

Response No.	Respondent	Vision and Objectives
41	Woodland Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see a formal objective include in the promotion of accessible woodland as part of a green infrastructure strategy for the Borough to help improve people’s quality of life and create sustainable communities, particularly where there may be new housing development at Littlemoor, Southill and Chickerell
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives of the Core Strategy are generally supported. Objective 8 could be improved slightly by reference to public transport and, in particular, an enhanced service on the rail link to Dorchester/London
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, the Partnership warmly welcomes the Core Strategy and, in particular, the extent to which it complements the role of the community plan and the clarity with which describes the relationship between the two. Having established the strategic context, “Our Community, Your Future: Options” is considered to be a well-presented document that strikes a commendable balance between the provision of information and stimulation of debate – thus, for the most part, enabling and encouraging contributors to offer informed opinion across a broad range of subjects. The only shortcoming noted is the ‘stand-alone’ nature of the options and absence, in certain cases, of commentary on the correlation between choices – some of which appear to impact significantly on other options on offer • Finally, it should be noted that the wide range of interests that are held by board members has substantially constrained our ability to produce quorum responses and, accordingly, the substance of this submission is limited. However, the size of the enclosed submission should not be viewed as equivocation or lack of interest but simply a reflection of the Partnership’s functional probity <p>Vision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported; except for the absence of an explicit reference to the Borough being a ‘healthy’ place in which to live and work. We consider that inclusion of such comment to be essential and, apart from its obvious merit in terms of substance, it would also strengthen coherency with the Community Plan (CP) and with Core Strategy Objective (CSO) No. 10. <p>Foreword</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In paragraph 1 we believe the reference to the options leaflet should read “Your Place” instead of “Your Place, Our

		<p>Future”.</p> <p>Core Strategy Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported – a comprehensive and achievable set of aims that link well with the thrust of the CP
270 *	Mono Consultants Ltd on behalf of Mobile Operators Association	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No particular comments on the policies in the Options Document. However, would like to see a telecommunications policy within the emerging LDF, the importance of which is identified in PPG8. PPG8 states that local plans (LDDs) should set out criteria based policies to guide telecommunications development. Within LDF there should be concise and flexible telecommunications policy contained within one of the Council’s statutory LDD. It is recognised that this might be contained in a Development Management DPD than the CS which is of a strategic nature. Such a policy should give all stakeholders a clear indication of the issues which development will be assessed against. Telecommunications policy wordings suggested. This policy can be a standalone policy within one of the main LDDs with any background information such as electromagnetic fields (EMFs) and public health, being contained within a separate LDD or SPG. This could be read with PPG8, the Code of Best Practice to give a comprehensive background to any proposed development. The wording to introduce the policy is suggested as: <p>“Modern telecommunications systems have grown rapidly in recent years with more than two thirds of the population now owning a mobile phone. Mobile communications are now considered an integral part of the success of most business operations and individual lifestyles. With new services such as the advanced third generation (3G) services, demand for new telecommunications infrastructure is continuing to grow. The Council is keen to facilitate this expansion whilst at the same time minimising any environmental impacts. It is our policy to reduce the proliferation of new masts by encouraging mast sharing and location on existing tall structures and buildings. Further information on telecommunications can be found in Local Development Document...”</p> This should be introduced by a short paragraph outlining the development pressures and the Councils aims. In keeping with the aims and objectives of the new legislation any background information should be contained within a separate LDD which would not need to go through the same consultation process

269 *	RSPB South West Regional Office	<p>Vision Page 9</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the vision’s commitment to protecting and enhancing the environment and sustainable development <p>Objectives Page 10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Objective 2 • Also support objectives 8 and 9 relating to improving accessibility and sustainable development
251*	South West Councils	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome that the document is well written in plain English style to appeal to a wide range of audiences. It gives a clear vision for Weymouth and Portland over the next 20 years • Pleased to note that earlier comments on making Weymouth more self-contained and recognizing the opportunities arising from 2012 Olympics have been addressed to a greater extent within this document
185*	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Bourne Leisure	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is vitally important that emerging development planning policies allow fully for changes to take place with economic benefits being properly balanced with environmental issues in the drafting of policies • To ensure that holiday parks in Weymouth and Portland do not fall behind others, in terms of quality and facilities, positive policy direction concerning tourism signaled in the Corporate Plan should be reflected in LDF documents <p>Vision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourne Leisure supports first sentence of the Vision, but considers that it should also refer to the Borough being an exciting place to visit, in order to reflect the area’s vitality important and increasing tourism role, objective 6 of the Core Strategy, which is to focus employment growth on (amongst other matters) tourism and leisure, and the Corporate Plan which recognizes the role of tourism • This addition is important to reflect the Corporate Plan 2008-2013 and to ensure that the Council’s policy direction is coordinated

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moreover, paragraph 3.4 of Issues Paper 1: Spatial Context specifically refers to the need to focus on tourism in order to sustain current levels of economic growth <p>Objective 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bourne Leisure accepts objective 2 (conserve and enhance the natural environment) but considers that this objective should be reconsidered to allow scope for carefully balancing it with the objectives for employment growth in tourism (objective 6) and to recognize the role of tourism in the local economy <p>New Objective on Tourism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new objective to promote tourism should be added with the proposed new wording: <p>“To develop the role of Weymouth and Portland as a thriving tourism destination through encouraging improvements in the quality of tourist related facilities and accommodation that will extend the tourist season and are likely to attract higher spending visitors”</p> This new objective would reflect the Vision for Weymouth (at paragraph 5.5) as a lively forward looking town, whose economy is built (in part) upon tourism In line with the Corporate Plan the emerging LDF should be seeking to improve the quality of the tourist experience, extend the season and attract higher spending visitors
		SS1
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England supports Option SS1
156	Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports SS1 – reducing the need to travel by car. Agency agrees with the principle of creating mixed use developments in order to deliver viable new communities. Such development should include a broad range of facilities and employment opportunities alongside new homes. New development should also, where possible, be located in close proximity to existing areas and sustainable transport routes, so as to reduce the need to travel
262	GOSW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option SS1: this is a principle not an option – it can have many different spatial forms: to conform with the emerging RSS you should demonstrate that your preferred option takes this forward as best possible.
214	Pegasus Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the principle of increasing self-containment and reducing the need to travel by car. Given the physical and natural constraints, it is recognized that the Borough is unable to bring forward large areas of land for development and hence

	Group	there is need to work with WDDC and look outside the boundary of Weymouth and make additional provision at an urban extension (land east of Chickerell in this case)
217	Entec on behalf of The Crown Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In support of the policy. The option would support the allocation of the mixed use residential / education/employment proposals (HO2c) for Independent Quarry, which provides a sustainable location in line with guidance in the RSS and is well served by public transport • Delivery of additional housing and mixed use scheme on Independent Quarry accords with the emphasis placed on ensuring sustainable development by the Government in addition to the overall aims of the RSS and more specifically Policy SD4 'Sustainable Communities'. HO2c should therefore be proposed as a mixed use allocation to meet the objectives of SS1 as the option promotes self-containment in Weymouth reducing the need to travel by car. Independent Quarry performs well against South West Plan (Policy SD4). It is located in a sustainable location and would utilize a well located and accessible site within walking distance to Easton Town Centre and its amenities; located on a high frequency public transport corridor and would reduce the need to travel by car as the future residents would not be dependent on car use to access employment and other needs. The scheme accords with the emphasis placed on ensuring sustainable development by the Government through the co-location of residential and other development to provide sustainable communities. Close to existing schools, shops and the mixed use proposal includes 16 plus education facilities and dual use of facility by the community (services are currently off the island)
221	SWRDA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the current imbalance between jobs and resident population, actions within the strategy to improve the proportions of jobs relative to residents within the borough is welcomed. • However Core Strategy should acknowledge the strong functional relationship that exists between Weymouth and Dorchester, reflected in the shared Travel to Work Area (TTWA) and should not be unduly constrained by administrative boundaries. Given these functional linkages, positive cross-boundary working with West Dorset DC will continue to be very important in successfully planning a sustainable future for both towns.
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objective is generally supported however, it may be difficult to attract employment, particularly of the types which are favoured by the Planning Authority because the town is remote from sources of raw materials and markets
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported
240	Local History	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unrealistic to reduce the need for travel by car

	Research, Images and Publications	
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports • Cars kill so reduction in dependency is to be welcomed.
		SS2a
263b*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the amount of development on Greenfield sites (as opposed to SS2b) • Likely to achieve the needed housing delivery; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◇ More family housing rather than flats ◇ More affordable and social housing than redevelopment sites ◇ Provide community benefits eg allotments or flooding benefits ◇ Could help achieve SS1
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England supports the principle of focusing development on previously developed land. Natural England, however, also recognises that Greenfield sites tend to provide greater opportunities for securing environmental and community gains, e.g. the provision of significant green infrastructure. Natural England therefore does not oppose the principle of Greenfield development provided it can be demonstrated that the sites chosen are the least environmentally damaging and most sustainable option available. All options should therefore include a strong presumption against building on greenfield sites unless it can be demonstrated that, 1) there is no suitable previously developed alternatives, and 2) that the development of a greenfield site does not in itself conflict with any other sustainability objectives. The appropriate Option is therefore very much dependent on the availability of brownfield sites which do not in themselves have significant environmental constraints.
211	Brimble Lea and Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting this option in line with stated advantages – bringing forward a strategic Greenfield allocation will provide better opportunities for delivering a range of dwelling types including family housing along with a significant proportion of affordable housing and other community benefits depending upon the size of the site. This option will reflect if SFRA 2 indicates that higher proportion of development on previously developed land or in town centre will be inappropriate and unacceptable to EA
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not supporting • No objections as long as health features included and density does not preclude green spaces and allotments causing lower socioeconomic groups to struggle in cramped accommodation with no gardens and suffering from noise pollution and aggravation from neighbours being too close with no room to live quietly and comfortably.

269*	RSPB South West Regional Office	<p>SS2a and SS2b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst generally supporting the focus on previously developed land from a sustainability perspective, we would comment that ‘brownfield’ sites may have biodiversity interest. In particular, the redundant mineral sites in the Borough have considerable in situ biodiversity interest, and some are designated Site allocations brought forward in connection with these options will need careful assessment against designated site issues and the potential for restoration or recreation
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The target for a future development on previously developed land is higher than the national requirement. The main problem is that it will not achieve significant levels of affordable housing and not meet the proposed targets in the Plan. Previously developed sites have existing use values and investment values. The development value must exceed these values in order to secure the implementation of housing on brownfield sites.
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<p>SS2a and SS2b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not support such high levels of development on previously developed land as there are only limited opportunities for large scale development, which are often constrained and offer a more limited choice of housing types – with a high proportion of flats.
42	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>SS2a and SS2b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dorset Wildlife Trust would point out that ‘brownfield’ sites can be equally environmentally sensitive as ‘greenfield’ sites. In particular in Weymouth and Portland Borough there are a number of disused quarries and ex military sites which might be considered to be brownfield but in fact support important environmental assets such as Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCIs). Whichever option is chosen site allocations should be very carefully planned, and should not be allowed to over-ride nature conservation designations or Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitats.
156	Highways Agency	<p>SS2a and SS2b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The agency strongly supports the principle of focusing the highest proportion of development on brownfield land that is realistically deliverable.
217	Entec on behalf of The Crown Estate	<p>SS2a, SS2b and SS3a and SS3b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the options. Modify to acknowledge that bulk Greenfield sites and other previously used sites will be needed to assist in the delivery of the Council’s housing requirements. The use of land therefore needs to be related to an informed housing trajectory; flexibility is required to perhaps allocate Greenfield sites if housing targets are not being met

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These targets are far too simplistic and need to be phased to ensure the delivery of housing but also to encourage the recycling of brownfield land. The options need to be modified to acknowledge that the release of Greenfield land may be needed early on to meet the housing requirement and to acknowledge that sites like Independent Quarry, although do not meet the definition of previously developed land, are previously used and should come forward to assist in the delivery of housing. Also concerns about Council's supply of sites which appears to have a heavy reliance on windfalls.
239	Tetlow King Planning on behalf of South West RSL Planning Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% target is preferable. By setting a 75% target the Council can still exceed this target if necessary while addressing other issues. However applying a strict percentage target figure to development on pdl is considered overly restrictive and should not be applied so rigidly as to adversely affect the overall development within the Borough; the target set must be aspirational rather than an absolute constraint on development. Emerging RSS sets a target of 50% of new housing development to take place on pdl across the region. Para 3.7.9 of emerging RSS states that promoting the development of pdl should not be the overriding priority, rather the development of Greenfield and pdl are two separate but complementary streams of supply which should not be sequentially phased as this would put at risk delivery of the RSS
240	Local History Research, Images and Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25% development on Greenfield – too high – would lead to a severe and irreplaceable loss of landscape and amenity
252	Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Options SS2a and SS2b – advantage of developing on brownfield sites where contamination is a major issue is that this contamination will need to be dealt with prior to any new development taking place. This will help to improve soil and sub soil, groundwater and surface water quality.
185	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Bourne Leisure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bourne Leisure considers that this option is preferable to Option SS2b. In view of Bourne Leisure's understanding of the development needs and the land availability, a 75% target is more realistic and will result in a greater likelihood of achieving inward investment/development over the plan period
		SS2b
263b*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly opposed • Likely to delay delivery of housing • Hamper the provision of new employment, which will have to be on Greenfield land • More likely to deliver flats than family housing • More likely to deliver upper end housing due to high development costs of brownfield sites, and fail to deliver social housing

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wouldn't deliver community benefits eg allotments • Would fail to help achieve SS1
211	Brimble Lea and Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed for reasons as stated in disadvantages in the report and flood risk issues
239	Tetlow King Planning on behalf of South West RSL Planning Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 90% target promotes the development of pdl above all other priorities – may limit opportunities to provide more affordable housing
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My comments with regard to Option SS2a apply with even greater force to this Option. Not only do I think that the opportunities for brownfield sites will gradually dry up. As the demands of the Local Authorities' increase for affordable housing and infrastructure provision the development costs will rise so that the development value will not exceed existing use values. 90% is totally unrealistic.
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported
240	Local History Research, Images and Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No reason to say that 90% of development on brownfield sites would mean a higher proportion of flats – this could be prevented by normal planning powers
257	Stone Firms Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The developments costs are not higher on our land. Because it is brownfield the archaeological and ecological costs are less. In any event that should not be a planning consideration that falls to the developer. We have the land available now and it is not constrained, so not a sustainable argument
215*	Terence O'Rourke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pursuit of such a high level of development on previously developed land is objected to. Previously developed sites are inherently more complicated to develop than green field sites, and a reliance on this source, by prohibiting delivery of green field sites, may lead to future housing shortfalls. Such an outcome would be contrary to the requirements Planning Policy Statement 3: <i>Housing</i> and Policy Statement 12: <i>Local Spatial Planning</i>, which demand that policies contained within Core Strategies are deliverable and are therein <i>effective and consistent with national policy</i>.

271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The same comment only more serious impact
		SS3a
263b*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes Least likely to achieve housing delivery Least likely to achieve family housing Least likely to address the needs of the lower end of the market or social housing Least likely to achieve community benefits such as allotments and flood alleviation Most new employment will require Greenfield sites Least likely to achieve SS1
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England would have no objection to Option SS3a provided that the land that is brought forward can be demonstrated to have no significant environmental or landscape constraints. In our view greenfield sites should only be adopted if they contribute significantly to sustainability objectives and provide substantial environmental enhancements.
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
211	Brimble Lea and Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed for reasons as stated disadvantage
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst I acknowledge the encouragement given to the development of brownfield sites over greenfield sites, greenfield sites may be necessary in order to achieve other objectives of the Core Strategy. In the current economic climate it is likely that many of the sites which are already committed will not be delivered within 5 years. It is unlikely that any of the greenfield sites currently proposed can be delivering houses much before the end of 2011 in any event, probably 2012 by the time the Core Strategy is adopted
215*	Terence O'Rourke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previously developed sites are inherently more complicated to develop than green field sites and a reliance on this source, by prohibiting delivery of strategic sites that can take many years to build out, may lead to future housing shortfalls. Such an outcome would be contrary to the requirements of PPS12: <i>Local Spatial Planning</i> which also requires that policies contained within Core Strategies should be, <i>effective</i> and <i>consistent with national policy</i>. In order to overcome this problem no phasing constraint should be imposed on the strategic development sites.

