

Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Policies

Cross-Mapping of the Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan Policies against the Proposed Policies in the Pre-Submission Version of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan

Background

With the formation of Weymouth Town Council due to local government reorganisation it was agreed to create a Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan (W) and that the Weymouth Neighbourhood Area would incorporate the whole of the Weymouth Town Council area including that covered by the 'made' Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan (SPNP). The Weymouth Town Council has publicly stated the intent to "include and respect" the SPNP policies in the proposed plan for the whole of Weymouth, however it is not stated how this is to be achieved, this matter being left to the W Steering Group.

Two options appear to exist for incorporation of the SPNP policies.

- (a) A separate section (or "Chapter") within the W containing the SPNP policies with reference to the 'made' SPNP document.
- (b) A Chapter or Appendix identifying the policy areas where the W policies replicate and/or enhance the SPNP policies and can therefore supercede them and for those policy areas which are not adequately addressed the inclusion of the SPNP policy reworded as necessary to apply to Weymouth as a whole. This approach has been used in similar situations with Local Plans e.g. North Dorset as discussed with Dorset Council.

In the interests of simplicity, a fully integrated community approach, clarity of ownership, ease of monitoring and extension of the plan period, option (b) is suggested as the most logical and realistic approach subject to formal public consultation.

In the event that the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan is not 'made' the SPNP will continue in its current form and be subject to review by Weymouth Town Council as the Qualifying Body.

The cross-mapping exercise below is designed to inform option (b) which will ultimately be subject to a decision of the Weymouth Town Council as the Qualifying Body and having regard to public feedback following statutory consultation.

Table X:

SPNP Policy	W Policy	Comments
BNE1: Protection and Enhancement of Wildlife Habitat in relation to New Development		
<p>BNE1.1 Development proposals that protect or enhance wildlife habitat on-site and along their boundaries will generally be supported.</p>	<p>Policy W05: Ecological Impact of Development</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development proposals should comply with national legislation and the requirements of the Local Planning Authority and, unless statutorily exempt, must contribute to the enhancement of the natural environment by providing for a substantial Biodiversity Net Gain. 2. All development proposals should consider potential ecological impacts at an early stage in their design consistent with best practice guidance and identify an array of suitable habitats and other measures (e.g. bat tiles, swift bricks, bird boxes, retention of hedges and other heritage boundaries, green roofs, rainwater gardens etc) to be included in the development 	<p>Fully aligns and strengthens the SPNP policy. W05 policy is more robust and calls for substantial biodiversity net gain (BNG) given that the government Environment Act 2021 which was introduced after the SP policy was made states a 10% minimum BNG requirement.</p>
<p>BNE1.2 Development proposals will demonstrate that they have sought to protect existing wildlife habitat and should seek opportunities to enhance wildlife habitat and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. Where they fail to address wildlife habitat protection, development proposals will not be supported.</p>	<p>Policy W05: as above Policy W03: Wildlife Habitats and Areas</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development proposals that are likely to have a significant adverse effect on the integrity of habitats of local and national importance and the wild flora and fauna in those areas that form part of the ecological network will not be supported unless unavoidable due to exceptional circumstances and the proposed mitigation measures are proportionate to the status of the site and satisfy the requirements of the local planning authority. 2. Where impacts to biodiversity are identified, proposals must apply the mitigation hierarchy and do everything possible to firstly avoid then to minimise impacts. Compensation measures will be permissible as a last resort only. 3. Proposals to protect or restore any existing features, or to create new features of wildlife habitat ,particularly where these form linkages between habitats within or beyond the site, will be encouraged and supported. 	<p>W05 policy strengthens the biodiversity net gain element of the SPNP policy by quantifying it in line with recent legislation. W03 also ensures that biodiversity enhancement measures are introduced that are proportionate to the ecological status of the site based upon a site specific species and habitat ecological evaluation and application of the 'mitigation hierarchy'.</p>
<p>BNE1.3 Development will not lead to or cause serious risk of environmental harm to the</p>	<p>Policy W04: Wildlife Corridors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All development proposals impacting the areas recognised as Wildlife Corridors on 	<p>Aligns with and strengthens the SPNP policy through an extended corridor in</p>

