

From: David Nash

Sent: 12 July 2025 10:09

To:

Subject: Melbury Abbas and Cann Common Neighbourhood Plan - Site 1g. Southbank Farm, Cann Common

Dear Sirs,

Please forgive this direct approach.

Having had extensive discussions with the Melbury Abbas and Cann Common Parish Council, in a stop start-process over many years including meetings with a sub-committee of the PC to ensure clarity regarding the feasible development mix, regarding the Southbank Farm Site (emerging allocation 1g. in the Reg 16 Draft NP), the landowner Mr Read has been focussed on preparing a planning application for the site following a community consultation event facilitated by the PC in October 2024. Despite being a key stakeholder in delivering the most significant housing-led allocation in the draft NP the landowner was not consulted directly on the Reg 16 Draft version and, regrettably, missed the general Regulation 16 consultation when the process switched from Parish to Dorset Council.

It is noted that both the Council's Response to the Regulation 16 Consultation (Representation number 10) and the Letter from the Examiner 2 July 2025 (points 6a)-c)) seek clarification of the development proposals at Southbank Farm, Cann Common and in particular the inference at policy 1g(iv), and arguably in our opinion preamble text at paragraph 96 of the Reg16NP, about the housing mix and the village hall component of the development.

This email is therefore submitted for information and clarification from the landowner's perspective.

The development proposal, which was understood to be agreed with the PC previously, is as follows:

- 10 new dwellings (there are existing houses on the site fronting the B3081 which are to be retained too) of which 50% of the new dwellings (5 dwellings) would be affordable (final type and detail to be resolved at the planning application stage but with a local connection as the priority occupation secured via a s106 'cascade' mechanism, or similar, to reflect Registered Provider interest at the point of commencement and/or transfer);
- Provision of a serviced parcel of land only in the south part of the site reserved for future provision of a village hall by the Parish Council to be secured at the planning application stage via mutually acceptable s106 obligations. The construction of a village hall being subject to the Parish Council obtaining appropriate funding at a future point in time because the development cannot viably support a £1Million plus facility of that type but would be giving the land

on a long lease for £1 which can be drawn down when the village hall construction is certain;

- Provision of a suitably surfaced car park within the development zone in the northern part of the site triggered in association with the housing development, secured via s106 obligations at the planning application stage with mutually acceptable timing triggers, for public use, initially for access to the proposed public open space on the southern part of the site but in future having the scope to serve the village hall when the PC is able to construct such a facility, and
- Provision of an area of public open space within the residual southern section of the site to be designed and detailed at the planning application stage (subject to BNG, ecology, landscape and visual considerations) and secured and managed via mutually acceptable s106 obligations.

A trail of previous communication between the landowner and the PC is attached to confirm the nature of our discussions to-date and reinforcing our position that it is 10 new dwellings, 50% of which would be affordable, and that only a serviced site for a future village hall is proposed here.

Policy 1g. needs to be refined through the basic conditions examination to reflect the agreed nature of the development and to avoid ambiguity. We would also ask for further clarification in the NP about the status and intent of Figure 18 because the underlying layout and the coloured use zones should be only seen as a broad-brush preliminary approach to inform the detailed planning application stage not a definitive plan. There will need to be some flexibility in the final design and layout submitted at the planning stage to accommodate the allocation but also respond appropriately to emerging more site-specific considerations from detailed survey work like, for instance, hedgerow and bat corridors / buffers, access design etc.

Should the Inspector find that additional housing need exists above that currently proposed in the Draft NP then Southbank Farm could accommodate some or all of that difference if required.

Thank you for considering these points and if I can be of further assistance please contact me.

Kind regards,

David

David Nash