271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This may be better than cramped brownfields as room to appreciate nature and grow own vegetables etc.
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<p>SS3a and SS3b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to any phasing. Panel at Regional EIP concluded that there was no need for any phasing of the Greenfield supply to support the brownfield supply; the contribution from brownfield on its own would not provide the rate of development required and therefore there will be a need for a Greenfield contribution throughout the plan period, particularly during the economic recovery – this was endorsed by SoS in the Proposed Changes to the RSS in July 2008
156	Highways Agency	<p>SS3a and SS3b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Justification for Greenfield land release need to be carefully explained. In some cases, it can be supported because of the characteristics of the brownfield sites that are available or deliverable during a plan period (and in particular their potential to provide a full range and type of new homes) or because approved growth requirements clearly exceed the capacity of those brownfield sites. The options paper provides some hints at the position in Weymouth and Portland, but it is not clear if one, two, three or four of the Greenfield land releases are justified at this time or in the current context. If Greenfield releases do feature as part of the strategy (and this will be something that the HA may wish to comment on further once the CS is formally submitted for consultation), then any such development must be the subject of rigorous examination in relation to sustainability as Greenfield sites are often peripheral and therefore less sustainable in transport terms. The Agency would wish to be involved at the earliest possible opportunity in order to identify any potential impacts on the SRN It is also important that any Greenfield sites make proper provision for a mix of uses and are well located with respect to existing and proposed employment opportunities. This will help to ensure self-containment within the Borough
217	Entec on behalf of The Crown Estate	<p>As included above in SS2a</p>
		<p>SS3b</p>

263b*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly supported • Most likely to achieve housing delivery • Most likely to achieve family housing • Most likely to address the needs of the lower end of the market or social housing • Most likely to achieve community benefits such as allotments and flood alleviation • Most new employment will require Greenfield sites • Most likely to achieve SS1
211	Brimble Lea and Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported and in line with advantages in the report
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The phasing however should take account of sustainability issues, particularly the proximity to sources of employment, the town centre and regular frequency bus services.
214	Pegasus Planning Group	As included above in SS2a
217	Entec on behalf of The Crown Estate	As included above in SS2a
215*	Terence O'Rourke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is considered that there should not be a phasing restriction placed on Greenfield development. The development of previously developed sites is often complex and delivery can be slow. Similarly there may be instances where new infrastructure or facilities are required as part of a large scale development whilst there will be a consequent need to get high levels of initial development to unlock the funding required for these.
		SS4a
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England objects to Option SS4a as the option does not give enough weight to the importance of town centre flooding. With climate change it is inevitable that flood risk will increase and exert an increasing economic burden to the town. Yet Option SS4a ignores this issue. A sustainable and growing economy could only be achieved if the combined benefits of developing the town centre outweigh the overall costs of flood defence over the anticipated lifetime of the

		development.
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even better as one would be planning now for the future
156	Highways Agency	<p>SS4a and SS4b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Agency supports the concentration of new retail, cultural, commercial and housing development in and around Weymouth Town Centre – this will enhance the attractiveness of the town and make it more self-contained and will reduce the overall need to travel by car. • New development within the Town Centre should be located within close proximity to public transport facilities in order to maximize the opportunities to use sustainable means of transport in preference to the private car • As stated in previous representations to Core Strategy Issues and Options, the Agency also supports the proposal to produce a separate Area Action Plan for Weymouth Town Centre which will consider a range of transport issues including the implications of the Weymouth 2012 Olympic proposals
269*	RSPB South West Regional Office	<p>SS4a and SS4b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are risks and opportunities likely to be attached to such development, particularly to Radipole Lake nature reserve, a SSSI – see comments on TC1a/b
211	Brimble Lea and Partners	<p>SS4a and b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing development within TC is likely to be restricted for flood risk reasons identified – necessitating the development of strategic Greenfield allocations a short distance from TC
216	RPS Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wording of options SS4a and SS4b should be altered to reflect the potential for additional floorspace to be located to meet qualitative deficiencies at existing retail facilities. Add following to the end of the options: ‘retail development to address qualitative deficiencies at existing retail locations will be permitted subject to their being no unacceptable impact upon the vitality and attractiveness of the TC’

256	Indigo Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both options SS4a and SS4b encourage self-containment and sustainability of Weymouth. However these options fail to recognize the strategic need to regenerate Portland. Strategic policies need to encompass the separate needs of Portland and encourage new retail, commercial and housing development on the island to support the new 2012 facilities. CS should aim to provide a sustainable retail and regeneration policy for the Borough as a whole than only concentrating on Weymouth Town Centre
258	Dorset County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Options SS4a and SS4b identify town centre as a focus for development and improvements. Draft Shoreline Management Plan for the seafront and harbour is 'Hold the Line' over the next 100 years but there is a need to consider what that might mean in terms of town centre –
262	GOSW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option SS4a: you need to apply PPS6 (& emerging PPS4), i.e. apply the sequential approach in planning for growth in town centre uses. Therefore this is not an option, but a principle which needs to be pursued first.
		SS4b
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England supports Option SS4b as a means of ensuring that town centre flood risk and the associated costs of flood defence are given full consideration.
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> support this option having regard to the sequential approach to town centre uses in PPS6 and the need to enhance the vitality and viability of town centres as set out in RSS Policy TC1 and also being consistent with Policy HMA12; any employment and other services including retail development at the urban extension would be complementary to that provided in Weymouth TC.
216	RPS Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> as in SS4a
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		SS5
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support this option but object to statement that urban extension at Chickerell will add to the existing concentration of employment sites in Chickerell and not improve the supply and demand of employment space across the whole travel to work area. Chickerell is an attractive location for new employment development given its business parks, which provide a range of

		available sites well located to public transport services, cycleways and existing infrastructure
156	Highways Agency	<p>SS5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With respect to urban extension, Agency has made separate representations to WDDC's Options for Growth consultation. These concluded that for reasons including proximity to Weymouth Town Centre, restraint of easy access to key road corridors notably the Weymouth Relief Road, and access to readily deliverable improvements in sustainable transport, the Agency is likely to support Options 2 (Southill) and 3 (Chickerell) ahead of Option 1 (Littlemoor). Agency has no strong preference between Options 2 and 3 and it is possible that the overall quantum of development required could be shared between the two sites if felt appropriate.
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The urban extensions may not be necessary if the greenfield sites are all allocated for development. However, it is agreed that because these urban extensions are remote from the town centre, they need to be mixed use developments, providing employment and local services.
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
215*	Terence O'Rourke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of employment land, as part a strategy to deliver an urban extension to Weymouth, is supported. Such an outcome will enable the creation of mixed communities, which are sustainable and prevent the need to commute out of an area. Clarity is sought on the level of employment development sought within the urban extensions, such that this can be responded to in the master plan and approach being worked up for the Southill site. The submitted West Dorset District Council Options for Growth consultation response (as attached) illustrates that land within the Southill area has significant potential to accommodate and support employment uses as part of a comprehensively planned mixed-use scheme.
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		SS6
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> supported

42	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support the inclusion in this option of a requirement to contribute to biodiversity
240	Local History Research, Images and Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported. Policy option would reflect a major change on recent and past developments. • No proposal should result in the loss of any existing quality open space which would be a permanent loss
252	Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is considered that part of the changes between the draft consultation and final consultation to Option SS6 are retrograde. The revised wording fails to consider the retention of ponds and watercourses or incorporate the additional text that was recommended earlier: <i>'Development in or adjoining flood risk areas should be safe throughout its design life and contribute to a flood risk management strategy which ensures that the infrastructure which supports the development remains operable in the future'</i>
258	Dorset County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option SS6 covers the quality design of development – for drainage the geology in the area is clay, sandstone, limestone that can give rise to landslides. Any development on hill sides should be mindful of soakways and potential ground conditions that could become unstable with added water.
262	GOSW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option SS6: Building for Life and Code for Sustainable Homes are both national standards that should be used and 'topped up' as far as necessary for local distinctiveness. The latter needs an evidence base for reference (has a local character assessment been done that you can use for this?)
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Option should not be used to frustrate greenfield development. Nor should the reference to higher standard of quality and design be used to impose personal ideas of what constitutes quality of design.
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported
269*	RSPB South West Regional Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the contribution to biodiversity and other sustainability measures. Guidance from the Borough for developers on the strategic context for contributions and how these are to be made would be welcome.
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported • Whatever is sustainable for the planet also helps people who are part of the natural ecosystem and not separate from creation.

		Weymouth Town Centre – TC1a
216	RPS Group	<p>TC1a, TC1b, TC1c and TC2 and paragraph 3.6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the options/paragraph. Paragraph 3.6 – recognition should be given to the fact that significant qualitative convenience need exists, as demonstrated by existing Asda store significantly overtrading. Accordingly, in respect of convenience floorspace, an alternative exists which is to specifically allow for existing convenience stores to address existing qualitative deficiencies by providing additional floorspace on site. • Wording of TC1a, TC1b TC1c and TC2 should be added upon: ‘... and by allowing existing convenience stores to address qualitative deficiencies by the provision of additional floorspace on site’
262	GOSW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option TC1a would only seem justified if there are particular opportunities, i.e. some key ‘eyesores’, weak-spots or under utilised areas.
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported • No objections to development as long as it meets the core specifications in the NICE guidance on planning on a human scale with adequate natural space. Overdevelopment that enriches developers in the short term but causes misery to residents for 50 years is to be deplored. New schemes should be low density and pleasant healthy places to live, as in SS6 above.
		TC1b
42	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If adopted this option should seek to enhance the setting and conservation status of Radipole Lake SSSI. Development in this area could present risks to the SSSI in the form of pollution, run-off or over-shading. However if planned well a developed could perhaps ameliorate the current situation with hard-standing and car parks running right up to the SSSI
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported

271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
269*	RSPB South West Regional Office	<p>TC1a and TC1b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We note the ambition to extend the town centre westwards and northwards, including the possible development of surface level car parks and other under-utilised land. We note this includes Swannery car park, immediately adjacent to Radipole Lake nature reserve. As commented above, the implications of developing adjacent to Radipole Lake could be significant. If adopted this option should seek to enhance the setting and conservation status of the SSSI. See also our comments on TC4 below
216	RPS Group	Same as above – TC1a
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England has no objection to the option provided the interests of the adjacent Radipole Lake SSSI are fully protected. For example, any scheme would need to ensure litter and surface water runoff do not affect the lake and should aim to enhance the habitats along the lake (Swannery) margin.
		TC1c
216	RPS Group	Same as above
		TC2
216	RPS Group	Same as above
271	Dr Jon Orrell, NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		TC3a – TC3b
262	GOSW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TC 3 would seem like a key site for the town centre and ensuring that you phrase a positive implementation strategy for it needs to be included as part of the Core Strategy.
271*	NHS GP Locality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported

	Group	
212	Drivers Jonas	<p>TC3a and TC3b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting the development of Pavilion and Ferry Terminal site for a comprehensive mixed use redevelopment with flexibility in the policies whilst acknowledging the viability. TC3a is supported. However visitor/education centre and public car park should be excluded from TC3a as they impact most upon the viability of development. An appropriate level of car parking should still be provided to serve the development • An appropriately sized, re-serviced and remodeled theatre should be incorporated into the policy to allow the delivery of a theatre which provides flexibility for the development whilst meeting the needs of the local population. Development of a new build, smaller theatre on site or alternatively relocating the theatre to another site could also be considered
238	The Theatres Trust (TC3a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the element of this option for a refreshed (not necessarily remodeled) Pavilion Theatre. • Trust recommends the retention of this building to provide a venue for middle to large scale performing arts in the area • The benefits which this theatre brings to town as a focus for cultural activity will be achievable as it is the most suitable venue available – particularly one which will be playing its part in the Cultural Olympiad being host to 2012 Olympics and Paralympics • There are no other large venues within the Borough that would be able to accommodate live performance without considerable capital investment • Weymouth Pavilion is a prized part of Weymouth’s cultural heritage and appears to have much affection and local support and demolition of this building for an inferior replacement should not be an option. • The theatre should be refurbished and continue to entertain, educate and inform through a programme of events for young people, elderly, amateur theatre groups etc to provide an arts hub for this mixed use development site • Local Cultural Strategy 2001-2006 has a section on the development of Weymouth Pavilion that states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To continue to provide The Weymouth Pavilion as a service to the community of Weymouth and Portland and South Dorset in support of the Performing Arts; ○ To develop the full year round potential of the venue by new business planning and development and by developing the artistic programme and audiences; ○ To develop conferences, conventions and exhibitions. <p>Would look forward to being consulted on next stage and other LDF documents – DC policies, Planning Obligations and Town Centre Area Action Plans</p>
252	Environment Agency	<p>TC3a and TC3b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • with respect to Pavilion and Ferry Terminal site, following additional text is recommended to be included within the wording of Option TC3a and Option TC3b – “To assist the regeneration of the borough the pavilion and ferry terminal site is identified for a comprehensive mixed use development that, subject to the management of flood risk, may include

		housing, a new ferry terminal a new or remodeled community theatre, retail and leisure development, a transport interchange, a large public square, and improvements to the public realm and esplanade, plus a hotel, marina, visitor /education centre and public car parking.”
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England is supportive of the option provided the interests of the Radipole Lake SSSI are fully protected. For example, any scheme would need to ensure litter and surface water runoff do not affect the lake and should aim to enhance the habitats along the lake (Swannery) margin.
269*	RSPB South West Regional Office	<p>TC3a and TC3b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RSPB has been involved in discussions on the future of this site. The Borough will be aware of the environmental sensitivities associated with the development of this site
		TC4
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
269*	RSPB South West Regional Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We note the prospect of a “waterside loop project” seeking to improve and enhance the public realm. Such an initiative would present significant opportunities to enhance the setting of Radipole Lake, but would require careful implementation
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<p>Housing – Paragraph 4.4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I doubt very much whether the Options put forward in the Consultation Document will achieve 35% affordable housing across the Borough. If the LPA proceed with the objective of limiting greenfield development to 25%, it is most unlikely that the Council would improve much on the 18% affordable housing which is said to have been achieved since 1994/95 (Paragraph 4.6). The Options for affordable housing acknowledge that provision of affordable housing will be subject to Viability Assessment and my experience is that that will mean levels of 35% simply cannot be achieved on previously

		<p>developed sites</p> <p>Paragraph 4.7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment are disputed. I am of the opinion that many of the sites are not deliverable, within 15 years particularly when one takes into account new policies
268	Wessex Water (HO3, HO4, HO5)	<p>A general review of the areas of search has been carried out and a high level assessment prepared for each site based upon demand from 700 dwellings. This assessment does not form a definitive review of strategic options to serve development proposals. It is understood one of these options may be promoted through the Local Development Framework.</p> <p>When preferred options are agreed a detailed engineering appraisal can be carried out to develop a robust strategy to satisfy capacity planning for water and sewerage infrastructure.</p> <p>Summary details are outlined for each site below with indicative infrastructure costs based upon the high level assessment and a characteristic requirement for improvements to water supply and waste networks. Where estimated costs are shown these are likely to be funded by developers when the works are implemented.</p> <p>Sewage treatment capacity and improvements are considered with longer term design parameters and are funded directly by Wessex Water – No costs are provided for sewage treatment.</p>
251*	South West Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CS should be based on options that concentrate growth at the Weymouth SSCT and if urban extensions are considered to be necessary then should be at the latter end of the plan period and closely related to the Weymouth SSCT (based on RPB’s representations opposing the housing numbers for the Weymouth and Dorchester HMA that includes Weymouth and Portland BC) There are some areas where we would recommend further consideration is given. These are related to the status of Settlements (ie RPG10: SS6, SS7; RSS: Development Policies A, B and C, TC1). Whilst it is clear that Weymouth is the key focus of new development, the extent of Weymouth (as a SSCT) is not clear. The function of the other settlements in terms of the RSS policies is also not defined. We recognise that the general approach to the document has been to avoid jargon but it would be useful to have seen some analysis/discussion of these issues in the Spatial Strategy Issues Paper to justify the extent and roles of settlements in Weymouth and Portland. Being clearer in this instance will also help with development management and monitoring of the RSS. We would also comment that no reference appears to have been made to housing density, even in terms as a general principle in either the draft document or Issues Papers (RPG10: HO6;