SPNP Policy	W Policy	Comments
<p>Green Corridor in Sutton Poyntz which follows the River Jordan and its tributaries.</p>	<p>Map 9 should meet the requirements of the Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Wherever appropriate, development proposals should demonstrate they take the opportunity to enhance and extend the network of Wildlife Corridors as a means of mitigating development impact with a focus on increasing biodiversity, wildlife value and general amenity value of these corridors. 3. Where Wildlife Corridors are disrupted as an unavoidable consequence of adjacent or nearby development, developers will be required to minimise the impact and to carry out remedial action in accordance with a scheme agreed with the Local Planning Authority. 	<p>line with the DERC ecological maps and supports the same underlying principles of applying the Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol. It also proposes enhanced Biodiversity Net Gain requirements for developments adjacent to wildlife corridors. It extends the green corridor along the River Jordan to Bowleaze Cove giving the benefit of connectivity with other areas in line with the SPNP intent. It could be seen as being more restrictive on development as the whole of the residential area is covered on the evidence source map compared to the SPNP green corridor map.</p>
<p>BNE1.4 All development proposals within the area defined as the Green Corridor that meet the requirements of the Dorset Biodiversity Appraisal Protocol, will be expected to include a Biodiversity Appraisal and Biodiversity Mitigation and Environmental Plan.</p>	<p>Policy W04 as above applies.</p>	<p>Fully aligns with requirements in W04 above noting the more extensive area covered by wildlife corridors and the enhanced connectivity..</p>
<p>BNE2: Local Green Spaces</p>		
<p>The sites shown on Maps 3 and 3a are designated as Local Green Spaces and afforded additional protection due to their demonstrable value to the local community in terms of their recreation or beauty or wildlife or historic value.</p>	<p><i>Policy W10 Local Green Spaces The areas listed in Schedule 1 and shown on Map 12 and as defined on the accompanying Inset Maps at Appendix B are designated as Local Green Spaces. Development proposals in the designated Local Green Spaces will be managed in accordance with national policy for Green Belts."</i></p>	<p><i>Aligns with the NPPF. Each of the 7 Sutton Poyntz sites are included in Schedule 1 and so given equivalent protection to the SPNP. The caveats in W10 supporting text align with the intent of the SPNP and comply with the NPPF requirements.</i></p>

SPNP Policy	W Policy	Comments
Policy BNE3: Tree Preservation		
<p>Development proposals should retain and protect existing trees and hedges which contribute to the distinctive character of the Neighbourhood Plan area or which contribute biodiversity value to the area. Where there is no practical alternative to the removal of such a tree it will be replaced with an indigenous species of a type appropriate to the location.</p>	<p>Policy W06: Trees, Woodlands, and Hedgerows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development proposals should avoid the loss of or damage to trees, woodland, orchards, or hedgerows that contribute positively to the character, biodiversity, and amenity of an area. 2. Development proposals which could result in loss or damage to ancient, protected, or veteran trees will not be supported. 3. Where loss or damage to trees, woodland, orchards, or hedgerows is unavoidable, development proposals must provide for appropriate replacement planting on the site with an indigenous species along with a method statement for the ongoing care and maintenance of that planting. The planting of new trees and hedgerows on the same basis will be supported. 4. Replacement planting should at least be on a two-for-one basis, adopt a 'right tree right place' approach and demonstrably increase the canopy cover on site consistent with an overall objective of a minimum 15% canopy cover over the plan period. 	<p>Fully aligns with the intent of SPNP policy and extends the scope to specifically include hedgerows and orchards. A 2:1 replacement ratio where there is unavoidable loss and a right tree right place policy align with the SPNP policy intent. Now benefits from a maintenance plan.</p>
Policy GA1: Transport Needs and New Development		
Any new development that generates additional traffic flow should:		
<p>GA1.1 Seek to minimise dependency on private car usage.</p>	<p>Policy W07: Rights of Way, and Access to the Countryside</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public rights of way and other non-vehicular public access routes should be protected. Proposals for improvements or extensions to those that exist will be supported where there is no adverse or harmful impact on biodiversity. 2. New developments must ensure that existing footpaths, bridleways, cycleways and other rights of way are retained, or that any diversion would not result in an adverse impact on biodiversity, residential amenity, or the safety of the public. 3. Opportunities to connect major new developments via footpath, bridleway and cycleway links to the network of countryside and coastline footpaths should be maximised. <p>Policy W46 Transport and Travel</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development proposals should: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. identify the realistic level of traffic it is likely to generate and demonstrate, 	<p>Several policies are aligned to the intent of the SPNP to reduce car usage in favour of walking/cycling and public transport. Given the broad generic SPNP policy it is considered to be significantly strengthened by the more specific W policies.</p>

