to the proposed plans
Bridget Betts	<p>General comment</p> <p>I was surprised that Weymouth peninsular not included as a vista as this area has had many policies relating to landscape and views and is probably one of the best vistas for Weymouth with views across the bay, to the harbour and to Nothe Fort. This needs to be protected and included in this plan.</p> <p>Objections:</p> <p>I do not support the inclusion of W23A: Lodmoor Old Tip North allocated for employment use comprising small light industrial units or workshops. This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transport and traffic - The proposed employment use of this site is likely to generate increased traffic in an area that is already experiencing congestion from residential vehicles and is heavily used by many learner drivers. The existing infrastructure is not equipped to handle the additional load, leading to potential safety hazards and a decrease in the quality of life for local residents. The increased traffic will increase pollution (noise and air) in a residential area. With only one way on and off this site this is not acceptable and there are safety issues relating to the many pedestrians that use this area (every day and every day of the year) to access the popular Lodmoor country park. Weymouth Bay Avenue is a residential street, often lined with cars both sides, therefore making it difficult for trucks, work vehicles to safely access this site. The junction at the bottom is narrow and people often park here to enter the park and walk their

Bridget Betts (continued)	<p>dogs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk – the gardens all along the back already are subject to flooding – with more infrastructure this raises the issue of increased flooding in this area and this is not acceptable. • Environmental Concerns <p>The Lodmoor Old Tip North site is a former landfill area, and its development could pose significant environmental risks. The disturbance of this land may lead to the release of hazardous substances, which could contaminate the surrounding soil and water sources. This poses a threat to local wildlife, habitats and for residents living close by.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Impact - The development of this site for employment purposes does not align with the needs and desires of the local community. There is a strong preference for the preservation of green spaces that can be enjoyed by all residents. <p>Please consider alternative uses for the Lodmoor Old Tip North site that would better serve the community. Options such as increasing Nature Recovery in line with the Environment Act 2021 and the Dorset local nature recovery strategy e.g. connecting up existing protected areas for nature recovery - this bit of land should be an extension to the Lorton nature reserve and the RSPB reserve as it is an important connecting site. Any new development here may harm the many birds, bats and wildlife in the area, therefore not supporting nature recovery. Creating additional nature areas would provide environmental benefits and enhance the quality of life for residents.</p> <p>Lodmoor Old Tip Mid Leisure W23C: small-scale development of the Lodmoor Old Tip mid section and Lodmoor Old Tip South Leisure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Concerns - The Lodmoor Old Tip Mid site is a former landfill area, and its development could pose significant environmental risks. The disturbance of this land may lead to the release of hazardous substances, which could contaminate the surrounding soil and water sources. This poses a threat to local wildlife and the broader ecosystem. The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan highlights these risks, noting the potential for soil and groundwater contamination. • Health Risks for Residents - The development of this site could expose the residents to various health risks. The release of hazardous substances from the former landfill could lead to respiratory issues, skin irritations, and other health problems. Studies have shown that living near former landfill sites can increase the risk of certain health conditions, including asthma and other respiratory diseases. The site is also very close to the sea and if there is disturbance there maybe a risk of contamination of the sea, affecting sea users (of which there are now hundreds swimming in this area all year round and to marine life. <p>Nature-based solutions can play a significant role in remediating contaminated old landfill sites where plants can absorb, concentrate, and/or degrade contaminants from soil and water. Certain plants can take up heavy metals and other pollutants, thereby cleaning the soil over time. Removing the vegetation in these areas and developing this area for leisure may therefore be detrimental.</p> <p>I request that the council reconsider these comments considering the concerns raised.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
------------------------------	--

<p>Cllr David Civil</p>	<p>On the whole I agree with both the direction, process and contents of the plan. It is important to give a steer to the development of our town and ensure that certain areas are protected.</p> <p>I do however have a couple of reservations/points to make:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please ensure that Greenhill Gans is included on the list and f protected green spaces 2. I agree with the comments submitted by my friend and colleague Cllr Matt Bell. Specifically: “While I feel able to support the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan due to its numerous positive elements and protection of many green spaces across Weymouth, I am concerned about the allocation of Lodmoor Old Tip - North Section (W23A pages 103 and 104). I would like clarity to be sought regarding this location due to one particular factor. <p>My concern is that according to Dorset Explorer, this site lies within the area designated as Country Park. The pumping station can clearly be seen excluded from this area with a box drawn tightly around it, but the rest of the site is shown as being in the Country Park area.</p> <p>Within the lease of Lodmoor Country Park between the owners, Dorset Council, and the Tenant, Weymouth Town Council, which is publicly available online and dated February 2022, the permitted use is described as "a play area and associated open space within Class D2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as at the date this lease is granted (Use Classes Order) and to use the Public Conveniences as public toilets and ancillary facilities and for no other purpose" on page 5. Appendix G of the Weymouth Town Council Full Council meeting held on February 16th 2022 shows that part of this allocated site falls under the lease containing this permitted use information. Does this present any impediment to the site being used as allocated in the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan for light industrial units or workshops?"</p> <p>The addition of commercial facilities in a quiet residential area, that in turn feeds into the very busy Dorchester Road seems wholly unnecessary. It would be better to rewind the start and add to the already abundant biodiversity in this part of town.</p>
<p>Cllr David Northam (Individual)</p>	<p>I am fully supportive of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan. It provides a good balance between needed development and protection of community-valued open spaces, habitat, and historic areas.</p> <p>Submission Plan W08 Coastal Green Recreation Areas - protection of these areas is critical to Weymouth’s popularity as a tourist resort. Whilst the beach if the current focus for this, all year tourism provides economic benefit and these areas for ideal locations for recreational walking visits. Some of these areas are large and overlap with Local Green Space requests for designation. It is hoped that these areas are either protected through W08 or W10 Local Green Space .</p>