		RSS H2)
		Housing – HO1
263b*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports • Essential in order to meet the Regional Spatial Strategy figure • Family housing provision would not be reduced, provided at least 25% of housing was on Greenfield sites and these sites are phased in through the plan period. • It would be inappropriate to allocate further very large housing developments on Portland.
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England is supportive of the policy provided that during the selection process full account is taken of both environmental and landscape constraints. Further development on Portland will also need to be supported by a detailed transport assessment to ensure there is sufficient capacity within the existing road network, or alternatively that road traffic enhancements options are available that do not threaten designated sites. Increased housing on Portland that may increase demands for road improvements that in turn would have an impact on SAC or SPA sites is likely to trigger a requirement for an appropriate assessment as set out by the Habitat Regulations.
217	Entec on behalf of The Crown Estate	<p>Do not agree that providing sustainable large housing options on Portland would be inconsistent with the RSS housing split for following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current 15 year supply based on heavy windfall allowance hence Council will need to allocate more sites to identify a supply of deliverable sites in the district from the date of adoption of plan. • PPS3 requires LPAs to identify deliverable sites for 5 years supply and developable sites for longer term and also currently non-developable sites and constraints affecting them – SHLAA para 5.23 – concerned that no assessment of deliverability has been undertaken, Council’s assessment of the supply is not robust and does not accord with CLG best practice provided SHLAA Practice Guidance • Greater degree of flexibility is required in site allocations to ensure successful delivery of Core Strategy and maintain a continuous supply of housing. Windfalls by their very nature are unplanned and cannot be brought forward to help supply • Council needs to provide a wider mix of dwellings in line with national and regional guidance, something which the current supply may fail to achieve • RSS policies HMA12 and HD1 allow LPAs the flexibility to respond and not treat housing figures as ceilings – should be

		acknowledged
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The objection to this policy is perhaps a technical one in that, if there is a period over which the Local Planning Authority fail to deliver 280 dwellings per annum, it may be necessary for the rolling 5 year supply of housing sites to be increased so that the target level of housing provision can be achieved over the Plan period. I consider therefore, there needs to be some re-wording of the policy. Whilst some housing on Portland may be appropriate to meet local demand, Portland generally is an unsustainable location, with poor access and poor retail provision. I do not consider there should be any strategic provision on Portland
240	Local History Research, Images and Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing services would not be able to support 300 houses in 10 years. Anything which would reduce the amount of family housing would be detrimental
252	EA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of detail within HO1 gives rise to concerns that evidence will not be available to support this policy. The initial findings of the Level 2 SFRA would indicate that a significant proportion of the urban area of Weymouth will be subject to an increasing flood risk and may therefore be unsuited to housing. It is recommended that an additional sentence be added to restrict development to areas which are outside the future high flood risk area.
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported. All fully supported as long as prices are deliberately taken under the control of the council planning to ensure a generous supply of affordable housing with full standards as in SS6. Vast tracts of agricultural land being barred for the right to roam by the populace with barbed wire and PRIVATE – NO ACCESS / DO NOT TRESPASS does not help improve the opportunities for exercise or for wellbeing through interaction with nature. Monoculture for profit also demeans the natural environment through toxic pesticides and cuts the numbers of native plants and birds further impacting on human enjoyment and health. If these sterile fields are returned to the common people as the former commonwealth that they once were then the reluctance to encroach on Greenfield sites would be overcome. The land if developed with green spaces , gardens, allotments and market gardens will be more ecologically diverse and support a far wider range of animal and plant species than insecticide soaked fields. It is possible for nature, the planet and people to thrive together. Some equalisation of income inequalities will be induced by this land redistribution from a few to the many. If the stated intention from the NHS to tackle health inequalities is genuine then this redistribution of wealth and land inequalities is the key. Societies that are more equal such as Japan and Scandinavia enjoy greater social cohesion and health than societies such as UK, USA and Australia where inequalities have widened and health has suffered.
		HO2a

263b*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports this site development over other options • Sustainable location for Greenfield development • Helps early development of affordable family housing and social housing • Could deliver community benefits- supports Littlemoor District Centre, provide allotments for Littlemoor, solve the Preston Brook flooding problem. • Least landscape impact (except Easton) • Phase 1 avoids development on IOGs and ALLIs • No SNCI or other wildlife designation • Directly on core frequent bus route, easy walking distance of a primary school • Phase 2 could join Wyke Oliver Hill to Lorton Country Park and prevent Littlemoor and Preston from coalescing.
156	Highways Agency	<p>Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency supports the emphasis within CS document upon concentrating new development on brownfield land within existing urban areas, and the principle of encouraging mixed use development that will reduce the need to travel and reliance on the private car <p>HO2a-HO2d</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In relation to Greenfield extension options, the Agency’s main concern is the peripheral nature of the majority of such sites which can correlate to their level of sustainability in transport terms. The preferred direction of growth would be towards brownfield sites. This reflects the Agency’s concern regarding the extent to which any Greenfield development might impact upon the SRN
42	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without seeing the exact boundary of the proposed allocation it is difficult to comment in detail. However DWT would suggest that any allocation must avoid restricting the wildlife corridor function of the open gap between Littlemoor and Preston – and in fact should be required to enhance the wildlife value of this area. The allocation should be required to facilitate the future development of a Lorton Valley Country Park (Option EN3) – as should any urban extension north of Littlemoor in West Dorset
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England objects to Option HO2a as the option would result in the loss of a strategic open gap, a key wildlife corridor connecting the Lorton Valley to the wider countryside and severely damage an important landscape feature. Wildlife corridors and stepping stone habitats are considered particularly important to Weymouth & Portland as the borough lies on a key bird migration route. The option would also compromise options EN2 and EN3. Furthermore, it seems unlikely that these environmental losses could be adequately mitigated, or effectively compensated.

262	GOSW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option HO2a (and others?) if you are contemplating to include land in flood zone 2 and 3 for ‘vulnerable uses’ you will need to ensure compliance with PPS 25 (including the emerging supplement to it¹)
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preston Downs is not a sustainable location. There is very little employment. It is remote from the town centre and even when the Dorchester Road Relief Road has been completed, there will be local congestion at the junction with Dorchester Road. The suggested advantage of the Littlemoor Centre is poor in that it only provides local facilities. Public transport is still a significant walk from this proposed allocation
209	WYG Planning and Design	<p>Reasons to support HO2a in comparison to other strategic locations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> area of Littlemoor - one of the most deprived wards in Dorset; key objective of planning being to create sustainable communities, development will support-sustain communities, creation of mix and balanced communities - one of government's key objectives could complement potential urban extension for housing and employment area has access to proposed Lodmoor country park and easy access to Relief Road, proposals for allotments in the area easy access to shops, proposed country park, easy access to the Relief Road support the scale of less than 700 houses at urban extension Littlemoor including significant employment, on the basis of paragraphs 22-23 of PPS7 that identifies the broad criteria of permitting development in the AONB.
257	Stone Firms LTd, Portland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put forward a number of sites adjacent to existing residential areas with good road frontage and the nature and scale will fit in well with existing settlements and not impinge on services and infrastructure. Sites put forward in SHLAA were non deliverable due to not fitting well with the built up area or are a part of the Important Open Gap.. scheme appeared now.. ??
211	Brimble Lea and Partners	<p>HO2a-HO2d</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Options HO2a-HO2d to identify strategic locations based on the assumption made within SHLAA 2008 of relying on housing growth being provided within existing built up area. This is not finalised yet and as a result of SFRA2 consequence, there is an objection from EA to incorporate growth within TC where it is subject to flood risk Ranking of sites in terms of sustainability within background paper – Transport Modelling of W&P Study by Buro Happold – misleading because the report considers the relationship of site to current services including public transport but does not attempt to assess it against other clearly identified aspirations for improving transport including the possibility of relocating railway station and creation of a P&R/bus hub within a short distance of the site. Similarly study does not recognize proposed improvement to existing bus services on A354 and proposed improvements to cycle ways beyond those that exist within the immediate vicinity

¹ <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/consultationfloodrisk>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strange that this option is proposed showing a large area outside the development boundary, with no relationship to the existing built up area, inside the Important Open Gap incorporating sports fields and employment area when our site was rejected and considered 'non deliverable' for reasons being not being in relation to existing built up areas...
258	Dorset County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If this option is pursued the only potential areas of development that would have the least landscape and visual impact would be in the far north west corner or the one in the south east – as the area forms a key part of a future Lorton Valley Country Park, is an important area of undeveloped open land and a buffer between the two areas of dense housing development to the west and east. Wyke Oliver Hill being another important prominent landscape key feature in the area.
259	Dorset AONB Landscape Planning Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development options HO2a, HO4 and HO5 lie within close proximity to the AONB (in particular the northern portions of options HO2a and HO5) – residual impact upon the designation and impact upon its setting
269	RSPB South West Regional Office	<p>HO2a</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current open gap between Littlemoor, Lodmoor and Preston is valuable for people and wildlife. We question whether the value of this open link could be maintained should the allocation be adopted
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported
		HO2b
263b*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly oppose development • Would adversely affect more existing residents than the other Option Areas. • Worst landscape impact • Would destroy an IOG and ALLI, the Town Green and rural footpaths • Would coalesce Westham and Lanehouse • Adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SNCI) • No community benefits, open space on upper slopes outweighs loss of town green • Not on north-south core public transport access • Weak vehicular access
42	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without seeing the exact boundary of the proposed allocation it is difficult to comment in detail. This site includes Little Francis Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI). The SNCI supports neutral grassland, scrub and hedgerows with 6 Dorset Notable neutral grassland plants present. The scrub also supports bird populations. Adjacent areas of grassland to the east of the SNCI have also been surveyed. Although not of SNCI quality, they do support locally valuable wildlife

		<p>features, including protected species, and form a valuable buffer to the SNCI. Some of the other fields in this site have been recorded as supporting similar habitat to the SNCI. DWT would advise that a full ecological survey should be carried out before allocating any of this land for development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dorset Wildlife Trust would object to any allocation which would adversely affect the SNCI or the green corridor function that this land provides to link central Weymouth to the Fleet hinterland. The SNCI, if not protected and enhanced along with a buffer area and wildlife corridor, would be extremely vulnerable to increases in indirect pressures such as recreational use, including nutrient enrichment and disturbance of fauna caused by dogs, predation by cats, arson, motorcycle scrambling and dumping of garden and domestic waste. Any allocation made must ensure these impacts are avoided
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England objects to Option HO2b as the option would result in the loss of an important open space that provides valuable “stepping stone” habitat for migratory species moving through the built up areas of Weymouth. Wildlife corridors and stepping stone habitats are considered particularly important to Weymouth & Portland as the borough lies on a key bird migration route. The policy would also result in the loss of one of the most significant areas of green open space remaining within the built up areas of Weymouth. Natural England supports the view set out in the disadvantages section that the SNCI and village green status would further constrain potential development. It is unlikely that the losses set out above could be adequately mitigated, or effectively compensated.
156	Highways Agency	<p>HO2b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Markham and Little Francis is understood to have achieved the highest ranking in transport accessibility terms of the four locations considered. This reflects the site’s location in closest proximity to Weymouth Town Centre and the provision of sustainable transport links. In contrast, the three remaining sites are distant from the centre, and the northern sites HO2a and HO2d in particular appear vulnerable to the development of a car dependent culture influenced by the provision of the Weymouth Relief Road which is now under construction. • Agency’s preference is for HO2b should Greenfield development be necessary. If new Greenfield development is considered necessary the Agency would wish to see appropriate new infrastructure and services provided alongside such developments. It would also wish to see a strong mixed use element to any urban extension so that the conditions for self containment are secured (both for the extension and the town) • Should any of the proposed sites be taken forward, the Agency would require them to be supported by a Transport Assessment produced in accordance with Circular 02/2007 and the “Guidance on Transport Assessment” (GTA) produced by DCLG. This should also include a detailed Travel Plan, which assesses the potential impact on the trunk road network and outlines a package of mitigation measures, which would minimize any potential impact.

264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is the most sustainable location for residential/mixed use development in or adjacent to the Borough. The land owner is prepared to commit to the 40% affordable housing which the Local Authority seek on greenfield sites. He is also prepared to consider the provision of low cost housing for local people. A Masterplan has been prepared which shows that it is possible to achieve a significant level of housing development with local services and employment, whilst retaining the most visible rising open land. The development need not impact upon the visual and wildlife corridor links nor the area which has been identified as being a Site of Nature Conservation Interest. As the Authority will know, the Respondents are still challenging the Village Green status of part of the site. If this site is development however, the land owners are prepared to include a significant element of open space and recreation area for the benefits of the residents and residents of the surrounding area. I would draw your attention to the copy of the Masterplan which was forwarded to the Local Planning Authority following consultation on the Issues and Options on 5 February 2009. Further copies can be provided
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported The comments apply least here where this area still has hedges, trees and is a green lung surrounded by dense housing. It would form a useful community land trust and allotments together with a green space and common. The property developer previously attracted scorn by ploughing up ancient grassland to destroy native rare wildflowers to prevent special scientific site designation. There would be some justice if the land were reclaimed at agricultural prices under compulsory purchase rather than permitting private profiteering at the expense of the public's wildlife enjoyment.
269	RSPB South West Regional Office	<p>HO2b and HO2c</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These potential allocations also present environmental challenges, as both areas have existing interest and are vulnerable to development pressures. They also provide important wildlife linkages and valuable open space Maintaining the sites' existing wildlife value and function would appear problematic should the allocations be adopted
		<p>HO2c</p>
263b*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes Relatively inaccessible for large scale development, may overload Portland and its main road Long way from Town Centre and rail station. Would join Easton to the Grove.

42	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Without seeing the exact boundary of the proposed allocation it is difficult to comment in detail. The photograph shown includes area of SSSI (including DWT's nature reserve at Kingbarrow Quarry) and areas of land with Site of Nature Conservation Interest recognition. Dorset Wildlife Trust would object should any allocation have an adverse impact on such sites
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England objects to the option as it is likely to lead to a significant increase in traffic to and from Weymouth that in turn has the potential to generate further demands for road improvement that may harm the Chesil and the Fleet SAC / SPA. The option therefore needs to be supported by a comprehensive transport assessment to ensure there is sufficient capacity within the existing road network, or alternatively demonstrate that road traffic enhancements options are available that do not threaten the European protected sites. Significant housing development that generates traffic volumes greater than the capacity of the current road link to Portland is likely to trigger a requirement for an appropriate assessment as set out by the Habitat Regulations. Additional housing within Independent Quarry would also significantly reduce the potential for restoration of species rich grassland and, given the condition to restore Independent to Nature Conservation purposes, would represent a significant biodiversity loss. This potential loss should be recognised by the option along with a requirement for appropriate levels of mitigation / compensation.
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst the site might be within walking and cycling distance of local facilities, the extent of employment in the area is limited and Portland is generally an unsustainable location, the only access to it being by road, which is often congested. It is not an appropriate location for a significant number of houses
217	Entec on behalf of The Crown Estate	<p>HO2c – supported; would make a significant contribution to ensuring land supply in sustainable way in line with PPS3 and PPS12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The allocation of option HO2c can assist in the delivery of a wider mix of housing including family homes, something which the current supply fails to achieve. The site can be phased to ensure the right mix of dwellings and balance to meet current and future demands is maintained over the plan period. The bulk of existing and past consents provides a limited mix of affordable housing and housing choice meaning that other sites should be considered that can meet these demands. The current identified supply which mostly comprises executive style apartments, cannot adequately meet the need identified in the Housing Market Area Assessment. Overall this site is of a sufficient size and scale to help provide for the development needs of Portland over the plan period in line with the RSS to achieve wider sustainability objectives Support the allocation but object to claim that large housing options would not be consistent with the RSS housing split

240	Local History Research, Images and Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part of this area is restored grassland which should be entirely preserved Portland has enough building development, all policies should be directed towards improving the existing stock, environment and economy
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		HO2d
42	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any allocation should protect and enhance the functioning of the River Wey corridor as a floodplain and wildlife corridor
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England supports the view the option is likely to lead to damage to a bio diverse area, important local gap and landscape feature. In particular, the option would impact on one of the few areas of mature woodland within the borough. The option site would also appear to be contrary to most of the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and should therefore only be considered if there were a lack of less damaging / constrained alternative sites.
211	Brimble Lea and Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site being on the periphery of existing development is at a distance from TC and has good access to public transport, cycling and walking and within reasonable walking distance of Upwey Railway Station Site has few if any disadvantages with respect to landscape impact and flood risk The site in part is within a relatively sustainable location and subject to proposed infrastructure improvements is likely to become one of the most sustainable locations for any form of strategic housing allocation Much of the site (particularly that on level ground immediately to the west of the Dorchester Road) is well related to existing development and would constitute a logical continuation of development that has already taken place in depth to the rear of the Dorchester Road immediately to the South Much of the site is visually contained and separated from Nottingham by landscaping (high hedges and copses) A reinforced green edge could be provided to the settlement in this location which would ensure the retention of an open gap between Weymouth and Nottingham, resulting in a significant landscape enhancement of the area and better containment of urban form than is currently the case. Much of the land is used for car boot sales and similar activities and the site as a whole cannot be considered to be Greenfield – already in use. Considering issues paper 5, site can be developed without causing adverse landscape impact. It is proposed that a detailed Site Specific Landscape be undertaken and detailed landscaping proposals be worked up to confirm that development can