SPNP Policy	W Policy	Comments
	<p>through an appropriate assessment of traffic impacts, that any infrastructure or highways improvements necessary to mitigate the impact on the highway network have been identified and shall be delivered as part of the scheme;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. ii maximise Active Travel opportunities, by making appropriate connections to the walking and cycling network within the area, and particularly to local shops, schools and services; iii. support public transport schemes and infrastructure wherever possible. <p>2. Development that would give rise to unacceptable highway dangers and/or air pollution will not be supported.</p>	
	<p>Policy W47: Public Transport Development proposals that make public transport more accessible through improvements to the infrastructure and network such as interchange areas, travel linkages, bus stops / refuges and enhanced information provision and do not cause unacceptable harm to the surrounding area will be supported.</p>	
	<p>Policy W55: Public Spaces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development proposals that will enhance the public realm, such as streets, squares, pavements, through the provision of street furniture, planting, and appropriate scale signage, will be supported provided it is demonstrated through a design and access statement that the proposals will enhance the character, appearance, and sense of place in their immediate locality. 2. New or improved lighting should be limited, unobtrusive and energy efficient, and minimise light pollution. 3. Innovative design and art installations in the public realm is encouraged. 	<p>Lighting is well covered, more explicitly stated and aligns with the SPNP intent. W55 addresses the intent of the SPNP regarding character of footways - with the statement “<i>the proposals will enhance the character, appearance, and sense of place in their immediate locality.</i>”</p>
<p>GA1.2 Apply the hierarchy of roads users to identify suitable access routes</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>Policies align as above.</p>
<p>GA1.3 Provide suitable access links to existing pedestrian and cycle routes where such opportunities exist.</p>	<p>Policy W07: Rights of Way, and Access to the Countryside</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public rights of way and other non-vehicular public access routes should be protected. Proposals for improvements or extensions to those that exist will be supported where there is no adverse or harmful impact on biodiversity. 	<p>Policies W07 and W50 fully align with and support the intent of the SPNP and are stated in more detail. The inclusion of protections aligns with and strengthens the policy,</p>