<p>Cllr David Northam (Individual) (continued)</p>	<p>Submission Plan W10 Local Green Space. I would urge these applications are supported. It is recognised the Plan includes a large number of Local Greenspaces. These have been progressed on the basis of recommendations from residents. Some of the WTC managed parks and gardens are included for this reason – note some parks were not proposed by residents – this is not to say they are without merit and also that as Town Council Open Spaces they might be regarded as already having protection – however financial pressure may come to reduced theses spaces which do have maintenance costs.. I am concerned that they may be judged to be too large for Local Green Space designation. Weymouth Town Centre is an urban area and the local parks and gardens provide free leisure, beauty and recreation space for many of our less well-off residents – and so I would wish them protected. I would welcome one of two approaches during the examination a) recommendation to include all Weymouth Town Council managed Open Spaces, Parks and Gardens or b) removal of those larger areas which are away from the most densely populated and deprived town centre areas.</p> <p>Submission Plan Document W13 Panoramas Vists and Views this policy should not be allowed to overly constrain development of the Peninsular Site (WEY6 in the Local Plan) as WEY6 development is necessary for Weymouth’s regeneration. I personally do not see this policy as helpful to the Planning Authority as the value and importance of views and vistas is very subjective. However the Sutton Poyntz Plan progressed such elements which the WNP respects by inclusion.</p> <p>Submission Plan Document W31 Principal Residency. I have three concerns reference this important policy which I hope will stop the town centre being hollowed out by unoccupied homes or homes occupied by people who do not contribute to the local community. Concern 1: the figures, in Table C, may not justify the policy in the eyes of the examiner– rather than throw out the policy I would ask the examiner to recommend applying it to the LSOAs with sufficiently high figures as shown in Table C on page 130. Concern 2: Weymouth Town Centre has a high proportion of residents with high incidences of deprivation (Melcombe Regis Carlton Road LSOA 4A – Index of Multiple Deprivation decile 2 (IMD2), Melcombe Regis Town Centre LSOA 4B - IMD1, Melcombe Regis Park District LSOA 4C - IMD1, Rodwell & Chapelhay LSOA 4F - IMD1). These residents have low levels of car ownership, are reliant on the services the town centre provides, and provide some of the labour force for the too-often low-paid jobs in retail, hospitality and care. For this reason, seeking a minimum of 35% Affordable Homes ownership with 70% for rent is seen as a necessary balance for the town centre population. Concern 3: it may be considered that there may be unintended consequences to the policy negatively affecting regeneration in the town centre. All the sites in the town centre are brownfield sites and many of these sit within Flood Zone 3. As such their development costs are higher than greenfield sites. But this should be offset by the potential high sale value of the 50% market led homes which are on the waterfront with either sea views or harbour views. This benefits the owners but only benefits the town economy if these properties are principal residencies. The viability testing confirms that with suitable Homes England funding high levels of Affordable Homes can be achieved.</p>
--	---

Colin Anthony Marsh	<p>As a resident of Sutton Poyntz I consider that the commitment by Weymouth Town Council to 'respect and include' the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan (SPNP) policies has been achieved should this plan be adopted in the current form. The importance of the latter 'made' plan is clearly recognised in Section 1 (Introduction) and the aims and objectives align well with the intent expressed in the Sutton Poyntz plan as summarised in Appendix D. It is encouraging to see a number of those policies replicated in the Weymouth submission such as W10, W13, W48 and W49 and the strengthening of others by incorporation into a wider area for example the range of Landscape and Greenspace policies which offer enhanced connectivity through wildlife corridors for nature as well as responsible recreational access for people. Policy W09 Green Gaps is particularly welcome given the specific inclusion of the 'green wedge' between Sutton Road and Puddledock Lane which is key to maintaining the character and identity of Sutton Poyntz.</p> <p>In terms of Homes the recognition of the need for smaller properties (to help people to downsize as well as meeting the needs of young families) is consistent with the needs expressed in the SPNP and this extends to the balanced policies on Design (W44) and Heritage Assets (W45). In the case of Design it was encouraging to note support from Dorset Council (at the Reg 14 consultation) for retention of the Sutton Poyntz Character Area map (Appendix D) and I hope that this character area mapping will be extended to other communities as part of future reviews of this Plan.</p> <p>The Communities section incorporates policies which are consistent with the needs expressed in the SPNP such as those on transport, Existing Community Facilities (W52), Public Houses (W53) and Sports and Recreation (W54) which are vital to sustaining smaller communities and recognise how these Weymouth wide policies actually strengthen those in the SPNP, for example through the marketing requirements for proposed sales of pubs and community halls. I feel that Sutton Poyntz will benefit from other policies such as those on Allotments (W56) which are stated much more explicitly here than in the SPNP.</p> <p>Overall I consider that the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan has effectively addressed a broad range of issues in a balanced and pragmatic manner without 'ducking' the difficult challenges (e.g. affordable housing allocation sites and the impact of climate change) that will inevitably arise in a Plan covering an area of such size, complexity and diversity.</p> <p>I feel it could have done more to strengthen policies on job creation, transport and utilities infrastructure (particularly in relation to flood risk) but recognise the constraints placed on a neighbourhood plan by these Strategic issues that are primarily issues for a Local Plan and indeed Government.</p> <p>On balance I believe this Plan will benefit the wider Weymouth community and merits the support of Weymouth residents as a whole. In particular I am persuaded from experience in Sutton Poyntz that we have far greater control over our own destiny in relation to future planning by having a Neighbourhood Plan as opposed to not having one.</p>
Dipan Shah	<p>The protection of Coastal recreation areas is important being a coastal holiday town.</p> <p>Policy W08: Coastal Recreation Area - Site "4" is a very popular green at Bowleaze Cove way.</p> <p>The road "Bowleaze Cove way" with free parking abuts this green, making it accessible to all including the elderly, disabled, children etc.</p> <p>With an elevated position it is a popular viewing space for air displays, kite festivals, fireworks etc. The local plan should actively</p>