		<p>be incorporated within the site and an improved green edge created to better contain development than is presently the case where there is a stark and hard edge between the rear of properties on the west side of Dorchester Road and fields beyond</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For surface water and foul drainage additional work be undertaken to identify the most appropriate and sustainable drainage methods. • Site has potential for 350-400 homes during the plan period • The negatives in the Sustainability Appraisal can be dealt with w.r. to biodiversity, flooding and landscape impact through appropriate mitigation/compensation measures whilst noting from a positive standpoint that the site is close to good public transport links
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The identification of this area of very open land, to the west of Dorchester Road, is somewhat surprising. The access to the town centre is poor, except by road and the slope from the valley floor up to Dorchester Road is not ideal for access to buses by people who may be in some way infirm. There is no employment close by. There is no shopping close by, although it is acknowledged that there is a good school and recreation ground on the opposite side of Dorchester Road
263b*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes • Not as good as the Preston Downs location. • Adverse impact on IOG and ALLI • No community benefits • No public open space • No support for economic regeneration • Weak access onto Dorchester Road • On the core public transport axis • Close to schools and recreation centre • Walking distance of employment at Mount Pleasant
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported • As HO3
		HO3 – Littlemoor
263a*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes

	of Harry J Palmer Holdings Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot justify development in the AONB when there are other options
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The option lies within the Dorset AONB a designation of national importance with the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The current wording of the option gives no weight to the importance of the AONB designation. Nature England therefore objects to the option. In our view the option would only be viable if it could be demonstrated that the scheme would enhance the interface between the AONB and surrounding Littlemoor development, leading to an overall landscape improvement that could not be otherwise achieved. Natural England also objects to any further constriction of the Wyke Oliver Gap (to the east of the allocation), which has been identified as a potentially important wildlife corridor into the Lorton Valley. However, provided we could be fully satisfied that the scheme and wording of the option would fully safeguard these interests and, critically, achieve the high level of landscape enhancement required, then Natural England would remove its objection to the allocation.
209	WYG Planning and Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> preferred location for urban extension Littlemoor less constrained in terms of flooding, nature conservation, biodiversity, flood risk and historic heritage Littlemoor within AONB, while Chickerell in AONB and Heritage Coast Proposed mix of employment land, housing and enhancement of community facilities in Littlemoor is supported – could bring about 500-1000 houses <p>Impacts of development on the Greenfield location less in terms of Littlemoor</p>
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to HO3 which includes land north of Littlemoor Road, despite this land being within the Dorset AONB, contrary to regional and national planning policy. Halcrow Study is particularly flawed as it has considered options for growth to the east of A354 which are not located in the Area of Search in the emerging RSS for the South West as illustrated on the key diagram inset 12 Weymouth and Dorchester Housing Market Area. AoS at Littlemoor is in significantly visual position and will impact on the wider landscape of Littlemoor area, the land will be severed from the existing urban area by the Weymouth Relief Road
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is an unsustainable greenfield location, remote from employment, the town centre and public transport. Furthermore, there is no obvious limit to the northern extension of that site. Unlike any of the other sites referred to, this one is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
259	Dorset AONB Landscape Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HO3 lies within AONB Development options HO2a, HO4 and HO5 lie within close proximity to the AONB (in particular the northern portions of

	Officer	<p>options HO2a and HO5) – residual impact upon the designation and impact upon its setting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On consideration of the options, higher regard should be given for the protection of AONB and its setting – any development affecting the AONB should be proven to conserve and enhance the designation
268	Wessex Water (HO3, HO4, HO5)	<p>Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site can be connected to local trunk main system in Littlemoor Road, with spine main to serve local distribution mains. Peak demand from the completed development site will require off site network reinforcement to provide satisfactory capacity. Network modelling required to confirm the scope of capacity improvements. Estimated cost of these improvements is likely to be within a range of £0.5 - 1 million. <p>Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On site sewers provided by developers with separate systems of drainage Off site surface water disposal to local land drainage systems with attenuated discharge to satisfy PPS25 Off site connecting sewer to agreed point of connection, where capacity is available to accept future foul flows. Engineering appraisal needed with network modelling to confirm scope of works. Estimated costs approx £500k Incremental phasing of the development from the downstream catchment will provide the most sustainable solution for sewerage infrastructure The developer will be able to requisition off site sewers from Wessex Water <p>STW</p> <p><i>Existing catchment drains to Weymouth STW – There are plans to improve process capacity at the works by upgrading aeration plant during the next 5 years. However the works were completed circa 1999 and sufficient capacity is available to accommodate development proposals to the plan period 2026</i></p>
215*	Terence O'Rourke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principally the Littlemoor site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is situated within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, in a Strategic Open Gap and is visible from the South West Coastal Path. Littlemoor is a relatively small settlement, development of which is likely to lead to high levels of out commuting

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requires significant infrastructure investment in the Littlemoor Railway Bridge to enable development to occur ○ Has a significant potential to yield finds of local/national archaeological importance ○ Is understood to fall under fractured land ownership, with a Compulsory Purchase Order applicable to land associated with Weymouth Relief Road, bringing into question the availability of this land for development ● Given doubts over the availability and suitability of developing land within the Littlemoor area it cannot be considered deliverable, in accordance with definitions established by Planning Policy Statement 3: <i>Housing</i>. It would therefore represent an unjustified, ineffective approach, which is not in accordance with national guidance and would be viewed as an unsound approach, as dictated by Planning Policy Statement 12: <i>Local Spatial Planning</i>.
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Supported ● These comments above apply particularly to the prairie fields to the north of Littlemoor. The hedgerows have been destroyed and barbed wire is the only demarcation between fields. Employment is needed in this part of town as it is some distance from the Granby industrial sites and the town centre. In many ways Littlemoor was a council sink estate and was remote from services and opportunities. New development, particularly with light industry would be appropriate. This would be near the road and more importantly the new cycle lanes and railway, both of which will become more important.
		HO4 - Southill
263a*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of Harry J Palmer Holdings Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Opposes ● Would need significant investment in infrastructure, may delay building ● Not significantly sustainable location ● Further from town centre, schools, jobs ● Poor bus service ● Higher adverse landscape impact, particularly northern part ● Electricity transformer station may reduce the area of the site available for housing ● Some current uses would require relocating, may cause delays ● High level of impact on existing residents in Southill
214	Pegasus Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Object to HO4 as it utilizes the majority of land in the area and would also mean the relocation of current recreation uses which includes the Wessex Stadium and a golf course. A smaller development would be possible so that existing uses

	Group	could be retained. The north of the option is particularly elevated and difficult to access and would require significant investment in infrastructure
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England objects to the option as presented as it would result in the further constriction of a wildlife corridor identified in the supporting Environmental Issues Paper. In order to maintain an adequate east west and north south corridor the land to the west of the stadium and south of the transformer station should be excluded from the developed area. However, provided this was achievable and scheme also provided substantial green infrastructure that included a north south green link, as well as ensuring adequate protection of the adjacent watercourse feeding the Radipole Lake SSSI, then Natural England would remove its objection to the allocation.
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is again an unsustainable location, remote from the town centre and, as the Local Authority acknowledge, would require substantial infrastructure investment
259	Dorset AONB Landscape Planning Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HO4 does not lie within the AONB boundary however it is in relatively close proximity. The area is not in any significant visual impact upon the AONB due to the screening effect of the ridgeline that runs between the development area and the designation; however regard should be given for the potential impact upon the designation in terms of increased pressure for recreation.
268	Wessex Water (HO3, HO4, HO5)	<p>Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site can be served from the existing trunk main on the western edge of the development area at Putton Lane – School Hill Spine main to serve local distribution mains subject to site layout <p>Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On site sewers provided by developers with separate systems of drainage Off site surface water disposal to local land drainage systems with attenuated discharge to satisfy PPS25 Limited capacity in existing foul water networks for a development of this scale Off site link sewer and downstream improvements subject to engineering appraisal and potential constraints from assets located within SSSI. Estimated range of costs £750k - £1million Incremental phasing of these developments from the downstream catchment will provide the most sustainable solution for sewerage infrastructure <p>STP</p>

		There are plans to improve process capacity at the works by upgrading aeration plant during the next 5 years. However the works were completed circa 1999 and sufficient capacity is available to accommodate development proposals to the plan period 2026
215*	Terence O'Rourke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fundamentally the submission demonstrates that an urban extension is <i>deliverable</i> on land within the Southill area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site is not effected by significant national landscape designations ○ The site is accessible to schools, medical facilities, local centres, employment and Weymouth town centre ○ There is scope to achieve a sustainable development ○ The land can easily accommodate a high quality urban extension, given the requirement to build at an efficient density, whilst maintaining a respect for the natural environment ○ Substantial infrastructure, which is capable of accommodating an urban extension, exists within close proximity. ○ Development of an urban extension will increase the viability of existing sustainable transport connections and thereby assist in reducing private vehicle use ○ There is sufficient land at Southill to create <i>flexibility</i> in the configuration of development to be produced, in relation to the scale and layout of housing, employment and open space. ○ Archaeology does not represent a constraint to development ○ Ecology is not considered likely to inhibit development ○ The site is being promoted by a collection of land owners and is considered to be <i>deliverable</i> • Allocating an urban extension on land within the Southill area would represent a sound approach to development, which is justified, effective and therefore in accordance with national policy, and thus the requirements of Policy Statement 12: <i>Local Spatial Planning</i>.
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported
		HO5 – Chickerell
263a*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of Harry J Palmer Holdings Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports • Suggests that this includes the land south of Green Lane (rejected by SHLAA because it is allocated for public open space/recreation and is part of a green wedge. However recent planning applications have altered this.) • Sustainable location • Good bus link • Walking distance of jobs at the Granby Industrial Estate • Close to Budmouth College and Chickerell Primary School

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to existing amenities in Chickerell • Close to Weymouth town centre • Low level of impact on existing residents • Delivery would not be delayed by significant investment and infrastructure. • Make better use of the existing Chickerell Link Road
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England objects to the option as presented as it would result in the further constriction of a wildlife corridor identified in the supporting Environmental Issues Paper. In order to maintain an adequate north south corridor the most western field should be excluded from the developed area. • Natural England is also concerned that the proposed extension to the north of Chickerell is in close proximity to the Dorset AONB, a designation of national importance with the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. It will therefore also be critical to ensure that the northern boundary of the development does not adversely impact on views to and from the adjacent AONB • Provided we are satisfied that these issues can be adequately addressed then Natural England would remove its objection to the option.
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the least sustainable location for development, being remote from the town centre, with relatively poor public transport and a potential impact upon the distinctiveness of Chickerell <p>Options Appraisal</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First of all, I consider that there may be a significant error in the Table which is relevant to all sites. I note that the existence of an employment use seems to be shown by the various crosses and ticks as a positive attribute. Surely the reverse is the case since the objective is to maintain the economy of the area. It seems to me that each cross should be a tick and each tick should be a cross 2. This Table by and large has only yes/no options. There are only three instances where I see both a tick and a cross in the same box and in all three cases these relate to minimising flood risk where, I suspect, that part of the site is subject to a possible flood risk. In all other cases however, the Appraisal shows either a tick or a cross which is misleading, particularly in the case of my client's land at Markham and Little Francis. Crosses have been put in all of the boxes relating to slopes, land stability, land of Nature Conservation Importance, land of Amenity Importance and land of Landscape Importance. In

		<p>fact, whilst we acknowledge that some of the site could be regarded as having these constraints, a large part of the site can still be developed, whilst retaining the important features. I find it surprising that the land to the west of Dorchester Road is not considered to be land of Landscape Importance, bearing in mind its openness and views across the valley.</p> <p>3. In the final box in this Appraisal Chart, it suggests that there is no scope for district heating and/or combined heat and power on land at Markham and Little Francis. I cannot agree. Not only is there scope for a possible district heating scheme or combined heat and power plant, there is also scope for generating heat and power from renewable resources</p> <p>4. It also seems to me that this Assessment fails to take into account the proximity to the town centre and places of employment which, I would have thought, would have been two of the key development criteria in a strategic approach. I would challenge the Sustainability Appraisal and soundness of any Core Strategy on this basis</p>
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support option HO5 - land to the east and to the south east of the settlement as indicated in Weymouth Options for Growth document. AoS should have included areas to the east and south east. Urban extension in this location would provide for a mixed use development. Housing would be provided to meet the development needs of Weymouth urban area together with employment land that would be well related to existing opportunities
259	Dorset AONB Landscape Planning Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HO5 does not lie within AONB boundary but lies in close proximity to the designation and regard should be given for the impact of development upon the designation in terms of increased pressure for recreation
268	Wessex Water (HO3, HO4, HO5)	<p>Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This option can be served from the existing trunk main located on the eastern boundary. No network reinforcement will be required The existing trunk main will require a dedicated easement or diversion to alternative location subject to site layout <p>Waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On site sewers provided by developers with separate systems of drainage Off site surface water disposal to local land drainage systems with attenuated discharge to satisfy PPS25 Limited capacity in existing foul water networks for a development of this scale. Off site link sewer and downstream improvements subject to engineering appraisal and potential constraints from assets located within SSSI. Estimated range of costs £750k - £1million <p>STP</p>

		There are plans to improve process capacity at the works by upgrading aeration plant during the next 5 years. However the works were completed circa 1999 and sufficient capacity is available to accommodate development proposals to the plan period 2026
215*	Terence O'Rourke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Principally the Chickerell site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is closer to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty than the Southill site. ○ The site is within a green gap ○ Does not have the infrastructure to cope with significant additional highway movements ○ Is not understood to have agreement between landowners to promote development, calling into question the availability and deliverability of the site ○ The gap between Weymouth and Chickerell is also such that it is likely to encourage vehicle trips to any housing allocation, being further away from ○ Weymouth town centre than land within the other areas of search. ○ There is a pipeline to the north east of the site ● Given doubts over the availability and suitability of the land within Chickerell allocating an urban extension within this area would be contrary to the requirements of Planning Policy Statement 12: <i>Local Spatial Planning</i>, which stipulates that decisions must be <i>justified, effective and consistent with national policy</i>.
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Still existing hedgerows and small fields
269	RSPB South West Regional Office	<p>HO3, HO4 and HO5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All three options raise significant environmental issues. These include potential direct and indirect impacts on wildlife habitats. Of particular concern to the RSPB is the prospect of indirect impacts, especially in relation to 'downstream' impacts on water quality and water level management ● We understand that the Littlemoor site may be hydrodynamically linked to the Lodmoor nature reserve, a designated SSSI important for its wetland habitats and species. Similar links may exist between Southill/Chickerell and Radipole Lake SSSI ● We are currently unclear as to whether there may also be hydrodynamic links between Southill/Chickerell and the internationally important Chesil Beach and the Fleet nature reserve, which is designated a Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation, Ramsar site and SSSI. As you will be aware, strict measures apply to developments potentially affecting such sites, and it is possible if linkages exist that an 'appropriate assessment' under the Habitats Regulations would be required ● The central issues stemming from these potential linkages are those of water quality (pollution passing downstream to sensitive 'receptors') and implications of increased run off volumes (affecting the ability to manage water levels on wetlands and causing environmental damage and flooding). These aspects will require investigation

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Without prejudice to the above, if confirmed the extension(s) also potentially provide significant opportunities for sustainable development. This might include biodiversity enhancement and open space, climate change adaptation/mitigation measures and other positive measures to reduce the impact of the development on the local and wider environment. These should be vigorously pursued and secured should the extension(s) be confirmed
		HO6
212	Drivers Jonas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In support of HO6 which identifies the Pavilion as an area which has potential for redevelopment for housing subject to the mitigation of flood risk
156	Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agency strongly supports the proposal to encourage the redevelopment of parts of Weymouth town centre for housing, as part of mixed-use schemes
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to HO6 as there are inadequate opportunities to accommodate development needs in the town – already been discussed at the Regional Examination in Public and hence the need to make provision for an urban extension to Weymouth
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		HO7a
263b*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the scheme: 10+ units to be 10% lifetime homes Opposes: one or more residential units to be lifetime homes. Too onerous for small developments, which could increase density and design and build costs. Therefore less homes built, reducing the significant contribution made by small windfall sites.
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policies like this are a nonsense. Either all homes should comply with the standard or none unless there is going to be some restriction on occupancy. Nobody knows when they are going to need a wheelchair, they certainly will not know

	Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	that when they actually buy a house. So what is the point of having one in ten houses built to wheelchair accessibility standards and not the other nine?
239	Tetlow King Planning on behalf of South West RSL Planning Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully support the aim for all residential units to comply with Lifetime Homes standards as this will ensure greater accessibility in new developments. However final policy wording must allow some flexibility as it is not possible to meet the LH standards on each dwelling. Support the provision of 10% or residences to meet the standards on ten or more unit schemes
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported More care in the community with closure of long stay NHS beds so wheelchair access is very sensible
		HO7b
263b*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes The 20% level for lifetime homes with wheelchair access is not viable on most Weymouth sites, which are mainly brownfield, and therefore have issues with levels etc. This would become costly and prohibitive in practicality. In their experience as developers, they do not feel that there are more than 10% of residents requiring lifetime homes with wheelchair access. As part of building regulations Approved Document part M, most homes do not require a more stringent policy target as they already have a good degree of wheelchair access.
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to HO7b which requires a higher proportion of homes to meet Lifetime Homes requirements. It should be noted that there are some issues in providing lifetime homes that contradict design objectives, for example vehicles dominating the street scene which affects the efficient use of land and influences the development layout
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> same as HO7a

266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Totally supported
		HO7a and b
261*	The Planning Bureau Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objection to the policy option (However it is considered naïve to think that on its own it will adequately address the future housing needs of older persons within the Borough) Suggests a further policy option be included, supporting the delivery of specialised accommodation for older people. Promoting specialised accommodation specifically would be more effective in addressing the Borough’s increasing older persons housing needs than a small percentage of new homes without age controls. Suggests that more Lifetime Homes be 1 and 2 bedroom accommodation, as most older person households comprise of one or two people. Less 3+ bedroom Lifetime Homes would assist the issue of under occupation.
		HO8a
263b*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports: that residential developments of 10+ units meet sustainable homes level 3 (with the provision that this level is to be increased to satisfy government targets if agreed) Opposes: that residential developments less than 10 units meet sustainable homes level 3. The additional costs would make smaller sites unviable, reducing housing numbers (Once the technologies and materials have been tried and tested on larger developments, costs may become more sustainable for smaller developments) Opposes: The levels of affordable housing, and that AH will be sought on all developments
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not understand why the Authority is mixing up the code for sustainable homes with an affordable housing policy other than the fact that a higher standard of sustainability is going to make homes less affordable It is a nonsense to require developments within the urban area to provide 40% affordable housing on all developments. IT IS NOT GOING TO HAPPEN. All you are doing, is making it necessary for the developer to jump through another hoop by providing you with a Viability Assessment, another cost that they can well do without. If you seriously want affordable housing to be delivered, this is not the way to go about it. You are not going to get 40% affordable housing on sites of three or more units. There are going to be very few cases where development of a small number of dwellings would

		justify a financial contribution equating to 40%. Contrary to what is suggested below the Option, this will not deliver a much stronger affordable housing contribution. It will have the reverse effect. If you want a stronger contribution of affordable housing then you will need to allocate more greenfield sites
215*	Terence O'Rourke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirement to deliver development to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 standards, in advance of the timetables established in national targets, is opposed. Such a requirement has the potential to impede the viability of schemes at a time when the draft South West Regional Spatial Strategy and Planning Policy Statement 3: <i>Housing</i>, focus on delivering housing against the context of a growing affordability crisis.
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported All efforts to make more affordable homes would be most welcome to improve the health of the poorest sectors of our society. Level 4 sustainability would make the homes cheaper to heat for those on low incomes and 50% affordable would be preferable. This could be self build to ensure cost containment.
212	Drivers Jonas	<p>HO8a and HO8b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30% of housing should be affordable, subject to assessment of the viability of development. Percentage of affordable housing sought should be fully supported by a valid and robust evidence base To ensure that residential development is delivered, the Council should encourage developments to meet the maximum level of Code for Sustainable homes with regard to the viability of development. A set level should not be specified within planning policy
42	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>HO8a and HO8b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These options suggest that a 'trade-off' between sustainability (whether Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 or 4 is required) and level of affordable housing required. In our view this is not very helpful and the two issues should be assessed separately. Fuel poverty targets suggest that sustainable homes (with resultant lower energy and water costs) should be encouraged for affordability reasons. As these technologies become widely adopted as the 'norm', the costs to developers will reduce so it is not fair to assume that building in sustainability features will add significantly to costs throughout the lifespan of the Core Strategy
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support HO8a. Affordable housing has be to Code Level 3 and is dependent on grant funding
239	Tetlow King Planning on behalf of South West RSL Planning	<p>HO8a and HO8b – option HO8a is preferred as this not only provides a higher level of affordable housing, it also accords with the emerging RSS which sets a target of 35% for affordable housing across the region. HO8b would not accord with RSS. If there is a concern about the impact of this on viability on smaller sites, then raising the threshold for the affordable housing requirement is</p>

	Consortium	<p>suggested. Council should also build in policy flexibility to consider the economic viability of the affordable housing requirement on a site-by-site basis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any suggestions for affordable housing requirement and thresholds should be properly tested against viability, in line with advice in PPS3, para 29, and against up to date SHMA in order to best assess the level of need and viability of imposing either of the two figures proposed for both Weymouth and Portland Adopting unviable target figures may adversely affect overall delivery of both market and affordable housing and should be avoided
252	Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pleased to note options HO8a and HO8b – all residential development meeting code level 3 or 5. Whilst there is no difference between level 3 or 4 with regards to water efficiency level (105 litres per person per day), when looking at the overall issue of minimizing climate change it is recommended to aspire as high as possible.
261*	The Planning Bureau Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a higher standard of Code for Sustainable Homes is provided, it will impact the economic viability of residential development, and therefore will only deliver a lower level of affordable housing. Implementing Lifetime Homes and Building for Life standards on residential development proposals could have the same effect. The Council should also consider providing guidance to developers as to what the policy preference is (which is most important)
		HO8b
263b*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes increasing sustainable homes to level 4 Does not support setting targets that will inhibit future small/medium residential developments
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England supports the highest level of sustainable homes possible. It should also be pointed out that affordable homes need to be affordable to live in as well as affordable to construct. Having a lower sustainable homes level for new affordable homes is likely to saddle future occupiers with greater fuel costs than might otherwise be the case.
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
214	Pegasus Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> objection to HO8b

	Group	
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the same reason as the Objection to Option HO8a. Increasing the code for sustainable homes to Level 4 will simply add to the costs of development, making houses more expensive and less affordable. All of these policies with regard to a code for sustainable homes should be dealt with under the Building Regulations, not as planning policies
240	Local History Research, Images and Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The balance suggested seems more rational and available than HO8a
215*	Terence O'Rourke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirement to deliver development to Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 standards, in advance of timetables established in national targets, is opposed. Such a requirement has the potential to impede the viability of schemes, at time when the draft South West Regional Spatial Strategy and Planning Policy Statement 3: <i>Housing</i>, focus on delivering housing, against the context of a growing affordability crisis.
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported Better standards
		HO9
263b*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports 'Building for Life' Supports that this should only apply to developments of 9+ units, where it warrants increased design input.
239	Tetlow King Planning on behalf of South West RSL Planning Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of Building for Life criteria should be adopted as part of a parcel of criteria for planning applications to be assessed against including Lifetime Home and Code for Sustainable Homes standards. Such criteria should be interlinked to provide one straightforward policy if all are taken forward and should help contribute to an overall level of high quality design and mixed, sustainable communities
240	Local History Research, Images	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This should apply to every development from a single dwelling upwards; the requirement should also be for adequate privacy and personal living space

	and Publications	
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
252	EA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriate rewording of Option HO9 (draft version) to Option HO10 (June version, page 53) with the deletion – ‘Flats, hostels, housing in multiple occupation, sheltered housing and residential homes will need to meet the following criteria: The development does not result in additional dwelling in areas that will be at an increasing risk of flooding during the developments life unless measures are implemented via a flood risk management strategy to mitigate the risk.’
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported Too many homes constructed of late have been built of materials designed for rapid building rather than long term energy efficiency and living. Any moves to improve building standards and make them more sustainable are to be welcomed. In Germany many homes have the entire south facing roof as solar panels and insulation standards are high.
		HO10
263b*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports
212	Drivers Jonas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the recognition that open space is sometimes inappropriate for urban design reasons – 20% allocation for new build unless it is inappropriate
239	Tetlow King Planning on behalf of South West RSL Planning Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly recommend inserting distinct policy to cover the full range of housing and care options for elderly, encouraging development of these within locations suitable to each, being appropriate to the individual needs of each proposal. Full range of housing and care may also include providing support for independent living within existing homes, extra care housing and continuing care retirement communities
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported

252	EA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriate rewording of Option HO9 (draft version) to Option HO10 (June version, page 53) with the deletion – <i>‘Flats, hostels, housing in multiple occupation, sheltered housing and residential homes will need to meet the following criteria: The development does not result in additional dwelling in areas that will be at an increasing risk of flooding during the developments life unless measures are implemented via a flood risk management strategy to mitigate the risk.’</i> Option HO10 – do not agree that the wording of this policy achieves the suggested compliance ‘accords with this objective as does not allow development that would be in an area that would be at an increased risk of flooding unless mitigation measures are included.’ with sustainability appraisal objective 10 ‘Reduce vulnerability to flooding and, sea level rise (taking account of climate change).’
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As the Notes acknowledge, this will result in additional build cost, not necessarily a small cost. It militates against the provision of low cost homes for local people. There will be a particular disadvantage to young people setting up homes in Weymouth
261*	The Planning Bureau Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly object. In response to amenity space provision with sheltered accommodation (no evidence/justification for 20% level of amenity space. Suggests that it is the quality and not the quantity of amenity space that is important to residents in sheltered housing developments. Imposing an arbitrary requirement for amenity space could use result in the loss of land that could otherwise be used for additional housing.
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported Flats have been crammed into brownfield sites in Weymouth in recent years, often replacing interesting architectural features with bland boxes extending to the very limit of the available plot and obliterating all green spaces, large trees and gardens. Any new development should not repeat these mistakes that enrich developers and impoverish
		HO11
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported

271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported This change in planning is long overdue. Many extensions in the Carlton Road area have been little short of vandalism on a grand scale.
		Employment – EC1
262	GOSW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option EC1 would appear to be in conflict with the emerging RSS in terms of the spatial strategy
240	Local History Research, Images and Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any policy for Southwell Business Park should not be too rigid. Some businesses have recently moved out so use of the site should be as flexible as possible, industrial or leisure
185	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Bourne Leisure	<p>Paragraph 5.1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bourne Leisure strongly supports the statement and considers that reference should also be made to paragraphs 2.11 and 3.8 of Issues Paper 12, Employment which notes that the Borough is seeking to take advantage of changing markets and tourism patterns and is promoting special interest and off peak tourism. Reference should also be made at paragraph 5.1 to the need to provide a range of high quality accommodation, including self-catering accommodation at holiday parks, which will help improve standards and extend the season There should be a new general option on tourism, which encourages the enhancement of Weymouth as a 21st century resort and specifically supports proposals which encourage and improve the quality of tourist facilities and accommodation. This would reflect CLG Good Practice Guide on Tourism (May 2006) which recognizes the importance of tourism to the economic, social and environmental well-being of an area. It would also accord with Policy TO2 of the draft RSS 2008.
156	Highways Agency	<p>Employment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important to note that different employment sectors will produce distinct travel patterns. Any significant development proposals should be accompanied by a detailed transport assessment and a travel plan Agency welcomes proposals to incorporate employment uses into the proposed urban extensions within the area. It is entirely appropriate that employment growth should be provided alongside housing growth as part of mixed use developments so as to promote self contained communities and reduce the overall level of commuting. Aspirations of CS in this respect are therefore supported. However Agency does not wish to make more specific comments in relation to the location of future employment sites until detailed information is submitted that outlines any potential impact upon the SRN
271	NHS GP Locality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not supported

	Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some employment needed in North Wemouth and Littlemoor areas
		EC2
263b	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes loss of employment land and loss of jobs, RSS suggests that Weymouth needs more jobs to stop out-commuting. Option would conflict with SS1
221	SWRDA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Converting some employment sites for non-employment uses should be resisted, unless in exceptional circumstances A key challenge for Weymouth and Portland in achieving its full economic potential is the provision of an adequate supply of appropriate sites and premises for employment uses, as highlighted in the RES Spatial Annex. Welcome the reference in the Core Strategy to the findings of the sub-regional Workspace Strategy for Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole which was produced for the South West RDA and Dorset authorities in 2008. This identifies a shortfall of employment space in the borough in the short term and a tight supply in the medium to long term. This evidence would suggest that permitting the redevelopment of some employment land for non-employment uses should be resisted, unless in exceptional circumstances.
256	Indigo Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is clear that nature of some existing employment sites has changed over the year and become constrained by neighbouring uses or not adaptable to modern employment requirements. Given this some flexibility does need to be applied when assessing individual sites in terms of accommodating future employment growth. Allocation of larger strategic sites together with the allocation of new employment land as part of a mixed use urban extension is supported.
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not supported Weymouth needs more local employment. 3500 cars leave the town to jobs elsewhere daily. Job losses would mean lower income for the town and more travel with deaths on the roads.
		EC3
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to this option – contrary to regional and national policy due to AONB location.
155	John Stobart Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The option lies within the Dorset AONB a designation of national importance with the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The current wording gives no weight to the importance of the AONB designation

		<p>and therefore Nature England must object to the option. In our view the option would only be viable if it could be demonstrated that the scheme would enhance the interface between the AONB and surrounding Littlemoor development, leading to an overall landscape improvement that could not be otherwise achieved. Natural England also objects to any further constriction of the Wyke Oliver Gap (to the east of the allocation), which has been identified as a potentially important wildlife corridor into the Lorton Valley. Given that business development is likely to be a larger scale than housing it seems less likely that a significant employment allocation in this location could achieve the necessary level of landscape enhancement. However, provided we could be fully satisfied that the scheme and wording of the option would fully safeguard these interests and, critically, achieve the high level of landscape enhancement required, then Natural England would remove its objection to the allocation.</p>
215	Terence O'Rourke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with the constraints applicable to the development site, particularly in relation to landscape, deliverability, transport and archeology, it would constitute an unsound and fundamentally inappropriate approach to locate employment land within this area.
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported • This is the perfect place for job opportunities
		EC4
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to Option EC4 to locate new employment at Southill – this option could accommodate additional employment growth, but it would not be well related to Chickerell
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England objects to the option as presented as it would result in the further constriction of a wildlife corridor identified in the supporting Environmental Issues Paper. In order to maintain an adequate east west and north south corridor the land to the west of the stadium and south of the transformer station should be excluded from the developed area. However, provided this was achievable and scheme also provided substantial green infrastructure that included a north south green link, as well as ensuring adequate protection of the adjacent watercourse feeding the Radipole Lake SSSI, then Natural England would remove its objection to the allocation.
215	Terence O'Rourke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitted West Dorset District Council Options for Growth consultation response (as attached) illustrates that it is suitable to develop the Southill site for a mixed use urban extension. • Given the size of the land being promoted for development within this area (currently up to 32 hectares) several

		<p>configurations, incorporating varying degrees of employment land are possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation is welcomed with the Council as to the level of employment land considered appropriate to this location. • Creation of new employment on a site which is extremely close and well connected to Weymouth town centre will help to reduce out commuting from the town, which is identified as a problem within Weymouth and Portland Borough Council Issue Paper 11: Transport.
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported • Quite close to the Granby estate. This may be helpful for interaction with existing businesses. However Littlemoor probably needs the jobs first
		EC5
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England objects to the option as presented as it would result in the further constriction of a wildlife corridor identified in the supporting Environmental Issues Paper. In order to maintain an adequate north south corridor the most western field should be excluded from the developed area. • Natural England is also concerned that the proposed extension to the north of Chickerell is in close proximity to the Dorset AONB, a designation of national importance with the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. It will therefore also be critical to ensure that the northern boundary of the development does not adversely impact on views to and from the adjacent AONB • Provided we are satisfied that these issues can be adequately addressed then Natural England would remove its objection to the option.
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support – as part of mixed urban extension to land at Chickerell making any future growth more sustainable and increasing the opportunities for self containment
156	Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency strongly supports the prioritization of office, retail and commercial employment in Weymouth town centre, as this represents the most sustainable and accessible location. Any major new developments within the town centre should be located within close proximity to public transport, pedestrian and cycle links in order to provide the opportunity to use alternative modes of transport to the private car • As far as new retail development is concerned, the Agency acknowledges the need for providing appropriate facilities in

		district and local centres as well as in the town centre in order to support local needs and promote the self containment of communities. However any proposals for out of town retail development that would be reliant on the private car should be resisted
215	Terence O'Rourke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In accordance with the constraints applicable to the development site, particularly in relation to deliverability and transport, it would constitute an unsound and fundamentally inappropriate approach to locate employment land within this area.
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		EC6
262	GOSW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option EC6: this is a principle in PPS6 (emerging PPS4) and therefore need to ensure compliance with this.
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not supported It would be helpful if many of the public sector jobs in Dorchester could be transferred to Weymouth so residents would not have to travel daily. A unitary authority for Weymouth like Poole would help.
		EC7
155	Natural England	Natural England supports the option.
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
185	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Bourne Leisure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bourne Leisure supports EC7 but considers that the supporting text should recognize and refer to the importance of ensuring that such sites are continually enhanced to ensure that they maintain their contribution to raising the Borough's tourism profile and making Weymouth at 21st century destination The Company emphasizes that without continual investment and change, tourist/leisure sites will stagnate

