

Comments on Policy W20 Wyke Oliver Farm North via Citizen Space

Objector name / organisation

1. Brian Bourne
2. Chris Browne
3. Daniel Hastings
4. Ergin Salih
5. Helen Brooks
6. Pauline Armstrong
7. Sandra Parkes
8. Tyron Ebdon

Comments on Policy W20 Wyke Oliver Farm North via Citizen Space

Objector name / organisation	Please write your comments / representation in the box below - Comments
Brian Bourne	<p>I believe a vast majority of Preston residents, including myself, object to the plan for the development of the land above Wyke Oliver, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exacerbates the flooding down through the gardens in Wyke Oliver, and all along the stream alongside the Preston Rd. 2. Exacerbates the need to release sewerage into the sea. This issue has already lost Weymouth's beach its Blue Flag status! 3. Lack of adequate green spaces separating the proposed development from existing properties (especially alongside Emminster Close). 4. Wyke Oliver Rd is narrow, with many cars parked on the road (presumably because their drives are too steep?), which is bound to create problems. 5. I believe the proposed development will have a major negative impact on the landscape, especially along the beach at Preston. 6. There is no plan for the extra demand for Doctors, Dentists, Schools, etc. 7. The plan ignores the fact that a very large development is being built on the north side of Littlemoor Rd. I understand that this isn't within the 'Weymouth area', but this is pure semantics. The new residents will effectively be in Weymouth, and will add to the extra demand of the Wyke Oliver development for additional Doctors, Dentists, Schools, etc. <p>If there is a real need for yet further development in the area, then I strongly believe it should be significantly smaller than that proposed for Wyke Oliver !</p>
Chris Browne	<p>While I recognise the thorough exercise that has been carried out in putting the plan together I have a few comments I would like to make.</p> <p>We already have 2 developments going on on this side of Weymouth at Littlemore and Sutton Poyntz area, which will be significant - both will add significant demands on the local area and it's services.</p> <p>The Wyke oliver development concerns me as the hilly area abuts the Budmouth one which has been removed I believe the same conditions apply to both and Wyke should be removed too.</p> <p>My concerns are twofold - my property has already been flooded in the last 30 years due to excess water in a nearby stream, we are surrounded by springs in this area, I believe if Wyke is developed this risk will be increased.</p> <p>Secondly there is only a small road leading to the area passing a care home with unrestricted road parking outside it for the disabled and will not be practical if more traffic is added. There are only 2 roads accessing this area of Preston now.</p> <p>In addition the main Preston Road is absolutely chocker in the Holidays with visitors.</p> <p>I'd also point out that Haven wants to expand too , which will further impact this area and the services.</p> <p>Thank you for giving me this chance to comment</p>

Daniel Hastings	<p>I am objecting to the plan, specifically development of W20. I refer to the SEA report: https://www.weymouthtowncouncil.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Weymouth-NP-SEA_Environmental-Report-November-2024.pdf</p> <p>With reference to the SEA (link above), the SEA was not considered by Weymouth Full Council in the meeting when the vote was cast to put the plan forward to Dorset council. It could not have been considered as the published dates clearly show it was published AFTER the meeting. This is critical as the SEA was also based on incorrect information, in that it only considers 112 to 135 homes, much less than the 250 homes allocated in the plan for this site. It is obvious that the actual submitted number of 250 would have had a material impact on the assessment and conclusions of the report.</p> <p>The report states "uncertain effects" on biodiversity and geodiversity, climate change, community wellbeing, land soil and water and transportation. However many of the comments do not seem uncertain, but fundamentally negative. There is surely a high likelihood these would have "negative effects" if the correct number of approximately double the number of houses were used. It is also inappropriate to put forward for development a site which has so many "uncertain effects".</p> <p>Furthermore, in the climate change section of the report with regard to the major issue of flood risk, consideration is only given to flood risk on site (conclusion - uncertain) and no comment made on flood risk from run off to the culvert at Preston Brook, and subsequently into the Lodmoor SSSI and other flood risk 3 areas immediately adjacent. Flood risk can only increase with the development of this site.</p> <p>Removal of W20 would overcome my objection. In order to satisfy the desire to achieve house building targets, an alternative solution would be to pause the plan and include Bincombe Park and adjoining sites within the plan (as they now fall within the Weymouth area)</p>
Ergin Salih	<p>I object to the plan due to the inclusion of the Wyke Oliver Farm (North) site for development, this takes a green area that is unsuitable for construction of buildings and forces it on an existing community that does not want it there.</p> <p>There will be a negative impact to the immediate and wider area due to the addition of these houses, lack of access to the site (a single entrance) will not help the new residents in getting to and from their houses easily and it adds to the traffic through an existing quiet community.</p> <p>The extra population to the area will also have an adverse impact on local services, specifically access to the local doctors. The local doctors office currently stretched and adding extra population to their roll will make it even more difficult to see a doctor.</p> <p>The addition of the extra houses will also have an impact to the sewage and drainage that is already a problem in the area, there is nothing in the plan to mitigate these serious concerns.</p>