	<p>protect this green which was gifted to the people of Weymouth from coastal erosion.</p> <p>Separately or in conjunction, an extension of the Preston Beach wall so that it continues to the Fantasy Island amusements would be a great asset to the town providing a walking, running track the length of Weymouth Bay.</p>
Elizabeth O'Connell	<p>The paper leaflet posted through my letterbox is totally useless. Even with a powerful magnifying glass the map is illegible.</p> <p>Looking at the Dorset Council website is very offputting with all the documents we are supposed to read.</p> <p>All of the above makes me think you do not actually want the public to respond. You are just going through the motions of 'consultation'.</p>
Ella Cane-Mould	<p>I objected to the whole Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan. I believe that there are many other better options and that the town doesn't have the infrastructure to facilitate what is being put forward.</p> <p>I especially object to 'Land at Lodmoor Old Tip Northern Section' which I believe is W23A. For these reasons...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The entrance into and out of Weymouth Bay Avenue is very narrow. • Since the traffic lights and junction have been changed towards Sainburys etc, the traffic regularly backs up towards Lodmoor Hill now, this will only get worse when M&S relocates. I'm not sure who thought removing the slipway and adding a cycle path to nowhere was a good idea... it wasn't, traffic is now awful. • Cars park all down Weymouth Bay Avenue both sides and there are multiple parts of the road where it is only single carriageway due to this without added traffic. • I am very curious why anyone would suggest the end of a long residential road for light industrial use?... there is no passing trade. • Water pressure is already just above the minimum on the road and this will only get worse. • The current sewage pipes struggle now, more development would only add to this and worryingly more sewage into the sea. • The close proximity of the RSPB reserve. Where Mash Harriers, rare Norfolk Hawker, Great White Egret, Herons, Waders Kingfisher, Song Thrushes, lots of different Butterflies and Dragonflies, Otters, Deer to name a few! It's a very popular, quiet, tranquil reserve and always busy. I walk my dog here most days and no matter the weather it's a busy spot with bird watches, walkers and nature in general. We should be protecting these peaceful areas of nature. • This location is in a flood zone, it has been discounted for housing because of this. • The nearest bus stop is at the top of Weymouth Bay Avenue which is a good half a mile from the proposed location. Meaning more people will drive than bus. <p>The other area mentioned for light industrial (Land at Jubilee Sidings – W24) is a much better option, in my opinion, mostly due to the fact there is already light industrial there, there are bus stops nearby and it's near the town centre and train station too so there will be more passing trade.</p> <p>I also object to the possible policy W32 Weymouth Town Centre Car Parks. The town centre is struggling enough with high parking</p>

	<p>charges and big names moving out of town, to remove car parks is just crazy. We should be encouraging people into town NOT away from it! Maybe a better idea would be to encourage landlords to maintain and convert upper empty floors of the town centre buildings and shops into residential. This would not only smarten up the town centre but would bring more people into town too. If you make the main town centre carpark the Swannary you will decimate town centre trade... people will go to Dorchester or the out of town retail parks! People want to drive and park.</p> <p>I also have to say that I think its bonkers that Weymouth has circa 58,000 people living here, and thousands more that holiday each year and we have one of the smallest land areas for the neighbourhood plan. It is very sad that the Granby Industrial Estate isn't included. Nor are a number of the other housing developments that are currently being worked on. I understand the need to break the area down, but surely there needs to be an overall plan. I truly believe that if we used what we already have in a better way we wouldn't need to over develop our beautiful town. I appreciate that you can only submit council owned land into this but maybe the better option would be to just look at the town as a whole and approach people who own land that would be better placed for residential or commercial than just squeezing things onto council owned land.</p>
Jane Church	<p>The plan does not meet the requirements in so far as it is not sustainable and does not meet environmental guidelines. The idea of putting industrial and housing developments right next to Lodmoor nature reserve is just one example. If 'sustainable' means that there is room for a similar amount of development every time a new local plan is devised then I'm afraid that it would result in a solid mass of development all over our beautiful Jurassic countryside within a generation. You need to make use only of brownfield sites for new developments (eg by requisitioning long-term empty commercial properties/sites and re-purposing them for housing) and ensure that properties are only used for year-round living and not as 'second' or 'holiday' homes. Weymouth is replete with visitors in summer as it is and more holiday homes will only place more pressure on an already-stretched infrastructure.</p>
Jean-Philippe Stanway	<p>I am an [REDACTED] resident and write in support of Hurdlemead in Upwey being designated as a Local Green Space. I use the field daily for recreation/dog walking and see the field in constant use by the local community. On an annual basis, we see deer using the fields as a corridor along with many other forms of wildlife. Using the Local Green Space designation protects the land for future farming and acknowledges the site's special local significance.</p>
Jim Goodey (1)	<p>Objection to the industrial area marked at the end of Weymouth Bay Avenue. The area has poor access, cars are normally packed either side of the access route narrowing the road to a single lane. Access to the industrial area is via a residential road. The area is in a flood zone. Previous attempts to attract industrial use at Mercery Road failed as I would expect this area. The area is also an ex tip with unknown contamination.</p> <p>Objection to Greenhill Gardens not being included as a green space.</p> <p>Objection to the area at the rear of Lodmoor car park being used for development as this is in a flood zone. This carpark is also well used in the summer and is general full.</p>