215	Terence O'Rourke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.41 To facilitate any move it is requested that flexibility be built in to the Council's Core Strategy to support provision of a new home for, and therein the financial survival of, Weymouth Football Club. Consequently the following policy is suggested to be included within the Core Strategy: <i>"Provision of a new football stadium for Weymouth Football Club will be supported, where it can be demonstrated that developing a new stadium would not result in a significantly harmful impact to the surrounding area. Any evidence base will need to include consideration of the impact of development on the road network, car parking, residential amenity, ecological interests and landscape considerations"</i>
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
256	Indigo Planning	<p>EC7 and EC8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These options reflect the importance of tourism to the Borough's economy. It is recognised in CS that Osprey Quay is a key tourist / leisure site. Whilst further tourism in this area is supported there is a need to balance this against employment growth. As employment and tourism are not mutually exclusive, care should be taken not to limit the development opportunities on Osprey Quay by specifically allocating it for tourism. A more flexible approach to this site that ensures that new development is compatible with existing uses is supported
257	Stone Firms Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EC7 does not promote or upgrade existing features to take into consideration the opportunities that exist on Portland
		EC8
257	Stone Firms LTd, Portland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be a new option EC8 to actively encourage and promote the use of existing facilities and promote new facilities for the benefit of the Borough, if demand and other policies in the Local Plan are adhered to A particular proposal is to restore Coombefield Quarry which is now exhausted in terms of dimension stone but could stay open as an aggregate quarry for next 30 years – can become a properly designed and landscaped holiday park which by being in the quarry has little or no impact on the surroundings – will bring income and employment to the area, also incorporating sports and leisure pitches that can be used by local community and could bring to fruition a number of proposals in Masterplan framework document.
240	Local History Research, Images and Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be encouragement for more tourist accommodation on Portland. Clusters (giving mutual benefit) of high quality tourist accommodation will be essential for future growth.
266	Weymouth and Portland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported

	Partnerships	
185	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Bourne Leisure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bourne Leisure supports the retention of existing tourist accommodation, but considers that option EC8 should explicitly support the upgrading and expansion of existing tourism accommodation, including holiday parks. The option should be expanded as: <i>“Proposals to retain and enhance existing holiday parks, including their expansion, will be supported where this results in improved accommodation and facilities, improvements to the layout and appearance of the site and can extend the visitor season”</i> Support for the enhancement of accommodation would accord with paragraph 8.5.8 of the draft South West RSS Bourne Leisure considers that both the policy and supporting text for Option EC8 should allow for holiday park sites to extend outside existing boundaries where this allows standards, layouts and the general appearance of the site to be improved, for example, by ‘spreading out’ units and adding extra landscape, provided that sites are not allowed to coalesce, there are no additional units and that mitigation measures are implemented to offset any potential impacts, including improved access to public open space. Such an approach would be in accord with adopted Local Plan Policy TO16 Increasing the quality of caravan parks will help to attract visitors with higher spending power and extend the season, both of which will benefit the local economy directly The existing text explaining the advantages of Option EC8 (page 79) is unclear. If existing sites do not change there is no (rather than less) impact on the landscape. With investment and change there is an opportunity to improve the impact on the landscape There are two paragraphs labeled 5.11. In the second paragraph 5.11 (page 79), the final sentence is unclear. However there are several factors not just landscape, that are of fundamental importance to the tourism offer
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported The short term interests of property developers must not destroy the long term holiday centre ethos of the town.
		Community – CM1
155	Natural England	Natural England supports the option as an important means of providing and supporting the provision of public open space.
212	Drivers Jonas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In support of the option to provide open space off-site or through a contribution where it does not accord with design and quality standards; any contributions sought should accord with the guidance in Circular 05/05 Planning Obligations which requires obligations to be among other factors, directly related and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development.
266	Weymouth and Portland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported

	Partnerships	
156	Highways Agency	Community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where possible community and recreational facilities should be located in the town centre. Where facilities are likely to generate a high number of visitors, proposals should be accompanied by a full transport assessment to identify any impacts upon the SRN and the local road network.
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		CM2
263b	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports (As part of Preston Downs development)
155	Natural England	supports
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported This is urgently needed. All the allotments are in the south of the town and Littlemoor lacks the infrastructure and facilities that others enjoy. 50 would be the minimum. The waiting list in Weymouth is 400 so 100 would be better.
		CM3
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		CM4a
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent Quarry is subject to a condition for restoration to nature conservation, and its central location lends it considerable potential for significantly improving the ecological connectivity between the internationally important

		habitats on the east and west coasts. Development within Independent Quarry would significantly reduce the potential for the restoration of species rich grassland and, given the condition to restore Independent to Nature Conservation purposes, would represent a significant biodiversity loss. This potential loss should be recognised by the option along with a requirement for appropriate levels of mitigation / compensation. Natural England therefore objects as the wording of the option does not take account of the ecological interests of the site. In our view an option for a Portland Academy at this location should ensure that any scheme is required to provide a comprehensive ecological mitigation / compensation package, that includes the restoration of significant areas of limestone grassland.
217	Entec on behalf of The Crown Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the opportunity to improve educational facilities but consider that this should be a part of mixed use scheme as CM4b • However object to the contention that the scheme would result in excessive traffic generation
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported
42	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>CM4a and CM4b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both these options involve development on land which was due to be restored for nature conservation benefit (limestone grassland). Dorset Wildlife Trust would wish to see this impact fully mitigated through an equivalent increase in quality of habitats restored on-site or an equivalent area of habitat restoration off-site in a location which strategically adds to the Green Infrastructure Network (Option EN2) and/or meets the objectives of the South West Nature Map
220	Development Director for Portland Academy	<p>CM4a/CM4b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly recommend the Independent Quarry site be developed for education and community purposes only, working with the Crown Estate closely to reach a mutually beneficial agreement • As a by-product of the Academy development, the sites that are currently in use for education will become available for residential and community development. These are situated close to existing housing and within easy walking distance of shops and other facilities. If more residential housing will be required in future, these sites will be ideally positioned to fulfill the social need without restricting the educational opportunities created by the Academy • Intention of the Academy in its programme is to use the natural features of the quarry to create an outdoor amphitheatre for local and national performances of major musical and dramatic procedures – would disturb any residential development situated close to the main campus
221	SWRDA	<p>CM4a/CM4b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High unemployment and low skills levels are identified as potential barriers to Weymouth/Portland achieving its full economic potential. Therefore, support the policies to take forward early proposals for Portland Academy. Aiming to raise

		education standards for 0-19 year olds, the initiative will help to improve skills and attainment with the ultimate aim of promoting a more skilled workforce
		CM4b
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England objects to the option as it is likely to lead to a significant increase in traffic to and from Weymouth that in turn has the potential to generate further demands for road improvement that may harm the Chesil and the Fleet SAC / SPA. The option therefore needs to be supported by a comprehensive transport assessment to ensure there is sufficient capacity within the existing road network, or alternatively demonstrate that road traffic enhancements options are available that do not threaten the European protected sites. Significant housing development that generates traffic volumes greater than the capacity of the current road link to Portland is likely to trigger a requirement for an appropriate assessment as set out by the Habitat Regulations. Independent Quarry is subject to a condition for restoration to nature conservation, and its central location lends it considerable potential for significantly improving the ecological connectivity between the internationally important habitats on the east and west coasts. Significant development within Independent Quarry would significantly reduce the potential for the restoration of species rich grassland and, given the condition to restore Independent to Nature Conservation purposes, would represent a significant biodiversity loss. This potential loss should be recognised by the option along with a requirement for appropriate levels of mitigation / compensation. Natural England therefore objects as the wording of the option does not take account of the ecological interests of the site. In our view an option for development at this location should ensure that any scheme is required to provide a comprehensive ecological mitigation / compensation package, that includes the restoration of significant areas of limestone grassland.
217	Entec on behalf of The Crown Estate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> support the opportunity to improve education facilities as part of a wider mixed use scheme but remove ‘increased trip generation’ revise site assessment on page 81 of the document
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported More development of the extensive area of redundant buildings in prime location that formed part of HMS Osprey to the east of the island on land under the YOI would be long overdue. There are acres of decaying buildings that could be taken over for community use and low cost housing.
		Environment – EN1
185	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on	<p>Paragraph 7.1 and EN1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bourne Leisure recognizes the value of the Borough’s natural environment, but considers that it is important that

	behalf of Bourne Leisure	<p>objectives and policies within the CS balance the need to preserve the environment with opportunities to promote tourism as part of the overall economic strategy for the Borough</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Company considers that a distinction needs to be made between areas of local importance and areas of national significance, such as the Heritage Coast when devising policy • Policies and their supporting text should recognize that there is scope for appropriate development in areas adjacent to designated sites, provided that commensurate mitigation measures, such as the inclusion of a buffer zone and appropriate landscaping are implemented to minimize both direct and indirect impacts. Moreover, careful detailed design and layout of any development adjacent to the buffer zone will ensure a satisfactory interface in visual terms and natural surveillance. There may also be opportunities to introduce areas of open space and cycle paths
269	RSPB South West Regional Office	<p>Paragraphs 7.3 to 7.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RSPB supports the approach set out in these paragraphs, and would welcome further details on how the framework and approach will be progressed through the Core Strategy <p>Option EN1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RSPB strongly supports this option, which is underpinned by national and international policy and law. The described advantages clearly communicate the contribution biodiversity and geodiversity makes to the Borough
42	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strongly support this option
155	Natural England	<p>Option EN1 Protection and enhancement of biodiversity and Geodiversity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England supports the option as a means of ensuring the borough’s substantial biodiversity and geodiversity interests are protected and enhanced
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports protecting biodiversity and geodiversity which is in accordance with RSS
41	Woodland Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pleased to see Option EN1. However following comments are made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No more loss of ancient woodland – Core Strategy should support absolute protection of ancient woodland ○ Protection for Ancient and Veteran Trees – Core Strategy should support absolute protection of ancient, veteran and notable trees ○ An increase in native woodland cover – Core Strategy should support an expansion in native woodland cover, particularly as part of a Green Infrastructure strategy • Option EN1 should be amended to read ‘<i>The biodiversity and geodiversity in the borough will be protected absolutely, enhanced and expanded.</i>’

271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported More access to the natural world works as ecotherapy for depression and anxiety disorders in humans
252	Environment Agency	<p>EN1 and EN2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly support these options and would like to see CS adopt the principle of seeking opportunities to enhance biodiversity and geodiversity through the planning process. However the Local Authority should also be encouraging the creation of new biodiversity habitats The CS should integrate the principle of the protection of rivers and other wetland habitats through the use of natural buffer zones which protect water courses from pollution, provide habitat for species and act as wildlife corridors along water courses PPS9 requires that planning decisions should prevent harm to biodiversity interests (PPS9: key principles) and should also seek to enhance and expand biodiversity interests where possible. Article 10 of the Habitats Directive, and PPS9 (paragraph 12) stress the importance of natural networks of linked corridors to allow movement of species between suitable habitats and promote the expansion of biodiversity. Such networks may also help wildlife adapt to climate change.
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		EN2
263b	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported (Wyke Oliver Hill would provide a green link between Lorton Valley Country Park and the AONB if development were at Preston Downs)
42	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dorset Wildlife Trust strongly supports this option and is extremely pleased to see the work on Green Infrastructure which has gone into this option and is set out in the Environment Issues Paper. Reference to the Green Infrastructure Network needing to be managed and enhanced as well as open and undeveloped is desirable and would provide for the network being taken forward into the future
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife corridors and stepping stone habitats are considered particularly important to Weymouth & Portland as the borough lies on a key bird migration route. The habitats within the Lorton and Wey Valleys provide valuable foraging areas for migratory birds passing to and from the Isle of Portland. The relative importance of these migratory corridors is likely

		to increase with climate change and the enhancement of such corridors is considered a key climate change adaption strategy. The Lorton Valley and Radipole Lake are also considered particularly important for foraging bats, all of which are European Protected Species. Natural England therefore supports the option as a means of ensuring these critical ecological resources are maintained.
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports EN2 to set out a green infrastructure network to adapt to climate change, increase connectivity and allow for wildlife corridors and networks
41	Woodland Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Option EN2 particularly the reference to reducing fragmentation on order to improve habitat connectivity. This option should be cross referenced to Chapter 6 social provision – para 6.2
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
269	RSPB South West Regional Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RSPB supports this option
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<p>EN2 and Key diagram on behalf of Mr and Mrs K Smith of Martleaves House</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Key Diagram is at a very small scale but nevertheless, appears to show extensive areas of green infrastructure network hard up to an existing built up area of boundary. If it is truly a Key Diagram then the boundary lines between the two ought not to be as irregular as they are, implying existing lines, but should leave scope for consideration in a further Development Plan document. My client’s land is of no value, so far as wildlife is concerned. It is not an Important Habitat and it is not an Important Open Gap, despite previous assertions by the Planning Authority. There is no scope for improving access to a green space through my client’s land and the green land beyond Martleaves House itself is meadow land used for grazing, to which there is no public access. The only residents who currently benefit from the quiet and tranquil environment are my clients themselves. A redevelopment of my client’s property would enable others to benefit. The site is in a clearly sustainable location, with local shops, schools plus close to the bus route between Portland and Weymouth town centre There would be no loss of quality of life. Clearly there is the opportunity to improve the quality of life for some people looking for new homes in the area
271	NHS GP Locality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported

	Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green spaces are good for nature and good for people
		EN3
263b	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported Community benefit Preserves green infrastructure Could be enhanced with the addition of Wyke Oliver Hill
42	Dorset Wildlife Trust	Dorset Wildlife Trust strongly supports this option, though it needs rewording for clarity. We would suggest that with removal of the last three words it would read more clearly
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> supports
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that there are proposals for a country park in Lorton Valley. Urban extension to Chickerell can provide a country park which will be compatible with recreational uses in the area and link with the provision of green infrastructure – this would require joint working between the two councils. Country park associated with urban extension at Chickerell will provide opportunities to increase the biodiversity of the area through habitat creation and enhance the access to informal recreation and also provide educational opportunities for local schools
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
269	RSPB South West Regional Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RSPB supports this option
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported A country park with easy access by cycling and walking from all directions. Littlemoor, Preston and Weymouth Beach and Southhill would be good
		EN4
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England fully endorses the landscape character approach to landscape assessment
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted that EN4 promotes use of landscape character types and areas. Local landscape designations should only be maintained or, exceptionally extended where it can be clearly shown that a criteria based planning policies cannot provide the necessary protection

240	Local History Research, Images and Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The description of Portland’s landscape character as ‘limestone island’ could be misleading • True original nature of Tophill plateau was diverse pastoral and agrarian with good soil cover. What little restoration has occurred has tended to be with minimal or no soil covering ‘to encourage calcareous grassland’. This denigrates the potential landscape quality • Loss of hundreds of hectares of good topsoil has destroyed the insulating, life supporting covering layer which is so essential in the natural life-chain for insects and birds, flora etc. The plateau landscape should not be dismissed as simply ‘limestone’
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported
		EN5
240	Local History Research, Images and Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designation of Southwell as an ‘Area of Special Character’ is intriguing. Southwell’s historic rural setting is quite destroyed. Any sensitive enhancement to the area will therefore be limited but welcome
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported • Good to protect areas where mature trees and interesting buildings make for a sense of identity. These have been severely damaged in Carlton road area and this should never be repeated.
		EN6
271	NHS GP Locality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported

	Group	
41	Woodland Trust	<p>EN6 and EN7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity should be identified as a key issue. As the relationship between climate change and biodiversity is a complex and important dynamic that we would like to see addressed more directly and integrated into a formal Option. This is in line with PPS: Planning and Climate Change supplement to PPS1 which says that '<i>climate change considerations should be integrated into all spatial planning concerns</i>' and specifically recommends that '<i>all planning authorities should prepare, and manage the delivery of, spatial strategies that: conserve and enhance biodiversity, recognizing that the distribution of habitats and species will be affected by climate change</i>'. • Such a policy on climate change should recognise the value trees and woodland can provide in <u>mitigating</u> the effects of climate change. Woodland can mitigate the causes of climate change by developing small scale local biomass (renewable energy) projects, minimising the carbon cost of materials and providing carbon offset opportunities. Woodland can also help reduce the unavoidable effects of climate change by increasing urban tree cover to provide shade, reduce ambient temperatures and improve air quality; using woodland to buffer watercourses and pollution pathways could increase water quality by greater than 90 per cent; targeting woodland creation to span floodplains could have a substantial impact on major floods (see the Woodland Trust publication <i>Woodland actions for biodiversity and their role in water management</i> - http://www.woodland-trust.org.uk/water/index.htm) • However, a policy on climate change should also focus on <u>adaptation</u> strategies for Weymouth & Portland, especially in relation to biodiversity and the natural environment. A report published by Defra on behalf of the UK Biodiversity Partnership, 'Conserving Biodiversity in a changing climate: guidance on building capacity to adapt' (2007), sets out six guiding principles of which no.4 is headed '<i>Establish ecological networks through habitat protection, restoration and creation</i>'. This goes on to recommend that '<i>Some species will need to move some distance from their current locality if they are to survive climate change; creating new habitat, restoring degraded habitat or reducing the intensity of management of some areas between existing habitat, will encourage this</i>' (p.10) • WPBC should promote action in the Core Strategy both to identify areas for new green space to help mitigate the effects of climate change, and also to identify new habitat creation opportunities to help semi-natural habitats in response to climate change
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supports
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land at Chickerell is within an area of low flood risk. It is noted that proposals for development will be considered in the context of Flood Risk taking into account climate change and wave action
266	Weymouth and Portland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported

	Partnerships	
		EN7
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supports
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In terms of energy and in respect of EN7, object to the need to consider combined heat and power plants or links to district heating systems.
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported • Areas with affordable housing would benefit from sustainable energy sources
		Transport – TR1
156	Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agency welcomes the proposed package of measures to increase walking, cycling and public transport usage and agrees that it should be an important short term priority to progress the transport package that will deliver network management and public transport improvements ahead of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.
251	South West Councils	<p>Transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The transport section would benefit from closer links to the Implementation and Delivery Section to justify how new infrastructure will support new homes, jobs and economic prosperity. You might also find it useful to refer to the Government’s 5 transport goals as set out within its new transport strategy 'Delivering a Sustainable Transport Strategy'
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support TR1 – aims to provide a package of measures together with enhancements and improvements to increase walking, cycling and public transport use – in accordance with RSS • Urban extension to Chickerell will seek to maximize potential for walking and cycling links to existing Chickerell and Weymouth urban area. There is potential for a number of footway and cycleway access locations to provide for maximum permeability by sustainable modes. Close proximity of Chickerell option site to existing employment uses provides a realistic opportunity to minimize trips by private motor vehicles
256	Indigo Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option is supported as it is important to make Portland more accessible to visitors. Short term and long term measures need to be considered to improve Portland’s congestion and accessibility issues
266	Weymouth and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported

	Portland Partnerships	
185	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Bourne Leisure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst Bourne Leisure supports greater transport choice, the Company considers that in the case of many tourism uses, such as holiday parks, which are often located in more remote coastal or rural areas, there may be no feasible alternative transport option available other than the private car. This constraint on the use of alternative means of transport should therefore be recognized in any strategic objectives and policies for sustainable tourism-related travel • This is recognised at paragraph 5.3 of CLG Good Practice Guide 'Planning for Tourism' (May 2006) • Any future development should however seek to provide foot path and cycle routes, in order to help reduce the dependence on cars once visitors arrive in Weymouth
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported • 2012 purports to be sustainable and green yet major road improvements receive generous funding and cycle routes are sparse then lacking altogether when it comes to accessing the main Olympic viewing area on Weymouth beach. Some genuine strategic leadership from the council to provide a painted cycle lane on the Greenhill section of the esplanade is needed. Currently the car is king and cycling is very dangerous. Thus most people go by car and vote against irritating cyclists who get in the way of fast driving. To mitigate climate change and cut carbon emissions we need bold leadership from the council in challenging the car domination. A safe cycle network that includes access to the Olympic sites, the main beach and academy is vital to any credible claim to a sustainable transport vision. The Portland route involves crossing a busy fast main road twice, something no sane parent would contemplate with children on a bike.
272	Richard Soper, First	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus lanes should also be included in the list of possible bus priority measures and the aspiration of all improved public transport interchange is shared by us. However managing congestion effectively in the streets in the immediate vicinity is an absolute pre-requisite.
		TR2a
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported
		TR2b
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported

		TR2c
263b	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes move • Detract from North Weymouth residents quality of life • Could encourage more car usage to and from North Weymouth.
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option would provide the attractive and competitive scheme to provide sustainable links between Dorchester and Weymouth and would maximize integration between alternative modes of travel
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported
269	RSPB South West Regional Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This involves using Mount Pleasant as a transport hub, building on infrastructure to be constructed under the consented Weymouth Relief Road scheme • The RSPB is in discussion with Dorset County Council over the avoidance of impacts on Lodmoor SSSI from the construction and subsequent operation of the Park and Ride facility. Intensification of the site associated with this option would need careful assessment for the potential additional implications for the management of the designated site
215	Terence O'Rourke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of option TR2c is supported as it will maximise the sustainability of connections between the Park and Ride and the town centre, through provision of significant supporting infrastructure to the Park and Ride site. • Maximising the sustainability of transport connections to the Park and Ride site will enable new development to be supported in this area, which can aid the continued growth and regeneration of Weymouth and provide the town with flexibility in implementing its future development strategy.
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not supported • Loss of Upwey station is a major blunder. This should remain as an access point to the newly expanding Littlemoor conurbation and industrial estate with a free park and ride of its own.
156	Highways Agency	TR2a-c <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency strongly supports the proposed provision of a park and ride facility or integrated transport hub in connection with the Weymouth Relief Road. Of the three options, TR2c would be Agency's preference, as it would offer most comprehensive transport solution. • There could be issues with the short term delivery of the whole scheme (with the agreement of Network Rail yet to be secured).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nevertheless, park and ride element of the proposals can be delivered early, with links to Weymouth Town Centre, Weymouth Rail station, Upwey Rail station and Dorchester as proposed under Option TR2b. It is of paramount importance that park and ride is delivered ahead of the 2012 Olympics when large no. of people would travel to Weymouth and Portland and local road networks could be placed under significant strain.
272	Richard Soper, First	We strongly agree with the general prominence given to public transport and its role in addressing the environmental issues posed by the RSS. We also agree with the Park & Ride proposal and the associated reduction in town centre parking provision.
		TR3
272	Richard Soper, First	It is worth commenting that from our experience of urban centres elsewhere, to try to introduce additional facilities through Park & Ride without a reduction in town centre parking ultimately delivers a very poor return on the investment. Whilst accepting a need for 'realism about the place of the private car in Weymouth, we do think the reduction of car parking in the town centre could go further.
212	Drivers Jonas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the principle of option TR3 and considers that the option will help to reduce congestion within TC creating a more pleasant environment whilst also reducing carbon dioxide emissions – specifically helping the viability of redevelopment of Pavilion and Ferry Terminal site.
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support this option. Urban extension to Chickerell already benefits from being situated a suitable cycling distance to the town centre and reduction of parking spaces in Weymouth TC in conjunction with improved bus transport linkages from the site will provide a more attractive and sustainable option for travel
156	Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agency welcomes the proposal of reduction in number of car parking spaces in Weymouth Town Centre. However in order for this of demand management measure to be effective, significant investment in public transport, including the proposed park and ride/ transport hub facility and pedestrian and cycling infrastructure will also be necessary.
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
240	Local History Research, Images and Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reducing car parking spaces in town centre could cause more people to shop in other towns, meaning more, longer car journeys
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported This will only work if the comprehensive cycle network (much more imaginative than the current minor upgrades) and improved buses, and free park and ride with regular shuttle train / buses are put in place first, long before any car park closures. If done properly and with investment in trains and buses, and cycle lanes that cost money, then this will work.

		TR4a
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		TR4b
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		TR5a
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		TR5b
240	Local History Research, Images and Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicular traffic should be more restricted in St Thomas Street. Original design of St Thomas Street / St Edmund Street / Town Bridge junction should be restored
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		TR5c
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		TR5a, TR5b, TR5c
272	Richard Soper, First	We accept the desirability of ‘pedestrianisation’ but believe it could become self-defeating if it results in a worsening of public transport access. We would look for the inclusion of a statement within the final document that progressive pedestrianisation will

		only take place without worsening access to public transport services, including the location of bus stops.
		TR6
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported. This option would improve connectivity between rail and bus networks and would link to the existing cycling, walking and public transport network for travel to/from Chickerell
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		TR7
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
156	Highways Agency	TR6-8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agency strongly supports the upgrading of including the proposed provision of a public transport interchange at Weymouth rail station. This would represent a significant improvement compared to the existing sub-standard interchange facilities located remotely from the station, and would support the potential improvements in heavy rail services identified by the Agency in Option TR9
		TR8
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
272	Richard Soper, First	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The idea of a 'continuous loop' bus service is not attractive and in our view will not be commercially viable. Will the Council wish to continue to support such a service indefinitely? We doubt it would be justifiable for it to do so. We therefore feel this should not be considered part of the public transport 'infrastructure'. Our experience is that people do not want to hop on and off unless they really have to. The need for this can be overcome by delivering intelligent routing and continued / improved penetration of the commercial areas by existing bus services.

		TR9
272	Richard Soper, First	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are not convinced by the BRT proposal in its current form but certainly are not opposed to it. We agree absolutely with promoting a BRT approach over rail and believe it is very realistic. However we suspect that the best way of achieving the ultimate objective would probably be by using priorities on existing highway rather than the rail track. In some places the rail track is further away from the residential areas and the existing highway offers netter access. This approach should also be feasible without appearing to unduly disadvantage car users in our view.
263b	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support concept However should be developed on or alongside existing highways, and focus on the core public transport axis (Preston-Littlemoor-Town Centre-Portland) Oppose closure of the Dorchester to Weymouth rail line
42	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dorset Wildlife Trust objects to this option. The proposal involves conversion of part of Chesil and The Fleet Special Area of Conservation (SAC) to a hard-surfaced bus route. The proposal would in our view be likely to fail the tests in the Habitats Regulations, particularly as there is a road between Wyke Regis and Portland which provides an alternative route The Rodwell Trail is selected as an SNCI (Wyke Regis Cutting SNCI) for its neutral grassland and population of the nationally rare Little Robin (<i>Geranium purpureum</i>), as well as two nationally scarce plants and four Dorset Notable species. Conversion to the trail to a bus route would not only be likely to harm the SNCI, eg through surfacing works or widening, but would reduce the attractiveness of the route as a 'green link' for walkers and cyclists From a sustainability point of view it would also seem disadvantageous and likely to lead to more car journeys if the direct rail link between Weymouth and London and Bristol, as well as more local stations like Poole, Bournemouth and Yeovil is removed
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ham beach is included in the Chesil and Fleet SAC. Any proposals, including the current option that may damage the interests of a European Protected Site will require an Appropriate Assessment as set out by the Habitat Regulations. Natural England therefore objects to the option. In our view the option would only be viable if the scheme could be implemented without harming the European protected site. Natural England also objects to the reopening of the Rodwell Trail to vehicles. The trail includes the Wyke Regis Cutting SNCI and is valuable wildlife corridor through the town. The Rodwell Trail is also a valuable recreational resource
266	Weymouth and Portland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported

	Partnerships	
269	RSPB South West Regional Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This option suggests construction within an internationally important designated site. As stated above, strict tests apply to ‘plans or projects’ within such sites, and we are doubtful whether the current proposal would meet these tests
156	Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the Agency strongly supports the principle of improved public transport in Dorchester-Weymouth-Portland corridor and would not rule out a BRT approach, it would be a concern if local transport improvements were to be achieved at the expense of longer distance movements by sustainable travel options • The Agency would be unlikely to support any proposals leading to the reduction in or removal of rail capacity in the Weymouth corridor for passenger movement and potentially freight in the future. Rail services provide viable alternatives to longer distance road journeys involving the SRN, and the Agency supports their retention and improvement • Agency suggests that consideration is given to potential heavy rail improvements in the corridor. The existing rail alignment represents an underused asset, with an exceptionally low passenger usage of rail for employment trips evident from research – background paper. Potential for increasing rail for commuter journeys is given more detailed consideration • As part of an approach retaining the existing rail infrastructure, the potential for light rail vehicles sharing the heavy rail alignment between Dorchester and Weymouth should be investigated. Light rail extensions could be provided in Dorchester and Weymouth Town Centres, providing enhanced access to town centre services and potentially incorporating the disused Weymouth Quay branch. Such an approach would accord with the underlying principle of maximizing the use of existing transport assets (Core Strategy Options Document section 8.2)
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not supported • Loss of the rodwell trail to walkers and cyclists would be a retrograde step. Instead the old railway lines along the quay should be opened to allow trams or light railway to run from the Park + ride into town and thence to Debenhams and the Pavilion.
		TR10

155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England supports the principle of the option provided the strategic route does not in itself cause harm to biodiversity interests. In particular, Natural England would object to the routing of a cycleway across the disused railway line on Hamm Beach, part of the Chesil and Fleet SAC. Any proposals, including the current option, that may damage the interests of a European Protected Site, including its vegetated disused railway line, will require an Appropriate Assessment as set out by the Habitat Regulations
156	Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agency supports the proposal
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support this option and envisage that footway and cycleway routes through the Chickerell site will be provided to link into the strategic cycle network and improve journey times towards Weymouth TC and key employment areas
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported Yes, this is the key to improving health and improving the mortality rates in this borough. See the separate map for some ideas on new interconnected routes.
		TR11
155	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> supports
156	Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The western route appears to be the only remaining option for provision of a transport corridor to Portland that avoids the built up area of Weymouth. Given the longer term ambitions of the Portland Port for significant growth, it would appear sensible for the safeguarding of western route to remain as part of an approach focusing on traffic management and public transport along the existing A354/B3157 corridor in the short to medium term
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported – would aid the sustainable movement of travel around Weymouth and Portland areas
240	Local History Research, Images and Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The A354/Wyke/Rodwell Relief Road should be seen as vital for the future of the Borough. It will be by far the most effective means of improving public and private transportation. It will reduce congestion, journey times, and accidents and improve the quality of life for residents along the Boot Hill/Rodwell/Wyke Regis corridor; will reduce pollution over a wide area. Refer to Adrian Lisney Environmental Report (late 1980s-90s). The Relief Road has suffered a catastrophic PR failure. The route will not directly impinge on the shore of the Fleet, other than Ferry Bridge. It will not be seen from the main

		part of the Fleet and over most of its length will fit nearly within the rolling landscape. Without this new road, commuting to and from Portland will forever suffer insufficiency and delays.
269	RSPB South West Regional Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RSPB support the removal of the Western Route proposal
258	Dorset County Council (Richard Dodson's comments)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As far as the Western Route is concerned I think we need to take the pragmatic view that it is very unlikely that the road previously identified as the Western Route would be constructed within the foreseeable future. • As you know the scheme is not in the West Dorset LP and is currently only appears anywhere as a policy in the Weymouth Plan. The West Dorset LP inspector correctly noted that although the scheme was included in Structure Plan, following a review of strategic road schemes it was not carried forward into the draft Replacement Structure Plan. Similarly there is no road scheme approximating to this one currently being considered for inclusion in the RSS / RTS and it does not appear in the Local Transport Plan. • The WD Inspector concluded that the evidence suggests that this road scheme would be highly unlikely to be implemented within the plan period and in line with PPG12 and PPS12, that the scheme should not be included within the local plan. It was also considered that if built within the Heritage Coast and close to the AONB it would be visually intrusive and potentially damaging to tourism and the economy. (not necessarily ecology - P'Sterlings point) • Safeguarding the route could also cause harm by reason of blight since there is no evidence which points to this scheme being brought forward for implementation in the time period covered by the Local Plan. - DCC accepted this recommendation • If we include the scheme for consideration in the Core Strategy at the very least this is misleading as DCC do not currently have any proposals to pursue this or any other similar scheme - indeed as part of the considerations for its deletion from the replacement structure plan DCC Cabinet accepted its non inclusion in the plan - (this was 2004 so after WPLP Inquiry but before WDLP inquiry) so effectively we have published an 'intent to abandon' • If we look to Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12)? it is important that proposals are realistic and are likely to be implemented during the plan period? etc and because there is significant doubt that a scheme will be progressed within the plan period (because there is no scheme!) it is misleading to include reference to this scheme in the your core strategy and it has the possibility that it would be a contributor towards making the plan unsound • Similarly there is unlikely to be any RFA funding available until 2019 and even then it is questionable if this would prioritise

