

**Carl Stott**

---

**From:** Mark Pickrell <Mark.Pickrell@charnwood.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 09 February 2022 13:19  
**To:** Carl Stott  
**Subject:** RE: Leconfield Road, Nanpantan - P/20/2199/2

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Carl,

Thanks for the comments.

Noted re. HoTs – these have been updated to correctly reflect the comments from the OS team.

Agreed that a mechanism will be included through the S106 to cover any pro rata contribution based on final dwelling numbers.

Re. conditions and as discussed yesterday, I am of the view that the detail of the point of access has been covered by the current description and that detail of access to plots would be covered under RM as part of layout details. Nevertheless, I have added access to the condition wording and put it forward to seniors and our legal team for review.

I do not have a record on public or back office systems of us having received the updated Arb Survey, TS and FRA and, unfortunately, the link in your email is blocked by our IT systems.

We can receive docs up to 20mb via email or WeTransfer as an alternative but I am loathed to add new documents to the public case file at this stage when consultation has been based on previous versions and responses have raised no objections. I would not want there to be any issues raised at this stage that result in a need to reconsult or to accept the docs and then try and explain the differences between versions when there are so many other issues raised by local residents with the risk that it would further complicate members understanding of the relevant issues when they are likely to want to show rigour in their consideration.

If you want to submit the docs as a point of record for officers information only and for them not to be subject to consultation and not to be referenced in the decision notice then I would accept that but otherwise, its my view that the current proposals show an implementable scheme to which there are no objections and the application is progressing to committee on that basis. If there are no changes to the details of the proposals other than minor updates then this could be managed as part of submissions to discharge conditions if approved, or potentially covered as part of a SoCG through appeal.

I appreciate that this has been raised previously, but the issue of land ownership and notification has been raised again. I accept that cert b has been signed with the owners with LCC notified and that there were issues with the red line being extended at the request of previous officers. I accept that the application is valid based on the information available and that the onus is on the applicant to provide an accurate representation of ownership. However, NWRG have suggested that within the extended red line there is an area of land that is unregistered. No evidence has been provided by them to demonstrate this though I expect that submission of any evidence may be timed to delay or block determination of the application. To be able to head off potential issues at committee and resolve this as quickly as possible please can you provide a land registry search which shows land ownership within the red line (as amended) and demonstrates that the correct notice has been served?

If no confirmation is available and NWRG submit evidence to show that the incorrect notice has been served then CBC will be required to take this into account and it could delay any resolution from committee. If any new

notification needs to be served then it would be preferable to get this underway asap but please confirm either way so that an informed response can be presented to committee.

Kind regards,

Mark

Mark Pickrell  
Principal Planning Officer – Strategic Development  
Mobile: 07852720913  
Email: mark.pickrell@charnwood.gov.uk

---

**From:** Carl Stott <carl.stott@nineteen47.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 08 February 2022 17:30  
**To:** Mark Pickrell <Mark.Pickrell@charnwood.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** RE: Leconfield Road, Nanpantan - P/20/2199/2

Mark

Thank you for your email. As subsequently discussed this afternoon, I have the following initial comments:

### s.106 Heads of Terms

- Outdoor sports facilities should refer to 0.19ha rather than 0.81ha, as per Cara Wild's consultation responses.
- Allotments should refer to 0.02ha rather than 0.1ha, as per Cara Wild's consultation responses.
- Many of the various monetary contributions are based on 30no. dwellings. You advised that the s.106 Agreement will include a mechanism to recalculate these if fewer dwellings were proposed at the reserved matters stage.

### Conditions

- **Condition 2:** This should technically also require submission of details of Access as a reserved matter, as we are only seeking consent at the outline stage for the Point of Access.
- **Condition 3:** The up-to-date Tree Survey is that referenced P2164/0521/02/17/08/21 Final v3, as was submitted on 26<sup>th</sup> August 2021. The up-to-date Access Arrangement drawing is that referenced ADC1905-DR-100 Rev P5 (same road layout as per Rev P4 but with the amended plot layout shown in the background that aligns with the Rev F Illustrative Masterplan).
- **Condition 9:** The up-to-date Access Arrangement drawing is that referenced ADC1905-DR-100 Rev P5 (same road layout as per Rev P4 but with the amended plot layout shown in the background that aligns with the Rev F Illustrative Masterplan).

I also mentioned to you that the Transport Statement and Flood Risk Assessment/Drainage Strategy Report had previously been updated, simply so as to align with the Rev F Illustrative Masterplan (no changes to the road layout or drainage strategy respectively - just to show include the updated illustrative layout in the background). I'm not sure these were picked up on by the previous two case officers, so I have included them in this link for your ease of reference, along with the aforementioned Access Arrangement drawing and the Tree Survey: <https://we.tl/t-eJ0gmRT9bn>. I mentioned that it would be best for reference to be made to the appropriate documentation should the application end up at an appeal.

I'm awaiting comments from my client on the Heads of Terms/Conditions and will revert to you with any further comments as soon as possible but trust the above is helpful for now.

Please let me know if any queries.

Kind Regards