Jim Goodey (2)	<p>I wish to object to the industrial area proposed at the end of Weymouth Bay Avenue. The access to the site is through a residential road which is generally narrowed to a single lane. The area proposed is within a flood risk zone. It is next to/within a nature reserve. The last attempt to attract industry to the area was at Mercery Road which failed and had to be changed to retail.</p> <p>I wish to object to the fact that a number of green spaces have been left out of the plan, Greenhill Gardens for instance.</p> <p>I wish to object to plan in general as it is too big and unwieldy and impenetrable.</p>
Jon Quilter	I support the Neighbourhood Plan
Lara McMahon	Weymouth would really benefit from an entertainment centre like the Jurassic fun centre at Freshwater, Burton Bradstock. It has a relatively small footprint but contains, a fun family pool, bowling and a restaurant. It would be fully booked all year round by locals and holiday makers alike. Surely someone could be found to invest in such a thing?
Lucy Bailey	<p>I could not find anything in the plan to alleviate parking issues in the Chapelhay area of Weymouth. This has been a constant battle for residents to have somewhere to park amongst the tourists and workers. There are some allocated parking spaces for those with permits within the flats, but that consists of 21 spaces per 5/6 blocks.</p> <p>A lot of cars and no where to park! Parking permits for residents with 1 hour no return for others would be very effective. There are plenty of places to park in the town itself for shoppers and holiday makers.</p>
M. Teitge	<p>I have today received a leaflet " Why you should care about the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan."</p> <p>There is a map inside "Plan Area and Land Use Policies " which is pretty useless to me as you can't see any of the areas clearly, you can't see any area names, street names.... And that's with my glasses on.</p> <p>There are coloured outlines for various policies etc....</p> <p>I realise it is difficult to reproduce these things, however, if there isn't enough clarity, people will be unable to make choices/comment. Once I know what I'm looking at clearly, I can peruse and make my comments.</p> <p>Many thanks.</p>
Mark Deverell	<p>I am very concerned about two developments planned in our area:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The incinerator planned for Portland, the whole idea of burning off materials and releasing noxious gases into the environment is totally wrong. Any added gases in our atmosphere can only be a bad thing for all locals and further afield the added environmental effects can only be a danger, there is no good side to the well being of our world. It is doubtful if the incinerator will ever achieve 100% efficiency and even if it did are those gases good for us? The positioning of the chimney and the upward flow of the gases are so easily influenced by the surrounding land that they could end up anywhere, be they good or bad! Once built the owners will defend it to the grave despite it not working correctly. The loss of the RYA to the WPNSA is of huge concern, why should we have to live within the incinerator's vicinity if such a body as the RYA won't allow its sports men and women to train for their respective watersports here? 2. The battery farm at Nottingham, as far as I know there is no action plan to deal with a major emergency such as a fire at the site or any

	<p>way of quelling a lithium based fire or dealing with 70,000 + residents in the area to take them away from the noxious gases or even less so to aid those stricken by the gases?</p> <p>A time for a major rethink on both of these developments.</p>
Michele Williams (individual)	<p>I FULLY SUPPORT the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan for a number of reasons, namely:</p> <p>It gives the community a Voice - gives us a say in shaping the future developments in Weymouth, helps protect the character and identify of Weymouth;</p> <p>It influences future planning decision - will help guide the design, location and of new housing, infrastructure and green spaces;</p> <p>It protects local heritage and the environment - looks at preserving important historical sites, green spaces and local landscapes whilst encouraging sustainable development with environmental consideration;</p> <p>It support infrastructure and local facilities - identifies the need for better transport, school, health services and amenities.;</p> <p>It encouraged appropriate development - will help manage where and how new homes and business are built - aiming to getting 50% affordable homes which has been highlighted as a necessity for Weymouth's future generations, as well as meeting local needs;</p> <p>It aims to boost the local economy - supports small and local enterprise, encourages investment in the area whilst managing its unique character;</p> <p>Supports stronger community engagement - encourages residents to take part in shaping the future of their neighbourhood and strengthen community identify.</p> <p>I believe that this plan will help deliver all the above and especially for the future of generations to come.</p>
Miranda Robinson	<p>I am objecting to the plan on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. This neighbourhood plan covers far too wide an area. I can only comment properly on the neighbourhood where I live and Weymouth town centre. I do not know the needs and concerns of, for example, the Chickerell residents. According to the Government website 'Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area. They are able to choose where they want new homes, shops and offices to be built, have their say on what those new buildings should look like and what infrastructure should be provided, and grant planning permission for the new buildings they want to see go ahead. Neighbourhood planning provides a powerful set of tools for local people to plan for the types of development to meet their community's needs and where the ambition of the neighbourhood is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area.'</p> <p>2. As a resident of the Preston area, I do not feel that my views have been seriously considered. T9.12 'Consultation exercises' - the one for Preston was poorly attended because it was held in August when many residents were away and was poorly advertised. Lip service was paid to consulting residents. I object to the fact that when local people did exercise their right to express their views, it was deemed as 'party political' interference rather than part of the democratic process.</p> <p>3. W20 Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North: Preston stands to be the most severely affected area of the town under the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan. National Policy guidance gives great weight to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty of areas of outstanding natural beauty. The proposed loss of open space in Preston is over-development, diminishing the natural boundaries between Preston</p>

<p>Miranda Robinson (continued)</p>	<p>and neighbouring settlements. The natural beauty of Preston is what attracts people to live and holiday in the area. This is inappropriate development of a green belt area when there are better alternatives available.</p> <p>The proposal to include these sites will increase the traffic considerably. In fact, if you live up the hill, it will be difficult to get to work or go shopping easily without the use of a car. Preston is ill-served by public transport. The extra traffic will adversely affect the bird life of Lorton Meadows bird sanctuary and the enjoyment of walkers and cyclists in the area. Preston Road is a busy road and in summer the traffic is swelled by the cars from the caravan parks. The proposal is going to turn the area in to one long traffic jam adding to pollution. This is equally applicable to Littlemoor Road. Additional housing will also add to the demands on the doctors' surgery in Preston to the detriment of residents.</p> <p>The latest scientific paper identifies the bottom of Wyke Oliver as having issues with flooding by 2030. This planned development is not taking the issue of climate change seriously. The site off Budmouth Avenue was deemed unsuitable for development and as the Wyke Oliver site is part of the same stretch of land, it has the same topography, and should be deemed unsuitable too.</p> <p>There are things that I do applaud about the plan, for example:</p> <p>Policy W38: Higher & Further Education & Skills Provision – I support the aspirations expressed.</p> <p>Policy W39: Weymouth Town Centre – I support the value of a masterplan for the Town Centre that 'promotes and stimulates a diverse range of relevant uses whilst safeguarding and enhancing the core retail offer.'</p> <p>Policy W41: Sustainable Tourism Development – 'Development that results in harmful impacts on local services, roads and other infrastructure will not be supported.' This is pleasing but I think it should have gone further and mentioned the impact of developments that adversely affect the quality of lives of residents, for example, from noise, litter and anti-social behaviour fuelled by alcohol.</p> <p>Policy W50: Cycle Routes Development proposals to improve and extend existing cycle routes, to effect better segregation from vehicular traffic, and to link them to the wider network of walking and cycling routes (Map 29) will be supported'. As someone who cycles for pleasure, I agree whole heartedly with this.</p>
<p>Mr Wills</p>	<p>We are not in the EU anymore we voted for Brexit; Your neighbourhood plan document, These documents are just "spin" to get plan to go ahead; as was Curtis fields you don't listen to voting public as money talks & as you know better with Angela Rayner pushing it through vote is already decided. Listen to the public by not fibbing - road networks need upgrading.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where did promised money go for Dorchester road avenue of trees 940k.?? after Olympics. 2. 8 x Electric charging points at mercery road ?? Near B&M/Dunelm. 3. Town green at Curtis fields, Doctors surgery/ school /employment etc all hot air like all the councillors. It seems as if we live in Putin's Russia dictated to by government & you lot [REDACTED] 4. I object there are too many houses being built here too many delays because of associated roadworks & maybe if UK's highest council tax, was voted down, I may agree. 5. Spin on parking charge increases for maintenance of car parks, sounds like you are now becoming like water utility companies fibbing to everyone about their under maintenance & continual price increases.