		<p>highly - under current considerations</p> <p>Summary therefore</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheme only exists in the current WPLP - not in LTP RSS or any other policy document • DCC published intent to abandon through SP review 2004 (albeit SP subsequently not pursued) • Continued pursuit of scheme with no intent to construct within Core Strat period would fail PPS12 test as no reasonable prospect of delivery • PPS 12 considerations therefore would be likely to find plan unsound as not deliverable! • Worth remembering considerations for abandonment was not for ecology reasons - although we had identified potential secondary impact on the Fleet - main issue was landscape / deliverability / and timing • If we were ever in a position to revisit the need etc we would have to look at it from first principles • On this basis the protection of the route should be removed • On the P&R / BRT issue the comments would have come directly from Public
256	Indigo Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not supported. Improvement to road access to Portland is necessary to help ease traffic congestion particularly in the Wyke Regis and Rodwell areas as well as to improve pedestrian safety. This option needs to continue to exist until it has been demonstrated that a workable alternative improvement can be implemented.
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported
42	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>TR11 and TR12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dorset Wildlife Trust supports the removal of the 'Western Route' from the proposals and its replacement with on-line improvements
		<p>TR12</p>
156	Highways Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency welcomes the proposal and looks forward to reviewing further details once available. As observed in TR11, Agency suggests an approach focusing on this existing corridor for short-medium term investment, while safeguarding the

		western route as a longer term option.
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported • Make them safer for cyclists, not quicker for cars
240	Local History Research, Images and Publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is doubtful whether any significant strategic improvement can be achieved to the existing A354 route between Weymouth and Portland. However the Harbour Roundabout should be revamped to ensure that main road traffic has priority at all times. Long standing proposal to improve the Wyke Road/Portland Road junction should be implemented. It would be a mistake to replace the Boot Hill mini roundabout with signals. Artificially stopping buses and HGVs on the steep gradient would be counter-productive • Other junctions along the route including Foords Corner roundabout are incapable of further meaningful improvement. Incidentally Lanehouse Rocks Road is a non-starter as any alternative for A354 traffic • CS makes no mention of Underhill Relief Road – the route should be firmly safeguarded. Without such a road there should be no major increases in trip generating developments on Portland.
256	Indigo Planning	<p>TR12 – improvements along Portland Corridor to help manage the work and prioritise public transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported. Welcome the fact that Council has already collected contributions towards these improvements Bus stops should be placed in strategic locations to enable visitors to enjoy the facilities at Osprey Quay, the marina and the town centre. Cycle routes should also be developed and cycle parking provided in key areas
		Implementation and Delivery – iD1
42	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The list of requirements should include contributions to management and enhancement of the Green Infrastructure network to complement Option EN2
155	Natural England	<p>Option iD1 – contribution from residential and retail development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England supports the option
209	WYG Planning and Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any policy which seeks to levy a roof tariff will have to demonstrate the relationship between the planning obligations sought and the projects on which they are to be spent on. Potentially this policy is not demonstrably linked to a particular set of proposals and so fails reasonableness test. • Important that each development is able to provide for or contribute to a sustainable community and that it is viable and

		<p>deliverable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roof tax potentially compromises that, particularly is to be produced alongside CIL. In each case, spending must be fully justified and ring fenced for a reasonable period of time
214	Pegasus Planning Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome this approach, but stress the need for some flexibility. Developer contributions should only provide for what is reasonable related to the development as set out in Circular 05/2005
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported
269	RSPB South West Regional Office	<p>iD1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would suggest contributions from developments to the management, enhancement, restoration and re-creation of biodiversity is a legitimate objective for this policy, and should be added
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Planning Authority should not be expecting developers to fund benefits for the rest of the local community. Policies should not be seeking to provide for management or enhancement or art and design improvements to the public realm. Neither should development elsewhere be expected towards contribution to coastal defences in Weymouth town centre. Developers should only contribute towards community infrastructure, in terms of education and community facilities where there is currently a shortfall, such that the development cannot be accommodated. • I consider that this wish list is contrary to the advice contained in Circular 05/2005. Contributions for sport and recreation should be to provide those facilities needed by the development and there is only a need where there is currently a shortfall. The repair, maintenance and replacement of existing facilities are revenue expenses and should be met from revenue resources. The occupiers of new residential development will be contributing in equal amount to other residents in the Borough
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported
216	RPS Group on behalf of ASDA	<p>iD1, iD2a and iD2b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition should be given to the fact that even the most profitable developments have a limit to the contributions that can be viably made.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wording at the end of the sentence should be: ‘... while ensuring the proposed development remains viable’ • Furthermore, it may not be possible to contribute meaningfully to each of the topic headings set out as bullet points under each option, yet the text could be read as if that were a requirement. Accordingly words – ‘and / or’ should be added after each of the bullet points
239	Tetlow King Planning on behalf of South West RSL Planning Consortium	<p>iD1 and iD2a</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly recommended that affordable housing developments be exempted from planning obligations put forward in these options. • As affordable housing is built to meet local needs it is considered that residents moving to affordable housing are already resident within W&P area and so create no further need than previously existed prior to development. All planning obligations should be assessed against Circular 05/05 which states that these must be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relevant to planning ○ Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms ○ Directly related to the proposed development ○ Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development and ○ Reasonable in all other aspects
		iD2a
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For all the reasons put forward in respect of Option iD1. These contributions should not be for the purpose of helping to improve the social, cultural and working lives of the people of the Borough. These contributions should help provide those facilities needed by the residents of the development. If the Borough Council feel that the residents of the Borough generally should benefit, then the Borough Council should provide that facility from other revenue resources
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arts means preserving the Pavilion Theatre
		iD2b
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		iD3
263b	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly object Policy not specific in the application of the funds acquired, and suggests that the funds will not directly fund art projects but will go into general funds Policy should not make developments unviable through costs such as this
212	Drivers Jonas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> seeking contributions towards art and publicly accessible elements of the built environment, in addition to contributions sought through the tariff system will impact negatively upon viability of development; further justification of the level of contribution required should be provided by the Council
262	GOSW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This needs to be absolutely central to your plan (PPS 12). While you have started addressing this, it doesn't go far enough and needs to be clearer to enable monitoring. I.e. you need to clearly set out the priorities, who, delivers what by when (should be know for the priorities, or at least a reasonable prospect of it being realistic). For each of the strategic objectives you need to identify a SMART framework, setting out indicators, targets and key milestones and considering when contingencies would be triggered (e.g. Poole Core Strategy contains good examples). You also need to ensure that the CS is sufficiently flexible to be able to react to potentially changing circumstances.
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developers are expected to contribute 1% of the capital cost of development as an investment in art and design. That 1% will have to be taken off contributions to other requirements, including affordable housing. The Local Planning Authority, like many others, fail to appreciate that development is a business like any other. They continually seek to tax developers' profits, but not all profits find their way into the developers' pocket. Profits are used

	and Mrs Smith	for re-investment. The less they can invest, the more they have to borrow and the greater risk they take in a volatile market
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		iD4
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Borough Council has a power to compulsory purchase land to fulfil its functions. It does not need a policy to do so. The threat of compulsory purchase is more likely to frustrate the delivery of development. Not only is compulsory purchase complex and time consuming, it can also be expensive in pursuing Public Inquiries and High Court Challenges
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		iD5
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
271	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported
		Miscellaneous
272	Richard Soper, First	<p>Transport In addition to the paper. I would wish to restate our concern at the poor Debenhams / Commercial Road bus stop infrastructure and would request that the Council again consider the Westham bridge option as a central bus stopping location.</p>

		Furthermore the issue of buses using the Town Bridge and traveling along North Quay justifies further examination since operating reliable frequent services over a bridge that raises so often and for unknown durations does cause serious reliability problems.
42	Dorset Wildlife Trust	<p>Paragraph 7.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The final sentence of this paragraph should more correctly refer to “including UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority habitats and species and UK and European protected species”. The Dorset Biodiversity Strategy does not itself identify additional habitats and species, though the Audit which accompanies it includes Dorset Rare and Scarce species. We would suggest in policy terms that the UK BAP will be most appropriate to refer to. <p>Paragraph 7.3-5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dorset Wildlife Trust strongly supports this approach. We would suggest that in paragraph 7.4 linkages are made to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) other climate change adaptation benefits of green infrastructure – as well as wildlife benefits there are direct human benefits such as reducing flood risk and lowering urban temperatures through increased shading ii) impacts on human health through better access to greenspace. The final sentence of 7.4 could be augmented with “and better enable healthy lifestyles”
51	Dorset Gardens Trust	<p>Dorset Gardens Trust commends to each LPA the following policy wording for CS and DPDs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The identification, conservation and, if appropriate, the restoration of historic parks and gardens will be sought and facilitated The Council will seek to protect historic parks and gardens of regional and county importance from development that would have an adverse effect on their historic character, appearance and setting Development that would adversely affect the historic character, appearance, or setting of historic parks or gardens of county interest and importance will not be permitted
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<p>Housing Delivery – comment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 9.17 is not accurate. Whilst the Housing Communities Agency may be able to provide a grant, it cannot always do so and cannot be relied upon to ensure delivery of affordable housing <p>Whole document – object on behalf of Mr and Mrs K Smith of Martleaves House</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Core Strategy fails to give consideration to the potential for housing on the urban fringe of Weymouth, other than with regard to Specific Strategic Sites. There are sites, including that owned by Mr and Mrs Smith which are basically developed sites on the edge of the urban area. They are not sites of high landscape value in themselves but cumulatively they could make a contribution to meeting the housing needs of the Borough. As the Core Strategy is proposed to be drafted, there is no scope for considering these. It seems to me that there needs to be an additional Option within the Housing Chapter to deal with small developments by way of infilling, redevelopment and changes of use, within or on the

		<p>edge of the urban area. The Local Authority needs to leave scope to be able to alter the boundary of the urban area in what I imagine would be an Allocations DPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The concern at the moment is that Option EN2 appears to include all land up to existing defined development boundary. That suggests that the Local Planning Authority have not given consideration to proposals made in response to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
185	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Bourne Leisure	<p>Issues Paper 4: Environment</p> <p>With respect to Jordan Valley GI area in Paragraph 3 (un-numbered) page 38 which states about parts of the area functioning as an open gap providing additional recreational function as well as visually separating the two settlements Bourne Leisure considers that there should not be a policy approach within the LDF for keeping open land undeveloped. Any proposals for development on open land should be considered on their own merit, taking a balanced approach, whereby there is scope for businesses to expand, where a balancing of economic and environmental considerations justifies this</p> <p>Issues Paper 5: Landscape</p> <p>Paragraph 9.15 (page 41) “...sweep of predominantly open grassland countryside...linked to the AONB” – Bourne Leisure strongly considers that areas adjoining the AONB should not be subject to policies for the AONB and that the need for the protection of designated / allocated landscape areas should be balanced with economic considerations and benefits and that the needs of existing businesses to develop should be recognised and facilitated where appropriate. The scope to develop / enhance existing businesses within and adjoining the AONB should be acknowledged, particularly where proposals result in improvements to the visual appearance and setting of the AONB</p> <p>Bourne Leisure considers that the views expressed by the DCMS, VisitBritain, regional guidance (TO1 and TO2 of draft RSS) and CLG should be taken into account and incorporated into the emerging Weymouth and Portland LDF. By ensuring that future tourism development in the Borough is of high quality and incorporates mitigation practices, including good landscaping and sustainable transport options, it will be possible to ensure that Weymouth benefits from the Olympic legacy</p> <p>Bourne Leisure considers that the tourism policies within the South West RSS and the CLG Good Practice Guide should be incorporated into the emerging LDF</p>
251	South West Councils	Issues Papers

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are also aware that the Issues Papers have identified relevant RSS policies for each topic area but do not take this further in terms of how, in general terms, these will be dealt with and in which Development Plan Document they will be covered. This would have been helpful in terms of gaining a clearer view in terms of policy areas that are not dealt with in the Core Strategy <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We also recognise that the Core Strategy is at an issues and options stage and that the Borough Council have put forward suggestions from other parties. When moving to the preferred option stage the Core Strategy will need to be based upon a realistic and robust delivery plan which should show how capital (identified in public spending programmes & from private sources) and revenue funding (a business case) will support new infrastructure
--	---

Form no.	Respondent
269	Renny Henderson, RSPB
270	Norman Gillan, Mono Consultants Ltd on behalf of Mobile Operators Association
185	Nicholas Thompson, NLP on behalf of Bourne Leisure
261	Planning Bureau Limited on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Ltd
263	Andrew Patrick, ProVision on behalf of Harry J Palmer Holdings Ltd
215	Adrian Barker, Terence O' Rourke, on behalf of Wessex Delivery LLP promoting land within Southill as UE
251	Neal Whitehead, SW Councils

		HO10
263b*	Pro Vision Planning & Design, on behalf of FH Cummings Unlimited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports
212	Drivers Jonas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the recognition that open space is sometimes inappropriate for urban design reasons – 20% allocation for new build unless it is inappropriate
239	Tetlow King Planning on behalf of South West RSL Planning Consortium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly recommend inserting distinct policy to cover the full range of housing and care options for elderly, encouraging development of these within locations suitable to each, being appropriate to the individual needs of each proposal. • Full range of housing and care may also include providing support for independent living within existing homes, extra care housing and continuing care retirement communities
266	Weymouth and Portland Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported
252	EA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate rewording of Option HO9 (draft version) to Option HO10 (June version, page 53) with the deletion – <i>‘Flats, hostels, housing in multiple occupation, sheltered housing and residential homes will need to meet the following criteria: The development does not result in additional dwelling in areas that will be at an increasing risk of flooding during the developments life unless measures are implemented via a flood risk management strategy to mitigate the risk.’</i> • Option HO10 – do not agree that the wording of this policy achieves the suggested compliance ‘accords with this objective as does not allow development that would be in an area that would be at an increased risk of flooding unless mitigation measures are included.’ with sustainability appraisal objective 10 ‘Reduce vulnerability to flooding and, sea level rise (taking account of climate change).’
264	Sibbett Gregory on behalf of Betterment Properties and Mr and Mrs Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the Notes acknowledge, this will result in additional build cost, not necessarily a small cost. It militates against the provision of low cost homes for local people. There will be a particular disadvantage to young people setting up homes in Weymouth
261*	The Planning Bureau	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly object. In response to amenity space provision with sheltered accommodation (no evidence/justification for 20%

	Ltd	<p>level of amenity space. Suggests that it is the quality and not the quantity of amenity space that is important to residents in sheltered housing developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imposing an arbitrary requirement for amenity space could use result in the loss of land that could otherwise be used for additional housing.
271*	NHS GP Locality Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported • Flats have been crammed into brownfield sites in Weymouth in recent years, often replacing interesting architectural features with bland boxes extending to the very limit of the available plot and obliterating all green spaces, large trees and gardens. Any new development should not repeat these mistakes that enrich developers and impoverish
258	Dorset County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wholesale provision of private residential facilities creates an environment where older people and their carers and relatives assume that this is the only accommodation and care option available when people become frail and unable to live independently without support. Other options such as domiciliary help can be delivered in people's own homes, extra care housing and sheltered housing. By making people aware of these alternatives and increasing the provision, it is envisaged that the demand for mainstream residential care for frail older people will fall. However it is recognised that there is a growing demand for specialist residential care and such private developments would be supported.
263b	Pro Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support - In the interests of good design, neighbour appreciation, and to create residential places that fit into the character of the neighbourhood.
264a	Malcolm Brown	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object - This will result in additional build cost, not necessarily a small cost; it will be against the provision of low cost homes for local people; in particular disadvantage will be young people setting up homes in Weymouth.
204	Member of public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support