Ergin Salih (continued)	<p>The neighbourhood plan seems to skirt around the fact that many of the local residents object to the developments in Wyke Oliver Farm (North) even though it fully acknowledges the objections.</p> <p>The SEA report does not show that there are actual positives to the site, with many of the assessments being 'uncertain', 'neutral', or 'adverse'. Again the neighbourhood plan just accepts that these are not positive without addressing the actual problems but proceeds in indicating that housing is required and it must have to go somewhere.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Development of homes Policy W20, Site E.</p> <p>Table 4.13 Assessment findings – Site E SEA Theme Site E: Land at Wyke Oliver Farm (North)</p> <p>Page 52:</p> <p>There are a number of criteria which are as follows and they fall into the following categories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Likely adverse effect (without mitigation measures) [red] - Likely positive effect [green] - Neutral/no effect [yellow] - Uncertain effect [blue] <p>Air quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uncertain effect <p>Biodiversity and geodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uncertain effect <p>Climate change</p>
----------------------------	--

Ergin Salih (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uncertain effect <p>Community wellbeing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uncertain effect <p>Historic environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neutral/no effect <p>Land, soil and water resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uncertain effect <p>Landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Likely adverse effect (without mitigation measures) <p>Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uncertain effect <p>Out of 8 criteria it break down as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Zero 'Likely positive effect' items - 6 'Uncertain effect' - 1 'Neutral/no effect' - 1 'Likely adverse effect (without mitigation measures)' <p>This report does not categorically endorse the Wkye Oliver Farm (North) site in any way and the effect will probably be negative due to the points raise in the individual sections.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan Report to Inform Habitats Regulations Assessment</p> <p>Policy W20: Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North</p>
----------------------------	--

Ergin Salih (continued)	<p>Page 49:</p> <p>Potential Likely Significant Effects alone This policy allocates approx. 250 dwellings on the Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North. This area is around 6 km from Chesil & The Fleet SAC, SPA and Ramsar site, and 1 km from the Isle of Portland to Studland Cliffs SAC. This development could impact this site through the following impact pathways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water quality (run off Potential Likely Significant Effect in-combination In addition to potential effects alone, the policy may cause an effect on Habitats sites through the following impact pathways in-combination with other plans, projects and policies: • Recreational pressure • Water quality and Water Resources <p>----</p> <p>This states that the water quality and runoff would be a problem for this Wyke Oliver Farm (North) site but does not provide any mitigation strategies.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan 2021 - 2038</p> <p>Page 85:</p> <p>Section 9.14: The two major sites (Budmouth Avenue and Wyke Oliver Farm) in Preston received a high incidence of objections from residents, particularly those living nearby.</p> <p>This indicates that the local community (the people ones affected by these developments) are not in favour of the developments proceeding but these objections have not been taken seriously.</p> <p>-----</p>
----------------------------	--