	6. Do not let it go ahead your building at Curtis fields/nottingham/littlemoor/chickerell Cg fry /wyke Portland causeway/cockles lane SURELY enough is enough!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
N Connell	Save historic beauty
Neil Cogdell	<p>I feel there is a significant lack of green space and the map has been created to disguise this fact.</p> <p>The use of multiple small green triangles to show green space or the mismatch in size between the green block and the actual space</p> <p>For instance, my estate has a small green space, yet looking at the map you would think it was 3/4 of the estate.</p> <p>There is also too much emphasis on 'affordable homes' that's are sold or rented for less than market price, this discriminates against many who would fall just outside the criteria.</p> <p>Why invest in electric charging, when many manufacturers are already reducing their EV line, other than cheap Chinese imported cars.</p> <p>How does having industrial use areas generate jobs? It generates more building, but the cost of premises and rates will still mean many cannot afford the premises</p> <p>And I have seen very little about how to regenerate the decaying town centre, empty and boarded up shops, it's not inviting or interesting to tourists, the lifeblood of Weymouth</p>
Penny Quilter	<p>I would like to comment in support of the plan. I have been involved in its development since 2020.</p> <p>Creating a plan fit for an uncertain future and the impacts of global heating has been challenging.</p> <p>Local politics have also hampered progress and created conflict when collaboration would have better served the populace of the town - that is regrettable.</p> <p>I am concerned about climate and ecological breakdown. Although I understand we have done the best we can given the constraints of the plan making process and the associated policy directives, much of what we want in this regard has been necessarily limited.</p> <p>I believe the plan has been developed with due regard for the current legal requirements.</p>
Peter Dye	<p>I write on the question of the proposed designation of the field (Hurdlemead) adjacent to Elwell Street as a Local Green Space..</p> <p>I was part of the group of councillors and local residents that viewed this field nearly four years ago (in the early days of the neighbourhood planning process) when it was made clear by the local community that they valued the field as a longstanding asset of value to the village that needed protection from development.</p> <p>Having chaired the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, I am aware of how both residents and landowners can misunderstand the implications of a Local Green Space designation, but I believe that the case for Hurdlemead's designation is overwhelming and that this is not only in the best interest of the community but also in the best interest of those that farm and own the land concerned.</p>

	If any further evidence is required, the successful protection offered to the Local Green Spaces identified and approved in the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan should offer reassuring evidence to all parties.
Peter Groves	I would like the green corridor between Church Road and Bowleaze Cove way to be designated as green belt. This is the last green corridor left for the residents of Preston to walk to the sea without having to walk through built up areas.
Phillippa Dine	<p>I support the plan in relation to housing development and the preservation of green spaces. There seems to be a pragmatic balance in favour of sustainable housing development for local residents, and in particular the young. I support stringent controls on housing development for profit on any greenfield sites, and using existing brownfield sites and redundant buildings for predominantly affordable housing for local people.</p> <p>I lived in the town centre for over 30 years, only moving to Radipole some 5 years ago. I knew many independent shop and restaurant owners in the town centre over the years whose businesses contributed to the vibrancy of the town centre. Many of the shops had a social function (several independent food shops), but many, like the small restaurants, had a relatively low profit margin. They were not able to sustain their business in the face of business rates, rents, the encouragement of out-of-town retail and fast food courts, and the Licensing Committee supporting a virtually 24-hour drinking culture that resulted in antisocial behaviour, including frequent serious damage to property and an intimidating atmosphere in the town centre. While many were eligible for business rate relief, the high valuations based in the local rentable values meant the rates were still high for businesses with a low profit margin.</p> <p>I would like to see 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.</p>
Rebecca Holmes	<p>Hi,</p> <p>After reading through all the comments and statement sections under each heading, my family and I fully support the plan. We are especially excited about the expansion of leisure facilities including the Sea life centre and Lodmoor as well as Bowleaze Cove, all places that we use and visit regularly. The idea of a new pier is also exciting, as is the expansion of indoor leisure facilities.</p> <p>I would like to add the absolute importance of indoor leisure facilities, as living in Weymouth for the last 2 and a half years (after moving from south east London), we have found a lack in these facilities all year round quite isolating, especially indoor facilities for older children and teenagers. We would highly benefit from bowling, cinema, soft play etc. all with facilities for older children and younger children. We recently visited Hollywood Bowl in Poole and found this excellent. An indoor swimming leisure centre would also be amazing, with slides, lazy river and other fun water activities. Weymouth swimming pool is fantastic for lessons, but leisure activities for families would be highly sought after. Lemur Landings in Poole is also highly popular, with the climbing walls, roleplay village and large soft play for all ages. We do not have anything like this close by and so this would be a different offering within a prime position too. It's great that there is the encouragement for tourism, but for the people that live here year round we do need more.</p>