SPNP Policy	W Policy	Comments
	<p>2. New developments must ensure that existing footpaths, bridleways, cycleways and other rights of way are retained, or that any diversion would not result in an adverse impact on biodiversity, residential amenity, or the safety of the public.</p> <p>3. Opportunities to connect major new developments via footpath, bridleway and cycleway links to the network of countryside and coastline footpaths should be maximised.</p> <p>Policy W50: Cycle Routes Development proposals to improve and extend existing cycle routes, to effect better segregation from vehicular traffic, and to link them to the wider network of walking and cycling routes (see Map 29) will be supported.</p>	
Policy GA.2: On-street Traffic Congestion		
<p>GA 2.1 Development proposals that do not comply as a minimum with the off-street parking criteria contained within the Bournemouth Poole and Dorset Car Parking Study will not be supported.</p>	<p>Policy W48: Off-Street Parking</p> <p>1. Development should be designed to discourage additional on-street parking on the existing road network.</p> <p>2. Development proposals that do not comply as a minimum with Dorset Council's off-street car and cycle parking guidance will not be supported.</p>	<p>W48 policy aligns – Policy W48 replicates SPNP and applies it as a single area wide policy.</p>
<p>GA2.2 Any development will be designed to discourage additional on-street parking on the existing road network, especially near junctions or where the road is narrow.</p>	<p>Policy W48 as above</p>	<p>As above</p>
Policy GA3: Impact on Traffic Density on Current Infrastructure		
<p>Proposals for new or improved transport infrastructure will be supported.</p>	<p>Policy W51: Traffic Impact</p> <p>1. Development proposals to reduce the volume and impact of motor vehicles including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. traffic calming and gateway treatments to deter non-local traffic in residential streets and visitor areas; ii. extending the areas of pedestrian and cycling priority in town, village, and neighbourhood centres; iii. establishing functioning Park and Ride facilities in appropriate locations; iv. campervan / motorhome overnight parking areas, which do not harm the character of the area, and 	<p>W51 policy aligns with the SPNP intent and broadens the scope appropriately given the need to consult with the public.</p>

SPNP Policy	W Policy	Comments
	v. the provision of dedicated cycle or public transport lanes will be supported provided they have been subject to consultation with the community.	
	Policy W33: Timing of Infrastructure Development should be phased logically and in tandem with the co-ordinated provision of infrastructure to help support sustainable growth and ensure that an unacceptable strain is not placed on the existing infrastructure.	W33 policy aligns with the SPNP intent and broadens the scope appropriately to a wider range of infrastructure.
Policy GA.4: Pollution Reduction		
The provision of adequate ultra-low emission vehicle charging facilities for all new residential units will be supported.	Policy W49: Vehicle Charging Facilities 1. Development proposals which provide parking facilities, or which are likely to generate vehicle movements or vehicle ownership will be expected to integrate the provision of infrastructure to enable the charging of electric or other ultralow emission vehicles into the design and layout of the development in accordance with the current requirements of the local planning authority. 2. The provision of public electric vehicle charging outlets in suitable locations will be supported.	W49 policy aligns with SPNP policy and intent and extends to the provision of publicly accessible charging outlets as an area wide policy. Implementation of either policy is determined by the Local Plan policy as updated.
Policy HE.1: Protecting Archaeology		
Development proposals on previously undeveloped land should be accompanied by the results of an archaeological assessment of the development site.	Policy W45: Heritage Assets 1. Development proposals should demonstrate, where relevant, that they respect and will cause no harm to heritage assets and their setting. 2. Development proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets or the 11 designated Conservation Areas shown on Map 28 should be accompanied by proportionate historic environment heritage impact assessments, demonstrating how any harm would be avoided, minimised, or mitigated. 3. Development proposals on previously undeveloped land should be accompanied by the results of an archaeological assessment of the development site. 4. Where appropriate, development should take opportunities within the setting of any designated and non-designated heritage assets to better reveal and enhance their significance.	Strengthens and incorporates SPNP policy in full as paragraph 3.
Policy H&P1: Building Style and Design		