Helen Brooks	<p>I wish to object to the proposed development of land at Wyke Oliver Farm (North) Map 19, Page 96.</p> <p>This is a greenfield site yet it was agreed, in the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan that the focus for new builds would be on brownfield sites.</p> <p>Wyke Oliver Farm is home to numerous wildlife species such as bats, migrating nesting birds, foxes, badgers and owls which currently nest in the barn.</p> <p>There are already hundreds of properties currently being built nearby off Littlemoor Road. Does the immediate area need 250 extra houses on top?</p> <p>Will all the extra residents be able to access school places, Doctors (you already can't get an appointment within 4 weeks at the Preston Road Surgery), Dentists (our NHS dentist has left our practice, forcing us to go private).</p> <p>This would be a skyline development causing a negative visual impact. Is Preston going to lose all of it's green spaces?</p> <p>All access for this proposed development would be via Wyke Oliver Road which is a narrow residential road with cars parked on both sides. How will heavy construction traffic navigate this road?</p> <p>If the development went ahead it would add hundreds of cars to Wyke Oliver Road every day. There are no amenities in the direct vicinity so private vehicle use would be constant causing traffic congestion.</p> <p>The development would be up to the top of a hill that has water run off, this already causes flooding issues which would worsen with development. This would cause a drainage and flood risk for all properties in the area.</p> <p>The reasons given for the recent refusal of the Budmouth Avenue/Brackendown Avenue development must be relevant, if not identical, to the Wyke Oliver proposed development.</p> <p>Quite simply, this site is not suitable for this development.</p>
Pauline Armstrong	<p>Policy W20: Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North - Page 84 / 85</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposition to build 250 houses at the top of Wyke Oliver Road. The volume of traffic will be huge and in holiday season very dangerous particularly in the summer months. The exit to Wyke Oliver road left is a very small roundabout, right is a very small roundabout, i don't believe the area has the current infrastructure to cope. Concerns for residents, visitors & delivery drivers.</p> <p>I don't believe that any dwellings should be built on the area suggested.</p>

Sandra Parkes	<p>Objecting Wyke Oliver Farm development</p> <p>Reasons</p> <p>1. No adequate infrastructure mentioned in particular increased gp surgery provision. Already waiting a month for appointment at Preston Road surgery, and emergency appointments not often available, you have to fight to get them. Add to that the additional vans Haven want at Weymouth Bay and the holidaymakers/owners who also use the local gp if required. It is essential to increase capacity or new surgery. Where are all these people in new houses going to park at the surgery, already a nightmare turning into Preston Road from surgery car park with no visibility because of parked cars. Parking in Wyke Oliver Road wouldn't be feasible because of the additional traffic using that junction. Think you need to speak to local councillors about how this will work, as Highways are not experienced or have a clue with the day to day problems we have as they live outside the area.</p> <p>2. What impact will it have on Preston Road with cars turning out of Wyke Oliver Road and Melstock Avenue. Visibility is already poor turning from Oakbury drive into Wyke Oliver Road as cars/vans often blocking view. Also take into account additional cars blocking road at Haven on check in days, Monday and Friday where an additional number of vehicles if Haven get approval, often 2 per caravan, will be trying to get into the site.</p>
Tyron Ebdon	<p>Reference Policy W20: Land at Wyke Oliver Farm North</p> <p>There are a number of issues which no doubt will be addressed with the correct approved solutions but the main concerning factor i have is the access to the new proposed development. I believe the proposed access to the new development is off Wyke Oliver Road and the existing access to Wyke Oliver Farm. This access is of a single track road unless existing farm buildings are demolished, the access will also be on a 90 degree bend and would like to know how this is not deemed not to be dangerous to the existing road users from Wyke Oliver Close.</p> <p>I understand that access could be gained from Louviers Road vis land owned by a Affordable Housing company, why can't an agreement be agreed with this company?</p> <p>What is the proposal for the existing farm, currently the stables are used for people to house their horses, there is no onsite parking for these people who constantly park on the corner of the proposed access. Is the farm closing down? Are the buildings being demolished? Some of the buildings form the boundary to some of the properties on Wyke Oliver Close.</p> <p>I look forward to see the proposals to how to get over the issues raised.</p>