<p>Rebecca Holmes (continued)</p>	<p>██████████ but having these opportunities for him as he grows will be fantastic for his social life and development, especially as you are looking to be expand on further education opportunities here too. We have found the job opportunities here to not be as good or wide, and considering the high council tax we pay, plus high parking charges etc. but low wages and jobs, we had talked about possibly moving further out later on, although we would much rather not!</p> <p>We live in Chickerell and are still awaiting our local plan to be put into place, as we are having so many extra houses built, but so far no extra shops, vets, doctors/dentists (we have not been able to get an NHS dentist since moving here), vets, school etc within our locality. This certainly needs to be factored in across Weymouth as the same is happening - lots of houses, but the infrastructure is not supporting more people living in each area. Doctors surgeries are already under strain and with the cost of everything going up, the cost of dentists are also practically unaffordable for families.</p> <p>Generally however, I can see how much has been factored in and highlighted in the plan and there seems to be lots of exciting ideas and plans. I feel hopeful that these plans will have a great impact on our amazing area - we love living here and it has so much to offer with so much potential, especially for locals! Thank you so much and we look forward to hearing more about the plans as it moves forward.</p>
<p>Rob Cheeseman (individual)</p>	<p>I am wholly supportive of this essential planning document for the whole of the town of Weymouth and its individual communities. I feel it is particularly strong and innovative in its addressing of the existential challenges of our times namely the climate and nature crises, building resilient communities and promoting sustainable living.</p> <p>Specifically I am supportive of the following sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape & Greenspace; Sustainable Living – page 10 • Climate & Ecological Emergency; DC Flood Note for Weymouth Town Centre – page 12 • The plan’s aims and objectives, particularly in relation to Environmental Sustainability and Landscape & Greenspace – pages 19-22 • Environmental Sustainability overview section – pages 23-25 • Landscape & Greenspace overview section – pages 26-29 • Communities & Neighbourhoods overview section – page 158 • Weymouth Community Aspirations – pages 185-196 • Supporting Environmental Targets – pages 203-223 • Landscape & Greenspace policies – pages 30-73 • Key sustainability-related policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Policy W15: Extensions & Alterations – page 80 o Policy W16: Major Housing Sites – page 81 o Policy W33: Timing of Infrastructure – page 133 o Policy W34: Sustainable Development – page 135

<p>Rob Cheeseman (individual) (continued)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Policy W41: Sustainable Tourism Development – page 152 o Policy W42: Facilitating Offshore Renewable Energy Projects – page 154 o Policy W43: Community Energy Schemes – page 156 o Policy W46: Transport & Travel – page 164 o Policy W47: Public Transport – page 165 o Policy W48: Off-Street Parking – page 166 o Policy W49: Vehicle Charging Facilities – page 167 o Policy W50: Cycle Routes – page 168 o Policy W51: Traffic Impact – page 171 o Policy W52: Existing Community Buildings – page 172 o Policy W53: Public Houses – page 175 o Policy W55: Public Spaces – page 180 o Policy W56: Allotment & Community Gardening Provision – page 181 <p>In a housing crisis and, therefore, a broken national planning system, I feel that it is also ambitious in attempting to address the availability of truly affordable housing and am, therefore, wholly supportive of policies W18, W26 and W27.</p>
<p>Ronald Glynn</p>	<p>Having experienced neighbourhood plans in the past where I once lived I have to say that it is all well and good thinking that this plan will protect areas in Weymouth but I do have my doubts.</p> <p>I strongly feel that it is developers who decide where they want to build, whether there is a neighbourhood plan or not. If their plans are rejection because its not in the plan, they will appeal to the secretary of state who override councils decision and allow development to go ahead.</p> <p>As I have said, this has happened in the past where I once lived in Oxfordshire, where villages parish councils spend a great deal of money to for a neighbourhood plan which turned out to be not worth the paper it was written on, developers ruled to roost and built on area not in the plan.</p> <p>There needs to be very strong opposition to any Secretary of State overriding local plans.</p> <p>BE PREPARED</p>
<p>Stephen Crowe</p>	<p>The plan does not indicate for proposed planning request for increasing The Haven holiday static caravan park by over 200 units on areas of countryside to the South of St Andrew's church, Preston.</p> <p>This proposal should be rejected as it covers an area of green space and outstanding beauty and scenic views with caravans.</p> <p>If there is consideration for building of this size with its infra-structure on this green space area then shouldn't it be part of the plan to enable consideration ?</p>
<p>Stephen Rewse</p>	<p>Broadly in agreement with the development plan, especially with the provision for green spaces to be maintained. Particularly relevant to me as we lost our green space (land off Spa Rd and Roman Rd) despite the council planning committee rejecting planning approval,</p>