SPNP Policy	W Policy	Comments
<p>H&P1.1 Development will seek to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, taking into account of traditional building style and materials.</p>	<p>Policy W44: Design</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All proposals for new development should demonstrate high quality design, use of materials and detail, which harmonise with the recognised local character and context; also, having regard to prevailing scale, massing and density and the development principles set out elsewhere in the Neighbourhood Plan. 2. Within conservation areas and in proximity to heritage assets, development proposals are expected to demonstrate how they will positively conserve and enhance the unique characteristics of the area. 3. Innovative design approaches will be supported where they enhance the character, function and visual amenity of the local area. 4. Development should not increase the risk of flooding and/or exacerbate existing drainage problems and should be designed to maximise the retention of surface water on the development site and to minimise run-off. 5. Development proposals within the Dorset National Landscapes (DNL), must be in accordance with the great weight afforded to their landscape and scenic beauty in national policy and the requirements of the DNL Management Plan for high quality design, materials and standards of workmanship. 	<p>W44 covers the policy and intent of the SPNP policy in full with particular reference to Clause 2 Other clauses align with the overall SPNP policies.</p>
<p>H&P1.2 Subject to H&P1.4 below New development within the village should take account of nearby buildings style and materials, as described for five defined character areas which have their own design guidance described in the accompanying text below. The five character areas, shown on Maps 8 are: Historic Core West Side Plaisters Lane North Gateway Puddledock South</p>	<p>Policy W44 as above. Policy W15: Extensions and Alterations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extensions, and alterations to a building that-require planning consent, should be designed to the highest sustainability standards and reflect the character of nearby buildings and their setting. This will require particular attention to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. the choice of materials ii. the scale of development including roof heights, and iii. layout within the plot 2. Measures to improve the sustainability of a building, including retrofitting to increase its energy efficiency and the appropriate use of micro-renewables, are encouraged. 	<p>As policy W44 is a general Weymouth wide policy it is not as specific as the SPNP policy. Reference should therefore be made to the Annex to Appendix D in the submission version of the whWich contains the SPNP Area Character Assessment map and key. Sub-section 9.22 of the supporting text to the W does however make clear reference to this - <i>“The Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan</i></p>

SPNP Policy	W Policy	Comments
	<p>3. Proposals should demonstrate due regard for the design guidance relating to the location of the development.</p>	<p><i>recognises the value of taking nearby building style and materials into account and the recognition of local character areas.”</i></p> <p><i>This is also referenced with a hyperlink to the SPNP in 2.13</i></p> <p><i>- “The Sutton Poyntz Neighbourhood Plan identified five distinct ‘character areas’ within the confines of the village of Sutton Poyntz. A similar tapestry of conspicuous character areas exists throughout the Weymouth area.”</i></p>
<p>H&P1.3 New development and extensions or alterations to existing buildings will not detract from the local character of the DNL.</p>	<p>As above and Clause 5 the final paragraph of W44 Design “Development proposals within the Dorset National Landscapes (DNL), must be in accordance with the great weight afforded to their landscape and scenic beauty in national policy and the requirements of the DNL Management Plan for high quality”</p>	<p>Aligns and provides equivalent or higher level of protection to SPNP policy.</p>
<p>H&P1.4 Development will be supported which enhances the character and appearance of the village at locations where existing development has not been in a style that is complementary or sympathetic to the area’s traditional building styles.</p>	<p>As W44 Design above</p>	<p>Aligns with the SPNP.</p> <p>SPNP Character Area map included as an Annex to Appendix D of the W. See also comments under 1.2 above.</p>
<p>Policy H&P2: Housing Numbers and Size</p>		
<p>H&P2.1 New residential development within the defined development boundary will normally be supported. This will lead to higher density and smaller homes within the defined development boundary.</p>	<p>Policy W14: Development Boundaries The defined development boundaries are shown in Map 16.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development on brownfield sites within the defined development boundary, shall be prioritised in the Development Plan. 2. Development proposals will be supported within the defined development boundaries subject to alignment with the strategic environmental objectives and targets of the Neighbourhood Plan and 	<p>W14 aligns with the SPNP policy and intent which also has to comply with the Local Plan provisions under SUS2.</p>

