

**Carl Stott**

---

**From:** Carl Stott  
**Sent:** 01 November 2021 15:56  
**To:** 'Ann Scott'  
**Subject:** RE: Land off Leconfield Road, Nanpantan (P/20/2199/2)  
**Attachments:** GL1028 - Land at Leconfield Road - Rebuttal to Local Objections September 2021 - 29-09-2021.pdf; RSE\_4942\_L2\_V1.pdf

Ann

I can confirm we have already had sight of the three LCC consultation responses attached to your email of 22<sup>nd</sup> October, at the time they were originally uploaded onto the Council's website. Thank you for forwarding them over anyway.

As previously mentioned, we have reviewed the lengthy comments submitted by the Nanpantan Ward Residents Group in September 2021, with particular regard to landscape impact and ecology, in addition to the latest comments from the Council's Ecologist and, in response, we attach the following documents:

- Rebuttal to Local Landscape Objections from September 2021 (by Golby + Luck - 29<sup>th</sup> September 2021 - GL1028); and
- Rebuttal to the Julian Jones Ecology Services Report from September 2021 and comments from CBC's Ecologist dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2021 (by RammSanderson - 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2021 - ref: RSE\_4942\_L2\_V1).

Further to the former, you may have noted that MPs recently voted against a House of Lords' amendment to the Environment Bill that would have seen a minimum 50m buffer around Ancient Woodland near new development - this instead remaining at 15m.

With regards the latter, we must emphasise that, whilst reference is made to the effects of dog walking on the site, any such activity has been unauthorised and not permitted by the landowner, therefore representing trespass. The landowner does not accept any trespass onto the site, including dog walking, or otherwise. The site remains private land and has been labelled as such on numerous occasions, with signage to this effect consistently removed by local residents.

With regards the comments of CBC's Ecologist, and further to the conclusions of RammSanderson in the attached rebuttal, we do not consider it appropriate that a further BIA is undertaken prior to the determination of the application for outline permission and our client also disputes the robustness of the CBC Ecologist's insistence on use of the Warwickshire Metric when it clearly does not form part of the Government's preparations of the Environment Bill.

I will try to catch up with you in the next day or so to establish your recommendation for the application.

Kind Regards

Carl Stott

Director

**nineteen47**  
CHARTERED TOWN PLANNERS  
& URBAN DESIGNERS