	<p>overturned on appeal. Most of the houses built there are not affordable being mainly 4 bedroom houses worth circa £500000. As stated in the plan what is needed are smaller houses suitable and affordable for young people to get on the housing ladder.</p>
Stephen Vitali	<p>I resided in Weymouth from 1987 to 2013 and have plans to return in the near future. I own a number of rented properties both in the town and surrounding areas and visit regularly. Weymouth is considered my home town and I have special interest in the Melcombe Regis/Park District areas where I've owned several properties over the years and still do. I have a number of comments as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Poor Standard of Rented Weymouth Town Centre Housing, Development and Particularly W29 HMO's <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Empty Housing - most striking is the amount of empty, boarded and dilapidated properties in King Street and Bath St, whilst our population suffer a housing crisis. The Local Authority (LA) seem uninterested or powerless to ensure these are not dormant. I see no initiatives to improve matters. Where are the incentives in the plan for owners or controlling organisations to make these properties habitable quickly. Why is Compulsory purchase not being extensively used? ii. Bus Workshop - I may have missed this as a redevelopment site so please excuse any oversight. Is the eyesore Bus Workshop on Commercial Road nominated for redevelopment? If not why not. This must take priority focus and could potentially lift whole area. iii. Town Center Waste Collection - If any Bus Workshop development plans are conceived then Bath St houses would benefit hugely from rear access & wheelie bins. Without large bins waste collection in these areas needs a seismic shift. The current storage and collections regime in properties without rear access (and therefore without wheelie bins) needs overhaul. Now is the time to introduce plans for a new regime. We need new significant investment and a radical rethink of dealing with town center waste. Underground storage/communal dumpsters are just one idea. These are common place in some developed city centers. iii. W29 Houses in Multiple Occupation - There are good and bad HMO's which are largely dependent on its manager and investment. I support introduction of article 4 in the Park District and I don't believe single dwellings should be larger than 5 bedrooms. Houses larger than 5 or 6 occupants become almost unruly and difficult to manage. There is a lack of community in the masses. Smaller groups of between 3 to 6 sharers can better build smaller more responsible and self accountable communities with a much more manageable product. <p>HMO's are crucial and invaluable at reducing homelessness. This cannot be overstated. Try to reduce HMO's in the town centre where the poorest need to reside to survive (close to amenities and without transport) will be significant in increasing both poverty and homelessness. The introduction of HMO's not being closer than 100m is unconsidered, ludicrous and must be removed from the plan. HMO density can be controlled elsewhere in other neighborhoods but not within the town center so sparsely as one every 100m. Housing in the town center focuses largely on public transport hubs (train station and sea front bus stops). Limiting HMO's in these</p>

	<p>areas will only challenge the poorest demographic in our local areas. Please rethink this with an alternative strategy and I promote limiting 5 or 6 people to one set of communal facilities. (kitchen, bathrooms communal open areas). Ban bedsits, they do nothing to promote community or social interaction. My 40 years experience as a landlord has proved beyond doubt that shared accommodation should have communal areas, where individuals interact, build common support, community, responsibility and are on the whole much more contented and peaceful environments in which to reside.</p>
Steve Elsworth	<p>I'm in favour of the plan: I'm in favour of affordable extra houses in our area, jobs, environmental protection and retention of open spaces. I'm in favour of retaining green gaps, maintaining access to the five coastal areas, and designing policies around the climate emergency. For this latter aim, I would have liked to have seen the mandatory introduction of electric delivery vehicles - but I gather that is outside the scope of the plan.</p> <p>I am at a loss, however, when it comes to understanding this plan: it is 291 pages long, and supported by 54 additional documents. I did take part in one of the workshops to condor the plan, and I admire the councillors and residents who have been responsible for getting this off the ground: there's a lot of work here, and I respect the people who made it happen.</p> <p>But, as an exercise in democracy? It's too complex for me to understand. I have been using the leaflet delivered door-to-door as a reference point.</p> <p>In the end, I just have to trust the councillors and residents who drew this up: and, actually, I do trust them. I think they have been struggling to put together a complex document while trying to consult people as much as possible. So, on trust, I support this plan.</p>
Susan Davies	<p>I support the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan December 2024, I think that it covers all necessary areas and complies with the requirements of a neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Policies that I strongly support are those relating to W02 Conservation of the natural environment; W03 Wildlife habitats; W04 Wildlife Corridors, W05 Ecological impact of development; W06 Trees and hedgerows; W09 Green gaps; W10 Local green spaces and W31 Principal residence requirements for new builds.</p> <p>I support the land allocations in Maps 7 and 8.</p> <p>The W04 Wildlife Corridors, W06 Trees and Hedgerows and W09 Green gaps policies are very important for wildlife to be able to thrive and not be isolated in little pockets of land.</p> <p>On Map 10 I would have thought the blue hatching should also include Greenhill Gardens and the Lodmoor bird reserve as these are adjoining the coast (they are protected anyway however).</p>

	<p>I strongly support the new protected Wey Valley meadow and addition to Lorton Valley Nature Park adjoining the proposed Wyke Oliver development. The Lorton Valley Nature Park and its link to the Lodmoor Bird Reserve are a real asset to the town and very much contribute to a feeling of green spaces for people to enjoy, whilst also providing sanctuary for wildlife.</p> <p>The W10 policy for local green spaces is very good and I support all the areas identified.</p> <p>The W31 policy is good because otherwise new developments are often just for people to buy a second home, this prices out local people who cannot afford to buy a home at all and leads to loss of local services in winter as there are less full time residents using them.</p>
Terence G Blake	<p>In general the Neighbourhood Plan does what the title says it is doing. However, why are we still calling up EU legislation such as found in Page 14 Para 4.4. I thought we left that organisation a number of yers ago, so we should only be adopting UK legislation.</p> <p>On Page 9 Para 2.15, I'm sure the word should be 'higher' not 'rather' in the 9th line from the bottom of the paragraph.</p> <p>Page 20 para 1. This is a splendid aim, but what control does the Council have of these factors, absolutely none. You only have to look at the business that have gone, AUWE, NAVY, Ferries etc which provided well paid jobs, to be replaced by low paid alternatives.</p> <p>GENERAL. Many of the aims within the Plan look and sound good but are pie in the sky, and are never achievable and certainly not under Council control. As we are talking generalities, I think the plan should also discuss the infrastructure required to support the extra population generated, such as Doctors, Dentists, Hospitals, transport and Police.</p> <p>Page 30 Para 8.16. At the end of the paragraph the sentence beginning 'In February 2024' is repeated.</p> <p>Page 180 Para 11.63. By the time this document is in place M&S will no longer be in the centre of town.</p> <p>Figure 7. I'm not sure what is supposed to happen to the small piece of land to the right of the footpath from Preston Rd to Elm Close: it seems to have been excluded from the plan yet it is as valuable as open space as the land on the left of the footpath. I have seen many wild animals using this patch of ground so why not incorporate it into the open space category.</p> <p>Concerning the proposal to turn the north of the Old Tip at the bottom of WEYMOUTH BAY AVENUE into a light Industrial area is perverse and vindictive. It would be far better to have this industrial estate in the Mercury Road area where there is direct access to the Trunk Road system, rather than turning a quietish residential road into into a feeder to an industrial estate. Even being a 'light industrial' estate, there will be a significant increase in traffic (vans, lorries) with the consequent increase in noise pollution . If you must use this land, housing would be the better kinder option.</p> <p>Finally, what is happening with the RSPB part of Lodmoor. I don't recall seeing any mention of it within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