SPNP Policy	W Policy	Comments
	<p>conformity with relevant policies in the development plan.</p> <p>3. Outside of the defined development boundaries, development should be strictly controlled to safeguard the unique character, natural beauty, agricultural value, and environmental significance of countryside areas with the neighbourhood area.</p>	
<p>H&P2.2 There is a preference for smaller (2 or 3 bedroom) homes to meet local needs. These include providing for families, for older residents wishing to downsize, and for young people wishing to continue living in the neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Policy W17: Housing Mix New residential development should provide or contribute to a mix of housing tenure types and sizes to help maintain mixed, balanced and inclusive communities within the neighbourhood plan area. The proposed housing mixes on major sites should be based on an up-to-date local housing needs analysis.</p>	<p>Policy W17 fully aligns with the SPNP – see supporting text for W17 regarding 2-3 bedroom homes being the preference for Weymouth as a whole as identified in the Housing Needs Analysis.</p>
H&P3: Key Views		
<p>H&P 3.1 The following views into, out of and within the village are designated as Key Views: 1. The iconic view of the village’s Mill Pond 2. From the Mill Pond towards White Horse Hill 3. From the Sutton Poyntz stone towards the junction outside the Cart Shed 4. North from the path below Chalbury 5. From the Beacon below West Hill 6. From Margaret’s Seat above Spring Bottom 7. From Winslow</p>	<p>Policy W13: Panoramas, Vistas and Views 1.</p> <p>1. Development proposals should respect important public panoramas, vistas and views. Development proposals likely to impact on the area’s important panoramas, vistas, and views, shown on Maps 15A to 15F inclusive and defined in the text in Table V.</p> <p>2. Development proposals likely to impact on the area’s important panoramas, vistas and views should demonstrate due regard to the local design guidance whenever available.</p>	<p>Policy W13 incorporates SPNP Key Views with inclusion of the map in full.</p>
<p>H&P3.2 New development should respect the key views. Any development which would obstruct or significantly detract from them will not be supported.</p>	<p>As Policy W13 above.</p>	<p>Policy W13 aligns with SPNP policy and intent and includes the relevant map. It updates it by making reference to any local design guidance.</p>
Policy H&P4: Flood Prevention		
<p>Development proposals will be required to make use of sustainable drainage design features including porous (permeable) surfaces and <i>demonstrate that the volume and rate of surface water</i></p>	<p>Policy W34: Sustainable Development</p> <p>1. All new development should seek to achieve high standards of sustainability, and demonstrate that design, construction, and operation aligns with the strategic environmental objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>SuDS policy is addressed in W34 (i) and the policy statement (italicised) incorporated in the supporting text to W34 in full.</p>

SPNP Policy	W Policy	Comments
<p><i>run-off onto adjacent land and traffic routes is either at a lower or equal level to that prior to the development.</i></p>	<p>2. New development will be supported provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. sustainable construction methods, water conservation measures, Suitable Drainage Design and permeable surfaces are integrated into the development proposals; ii. energy conservation measures and renewable energy technology predominate; ii. development will not result in unacceptable levels of light, noise, air, or water pollution; iii. provision is made for access to the fastest possible broadband and other communication connections to all new properties; and iv. adequate provision is made for the safe and secure parking and storage of bikes and electric vehicles consistent with the prevailing standard of the Local Planning Authority. <p>3. The retrofitting of energy conservation measures and renewable energy technology is supported. Where planning permission is required, measures and installations should be designed to minimise visual impact and nuisance to adjoining uses. The sensitive retrofitting of historic buildings and buildings in Conservation Areas should follow the guidance provide by Historic England.</p>	<p>The broader policy requirements align with the overall intent of the SPNP.</p>
<p>Policy SR1: Protection of Community Assets</p>		
<p>SR 1.1 Development proposals which would result in the loss of the following buildings as community assets in Sutton Poyntz will not normally be supported. The Mission Hall Springhead Public House</p>	<p>Policy W52: Existing Community Buildings</p> <p>1. Development proposals, including change of use, which results in the permanent loss of local community buildings, hubs, or structures (including where the most recent lawful use was as a community use), will not be supported unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. it can be demonstrated following discussions with the community, that there is no local need for the facility; ii. it is no longer viable or practical to continue the existing use; ii. a suitable replacement facility is provided in an equally accessible location to serve the local community, and iii. the community has been offered an opportunity at a realistic current use price, for its acquisition or operation. 	<p>W52 aligns with the SPNP policy and lists the Mission Hall in the supporting table.</p>

