

From: G V **Sent:** 22 June 2025 17:05
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Redacted
Subject: FW: Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan

PLEASE PASS TO MR MEAD

Dear Mr Mead

Re: Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan

Thank you so much for obliging DC and WTC to put your letter of 2 June 2025 into the public domain. I am writing to you and forwarding my thread with DC because they will not confirm that the DC and WTC responses to you will be published, so I'd like to ask you to oblige them again to do this.

You have asked pertinent questions and I won't comment further until we have these responses. You'll have seen from the Comments submitted the concerns of the public about the Secrecy and the Process behind The Plan, which culminated in me drafting an application for Judicial Review after the WTC unlawful vote of 20th November 2024, being finally ratified on 26 February 2025. I'd also draw your attention to a new revelation about Secrecy, which only came to light after Comments had closed. Please refer to these minutes of the meeting of the Steering Group (SG) <https://www.weymouthtowncouncil.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/17.03.2025-Neighbourhood-Plan-Steering-Group-Meeting-Notes.pdf>. You'll see 2024 given as the date but one presumes it is meant to be 2025. For me, this all started when I was one of 573 (mainly) Preston residents being excluded from the Process in January 2023 and then the SG using the mandate of 34 people out of 54,000 to proceed to achieve their party-political aims. The Lib-Dems had changed from urging us in 2018 to resist once again development plans for Preston to trampling on democracy in their haste to fulfil new party dogma. You'll have seen how I have referred to the WTC Leader Cllr Harris and the Chair of the SG Cllr Northam in this.

I note from your instructing brief the following about holding an examination in public:

**To examine a key issue in more depth or
to ensure a person has a fair chance to put a case.**

I would ask you to consider holding this public examination for the following reasons:

KEY ISSUES

1. The data relating to Housing Needs has been challenged as using just one snapshot and greater examination is needed to work through the figures released by DC under FOI
2. The Plan clearly has great issues with the boundaries. It was the decision of WTC to push ahead knowing that the boundaries were no longer correct. This had the effect to exclude the 500 houses already under way in Littlemoor and Preston at Bincombe Park from The Plan.
3. We need to examine the reasons for the proposed debate between WTC and DC at the end of May 2024 and why it never made it on to the agenda for that meeting after DC had clearly indicated that the WNP could look outside of the defined boundaries if they were having so

much trouble finding suitable development sites. There does not seem to be available an accurate plan of the “new” Weymouth northern boundary and I have done my best to interpret this in orange on the attachment “New Boundaries”. It seems pretty much to just include the Bincombe Park development. I am also attaching a photo of a development board, DJ Developments, which has been in place for a long time in the position indicated in my attachment “google maps”. Please refer to the photo above. This appears to offer development land outside of both The Plan submitted to you and the “new” boundaries. Possibly you saw that on your site visit opposite to the contentious site W20 to the south. It would certainly be a better site than W20 at first glance but, if it is not included in The Plan, then Littlemoor and Preston risk having hundreds more homes built there in addition to W20 just because it is outside the WNP. We also need to examine why WTC is minded to approve a further 240 homes in Littlemoor and Preston at the Weymouth Bay development. This is not mentioned in The Plan but was known about at the time The Plan was submitted to DC on 15 January 2025.

4. If The Plan is supposed to be “sustainable” then the residents would like to examine what this means. One definition of “sustainable” is that the lives of the people already there should not be seriously affected. You’ll have seen from the comments the problems about sewage in Weymouth Bay and Weymouth losing its Blue Flag. Bincombe Park has only just commenced occupation and these potential houses to come, probably now totalling more than 1,000 (W20 up to 270; Weymouth Bay up to 240, Bincombe Park 2nd and subsequent stages 300, DJ Developments brings it over the 1,000). The flushing has only just begun and yet The Plan does not address sewerage at all. Wessex Water say improvements to Weymouth are unlikely until into the 2040’s beyond the life of The Plan. So-called “emergency” discharges of raw sewage into our bathing waters have doubled in the past 2 years, probably the cause of the lost Blue Flag. You may be aware that the CEO of Wessex Water is one of those sanctioned by the government over his bonuses. Wessex takes it in turns to have these emergencies at different points so that we each get our fair share. I am attaching reports of these latest “emergencies” during the recent fine June weather. They are labelled “screenshots”.

5. Flooding is also a sustainability issue. The surface water run-off from these developments can only drain into the area already put by the scientists as potentially under water from 2030 on. There are 2 Wessex Water pumping stations for Preston sewerage within this predicted flood area and so more than 10,000 people could lose their foul drainage altogether, creating an environmental disaster for the SSSI.

6. Environment Assessment. We should examine how the SEA is fundamentally wrong for site W20 and why it differs so much from previous Assessments carried out from 2017 onwards, as listed by me in Comments.

FAIR CHANCE

1. I would like a public examination of whether the Process has been fair and whether the citizens have been able to have a fair chance to put their case. You’ll have seen much of this in the Comments and you will be aware that WTC have publicly minuted from their Full Council meetings that the SG would meet with residents to discuss their concerns. This never happened. For various reasons, no Preston Councillor has been able to join the SG to represent their constituents and the reasons for this need to be examined.

2. On a personal level, I have not been able to obtain information from WTC under FOI going back to August 2024 relating to the May meeting between them and DC referred to

above. Therefore I have not been able to comment fairly on The Plan. Each of my FOI's has either been complied with at the last possible date, exceeded the date, refused under various exemptions allowed by the Information Commissioner or simply not done, claiming "too busy". I was also told by WTC that they were minded to refuse my FOI's altogether although, in the event, they did not but proceeded as above. I can give you the evidence of this or you can ask WTC to give you a full schedule.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely

Glenn van der Pas