Terence Robinson	<p>T.Robinson Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan comments March 2025</p> <p>1. Size of area:</p> <p>1a. This neighbourhood plan covers far too wide an area. It is impossible to comment on the needs / wishes of people living in areas beyond Preston and the Weymouth Town Centre. Dorset Council obviously found the size and variation across the area challenging as it has been sub-divided into 5 'Character' areas!</p> <p>1b. According to the Government website 'Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area. They are able to choose where they want new homes, shops and offices to be built, have their say on what those new buildings should look like and what infrastructure should be provided, and grant planning permission for the new buildings they want to see go ahead. Neighbourhood planning provides a powerful set of tools for local people to plan for the types of development to meet their community's needs and where the ambition of the neighbourhood is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area.' A shared vision is impossible to realise across an neighbourhood community encompassing 53,000 residents!</p> <p>2. Poor consultation with residents:</p> <p>As a resident of the Preston area, I do not feel that my views have received serious consideration. T9.12 'Consultation exercises' - the one for Preston was poorly attended because it was held in August when many residents were away and was poorly advertised. Lip service was paid to consulting residents. I object to the fact that when local people did exercise their right to express their views, it was deemed as 'party political' interference and their views ignored; an infringement of the democratic process.</p> <p>3. Housing development on Wyke Oliver Farm North:</p> <p>The proposed development of 250 homes represents nearly 60% of the total numbers proposed in the neighbourhood plan. The allotted number is clearly biased against Preston and is too large for the size of the semi-rural community.</p> <p>This will result number of potential impacts – many of which are highlighted in the SEA report for the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan November 2024 [p53-56].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of houses assessed: A key flaw in the SEA report is the number of houses assumed for the assessment. Under SEA theme "Community wellbeing [p54] it states that "This site has the potential to deliver between 112 and 135 new homes, contributing towards the identified housing need for the area." Not the 250 proposed in the neighbourhood plan! • Climate Change and Flood Risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Land in the middle of the site and areas to the north are both assessed as already being in Flood Zone 2/3 from flooding and surface water flooding, therefore not ideal for building especially as Climate Change will exacerbate the situation. And, no assessment appears to have been made of the impact of the build on properties below the hill e.g. Wyke Oliver Close. When my wife and I lived on [REDACTED]
------------------	--

Terence Robinson (continued)	<p>on the [REDACTED], we experienced an underground stream forming under our house suddenly, after new properties were built at a higher level higher up the slope.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o On Wyke Oliver Road, I am already aware of one person who is unable to get House Contents Insurance due the risk of flooding. With Climate Change becoming an ever present reality, and with the latest Flood Map predictions, the new development will surely only make the situation worse. o I have also noted that the housing development previously planned for land off Brackendown/Budmouth Avenues has been deemed unviable and dropped. As I understand it, this land was essentially the other half of the field earmarked for the current Wyke Oliver Farm development, so surely the latter is also unviable. <p>4. Infrastructure: The development of 250 houses will have a high impact on car numbers, traffic noise and pollution on Wyke Oliver Close & Road, Oakbury Drive, the Overcombe Estate and the main Preston road, which is already very busy especially in the summer holiday months. It will also impact on other local services such as the Preston Road surgery as residents will have increased difficulty gaining medical appointments/treatment.</p> <p>Whilst the neighbourhood plan states that local plans should “make sufficient provision for the infrastructure required in the area”, in my opinion no developer is going to address these wider needs.</p> <p>5.Retention of green gaps: The site is adjacent to the Dorset National Landscape, and development could alter the settlement pattern of Littlemoor, contributing to urban sprawl [SEA para 5.51]. This is counter to the Policy W09 in the neighbourhood plan, which states that the retention of green gaps is “fundamental to retaining and protecting the special character and setting of settlement areas and preventing coalescence (the joining or merging of elements to form one mass”. This plan erodes green gaps. There is also a potential impact on greenfield BMV land.</p> <p>6. Biodiversity and Geodiversity: The site is adjacent to a large area of traditional orchard, a BAP priority habitat which could be disturbed through increased noise and light pollution of the development. There are also hedgerows on the site boundaries which could be impacted.</p> <p>7. The development is assessed as potentially impacting the setting of existing heritage assets (e.g. Dorset World Heritage Site).</p> <p>8. The relative proximity to Designated sites (Lodmoor SSSI, Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC and South Dorset Coast SSSI) could increase pressure on these sites.</p>
Tia Roos	<p>The neighbourhood plan has been something in the making for a while and everyone involved has put in a lot of time and dedication.</p> <p>I know that this is composed by people who care about communities and care about finding genuine sustainable ways to lift the people</p>

Tia Roos (continued)	<p>of Weymouth out of poverty and despair. I know the focus is around having places for connection and leisure but my focus is on housing.</p> <p>Housing is a major issue and eventually we will have to use land and build more. We can't forever keep letting the market be ruled and owned by people solely focused on profit before people. I know also there are people who don't want land built on. But we are in a precedence where houses MUST be built no matter the cost and they need to be genuinely affordable.</p> <p>I rent [REDACTED] [REDACTED] We are on our own. With both of us working it is still a squeeze to pay our rent and bills and have any money to live. The cost of living has pushed so many people [REDACTED] into homelessness or emergency housing.</p> <p>[REDACTED] Hotels with issues of their own. I know and my colleagues know there is not enough genuinely affordable housing to rent or to buy. Imagine having a mental breakdown and leaving hospital to be in a hotel room. It's depressing and not good enough.</p> <p>I know this plan looks to tackle just some of those issues and maybe kids like my son might grow up to one day have the chance to own his home or even be able to afford to rent. This whole plan is about hope. The foundation of keeping people alive.</p>
Warwick Brown	Objecting to Weymouth neighborhood plan