

Development at Littlemoor Urban Extension

For the 'Littlemoor' chapter a total of 25 responses were received. The individual comments were broken down as follows:

Number of comments made: 25
Object: 19
Support: 6
Neutral: 0

Specific and general consultation bodies	Key landowners / developers
Natural England	Neejam 165 Ltd & Budworth Developments Ltd
	Turner Associates

Responses to Question 9-i: The supporting text to Policy LITT1 has been amended to include a vision and a town centre strategy. Do you have any comments on these or any other changes to Policy LITT1?

Support

- We broadly support the continued allocation of land at Littlemoor for mixed-use development. The only outstanding issue is viability / S106 contributions. (Neejam 165 Ltd & Budworth Developments Ltd)
- We are generally in support of the preferred options LITT1 and LITT2. (Turner Associates)
- The proposals north of Littlemoor Road seem in the right place considering the land space and existing road infrastructure network.
- The vision for Littlemoor (para 9.2) is supported. As is the omission of references to exploring opportunities for district heating networks and to BREEAM Communities Assessment, which appear in para 9.2.2 of the current local plan. (Neejam 165 Ltd & Budworth Developments Ltd)
- The town centre strategy (para 9.3.1) is supported. (Neejam 165 Ltd & Budworth Developments Ltd)

Vision: Objection

- I object to the vision as it is not based on good evidence.

Green Infrastructure

- Para 9.4.3: We support the requirement for the proposals to contribute to the management and enhancement of Lorton Valley Nature Park. (Natural England)

LITT1 Criterion ii): Landscape / AONB

- An area that is of outstanding natural beauty will be spoilt. Already the Weymouth to Dorchester road has had an adverse effect on the pretty hamlets and villages to

the north of Littlemoor with noise pollution and additional traffic cutting through on narrow lanes.

- The Weymouth Relief Road and Littlemoor Road provide a natural boundary for existing and future development. Development beyond these routes will remove any tangible boundary to the developed area and weaken any future planning objection to yet more development up to and into the AONB.
- Development into the AONB is not acceptable. The proposals will neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the AONB and should therefore be rejected.
- The special nature of our landscape is at risk of being taken for granted. It is inappropriate that we should permanently impact on the ability of future generations to enjoy what is outstanding.
- We question whether the councils are compliant with section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. Development in the AONB would contradict Policy ENV1.

LITT1 Criterion iii): Transport Improvements

- A development of this size is wholly inappropriate to the existing infrastructure, i.e. the often grid-locked Weymouth Relief Road (particularly when tourists and caravans are on the move) and the totally inadequate Dorchester roundabout.

LITT1 Criterion iv): Employment Land Provision

- The 12 hectares of employment land proposed in the existing local plan is considered to be an overprovision. The overall reduction in provision is supported. However, an Employment Land Review supports a further reduction to 8 hectares, rather than 9.6. (Neejam 165 Ltd & Budworth Developments Ltd)
- There is no scheme or layout for what will be a huge site of 9.6 hectares.
- Demand will come almost exclusively from local companies, so the site will not be filling an existing shortage of land, nor will it substantially increase the overall demand for employment use in the area. (Neejam 165 Ltd & Budworth Developments Ltd)
- While Littlemoor's access to the county road network is better than most existing sites, the area is still remote from the national motorway network and the size of the local population would not attract large-scale inward investment from national or international companies. (Neejam 165 Ltd & Budworth Developments Ltd)
- Designating employment land will do nothing on its own to achieve the aim of facilitating better paid jobs.
- Employment opportunities will be few and will mostly be lower paid jobs in retail, which are already in decline in Weymouth. Nowhere do your plans suggest any long term higher paid prospects of employment for young people. This should be our priority, not more fast food outlets and random failing retail stores. I therefore wholly object to the present plans for LITT1.
- If Littlemoor is to achieve its intended outcome, it needs Supplementary Planning Guidance and a proactive development team to support the kind of businesses that will achieve the plan's objectives: small units; start-up units; business support; links to colleges and universities; and serviced site developments.

- We wish to ensure that neighbouring strategic employment sites and their potential for development are included as part of the master plan. Land at Icen Farm to the west of the preferred option site should be incorporated. (Turner Associates)
- Any development here will have a severe economic displacement effect on existing traders within Weymouth.

LITT1 Criterion iv): Littlemoor Local Centre

- There are a number of takeaways, a chemist, a convenience store, hairdresser and hardware store in the current local centre. However, for at least 18 months the mid-sized supermarket building has been empty, with both Co-op and Budgens not able to operate successfully from this site.
- The suggestion that community facilities in the new development to the north of Littlemoor Road can be integrated with the existing facilities to the south is flawed as this can only be achieved by pedestrian crossings over a main access route to the Weymouth Relief Road. The encouragement of pedestrian movements across such a busy road would fail the requirements of any safety audit into the proposal.

LITT1 Criterion v): Masterplanning and Design

- An outline planning application was submitted for the site in April 2016 for: up to 500 dwellings; 8 hectares of employment land; a new primary school; a new local centre; and road infrastructure. (Neejam 165 Ltd & Budworth Developments Ltd)
- As principal landowners within the LITT1 allocation we have developed a masterplan to demonstrate how the site can be developed and how the remainder of the allocated site can be bought forward by other landowners. (Neejam 165 Ltd & Budworth Developments Ltd)
- Mixed-use developments are rarely successful.
- Any expansion of Littlemoor should be towards Weymouth and should be built of traditional local materials including flint and stone.

LITT1 Criterion v): Education Provision

- Reference to a 2 form of entry (2FE) primary school instead of a 3FE primary school is supported. (Neejam 165 Ltd & Budworth Developments Ltd)
- As land is being provided not only for a 1FE primary school but also for any future expansion to 2FE as part of a current planning application, any contribution (in the form of a commuted sum for primary school education) needs to be reduced accordingly. The supporting text to this policy should reflect this. (Neejam 165 Ltd & Budworth Developments Ltd)
- There needs to be explicit mention of primary and secondary education contributions in addition to the provision of a 2FE primary site. Any S106 will be based on the prevailing rates at the time which may include contributions towards nursery and special education needs provision. (Dorset County Council: Children's Services)

LITT1 Criterion v): Provision of Community Infrastructure

- We support the policy but bullet v) 8 should be consistent with other policies e.g. CHIC4 and COM1. (Dorset County Council: Environment & Economy)

LITT1: Distribution of Housing between Weymouth & Portland and West Dorset

- The plan suggests a 25% / 75% split of housing between Weymouth & Portland and West Dorset. The illustrative masterplan accompanying the current applications indicates that a 20% / 80% split would be more appropriate. (Neejam 165 Ltd & Budworth Developments Ltd)

Policy LITT2: Land at Icen and Weyside Farms

Support

- Light Industrial redevelopment of Icen Farm makes good sense due to the strategic location and easy access off the Bincombe Bumps Roundabout.
- The land is poor quality, has excellent road and rail links and a cycle / footpath running its full length. It mostly would be hidden by the high hedges that would shield the majority of the site from the road.

Objections

- This site would accommodate a very large housing scheme with a lot less impact on the environment than the North of Dorchester (DOR15) site.
- The site across the road (Option W2 in the Issues and Options Document) was initially put forward with the potential for 70-80 homes, but was rejected even though it would barely be seen. This would be better than the field next to the CG Fry site at Nottingham Lane. This site goes right up a hill, and will be plainly visible. If reduced, it could still leave a green space to separate the housing scheme from Nottingham.

General Comments

- Why is there no map available and why did you not put housing all the way up alongside the new road?