SPNP Policy	W Policy	Comments
	<p>2. Extensions and improvements to existing community buildings will be supported if they are intended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. diversify and support the continuation of the existing community use (for example the change of part of the site to maintain the original use in a viable form); ii. help meet identified community needs through the more effective use of sites / premises, while maintaining or improving the existing community service provision (for example through a community hub), and iii. improve accessibility. <p>Policy W53: Public Houses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development proposals that involve the loss of a public house with heritage, cultural, economic, or social value must demonstrate that its use as a public house is unviable, and its retention has been fully explored. A period of at least 12 months vacancy should precede any change of use application, which should be accompanied by authoritative evidence of continued marketing over at least a 18-month period and no market interest in the building as a public house forthcoming, nor interest from local communities for the space to be used for alternative community uses. 2. The loss of part of a public house, including cellar space, car parking or other facilities complementary to its operation as a public house, will be resisted where it would adversely affect such operation. 3. Development proposals having an adverse impact on the existing operation and/or viability of a public house will be strongly resisted. 	<p>W53 on public houses aligns with SR1.1 for the Springhead pub.</p>
<p>SR1.2 Change of use of these facilities will only be supported where it has been clearly demonstrated that: - there is no local need for them or they are no longer viable; and no appropriate alternative community use is needed or would be viable.</p>	<p>As Policies 52 and 53 above</p>	<p>W52 and W53 align with the SPNP policy on the Mission Hall and Springhead pub.</p>
<p>SR 1.3 Proposals designed to modernise or extend</p>	<p>As Policy W52 above</p>	<p>W52 aligns with the SPNP policy and lists</p>

SPNP Policy	W Policy	Comments
community facilities for public use, including increasing their capacity, will generally be supported.		the Mission Hall in the supporting table.
Policy SR2: Enhancement of Community Recreation Facilities		
Proposals to use land within, or adjacent to the historic centre of the village for recreational purposes, such as a public children’s play area, will be supported.	<p>Policy W54: Sports and Recreation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The outdoor sports and recreation facilities and spaces identified in the Table D will be protected except in the following circumstances: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. the applicant satisfactorily demonstrates that there is no continuing demand for the facility, and it is not possible to use the facility for other sports and recreation activity, or ii. alternative provision of at least an equivalent quality, size, suitability and convenience within the neighbourhood area is made. 2. Development proposals which would lead to a reduction in the size or quality of these facilities and spaces will only be supported where the existing facilities are re-provided to a better quality or quantity in an accessible location. 3. Development proposals for improved, new and/or additional sports and recreation facilities and spaces will be supported where they: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. respond to a demonstrable need and demand for the proposed facility; ii. meet up-to-date standards of design set by the appropriate agency or governing body; iii. provide community access; and iv. demonstrate how they will be effectively managed and maintained in perpetuity. 4. Development proposals should demonstrate engagement with the local community to ensure proposals have taken into account the views and aspirations of the local community. 	The scope of W54 as a Weymouth wide policy covers the more specific SPNP policy requirement. Although not relating to the precise SPNP location the conditions of Clause 4 of the W policy, regarding consideration of local community views will ensure this policy will be respected.

CONCLUSIONS

The Sutton Poyntz and Weymouth (submission version) Neighbourhood Plan policies do not appear to conflict and in general terms it is reasonable to conclude that the Weymouth policies adequately cover the scope and intent of the Sutton Poyntz policies and in fact enhance them significantly in a number of areas. The latter policies are either replicated by the proposed Weymouth policies or are superceded with policies of equal or enhanced effectiveness, both in terms of the policy and the policy intent. Further reference in this respect is made to Appendix D (including the Annex) of the submission version of the Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan.

Weymouth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

October 2023

Revised December 2024