

[REDACTED]

56 PEVEREL ROAD
IFIELD
CRAWLEY
WEST SUSSEX
RH11 0TH

Jason Hawkes
Horsham District Council
Planning Department
Albery House
Springfield Road
Horsham
West Sussex
RH12 2GB

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

23 January 2026

Dear Mr Hawkes,

Notes and observations on the Environmental Statement (Chapters 1 - 10) and objection to the overall Hybrid Planning application DC/25/1312

I have thoroughly read the sections of the Environmental Statement which are of interest to me and about which I have a certain level of knowledge.

I was originally going to open this paragraph with the observation that the authors of this document are clearly far more competent than those behind the DAS and DC documents, but then I got to Chapter Ten, where the author has had what could be generously described as a bad day!

The document is riddled with a surprising number of simple errors pertaining to the site and its surrounds that are easily noticed by even a minimally observant eye. Whilst many of my observations are points of pedantry which, on their own, have no bearing on the application, the errors demonstrate a lack of care taken when preparing the Environmental Statement alongside an obvious lack of local knowledge. Designing and mitigating a development of this size without a good level of local knowledge clearly results in a poor design with inadequate mitigation. There are also a few points of contention; things that are being promised without any substance to the promises, things that are being forbidden without any thought being given as to the consequences of doing so, sly use of words that the Planning Officer should be aware of so as not to be made a fool of come determination time, and proposals that make little sense to the rational and pragmatic who have an understanding of human behaviour.

Of greater concern, and something that should be carefully considered by the Planning Officer, is that if the producers of the Environmental Statement have got so many simple things wrong then how can the Planning Officer and general public have any confidence that the more complex topics relating to the application, topics that require a higher level of professional expertise than the Planning Officer and general public may possess are correct? For example, how can we be sure that the results of environmental surveys, traffic surveys, long term detrimental effects etc. have been interpreted and represented correctly within the application?

My summary will highlight these errors, along with any other observations I have made concerning the validity of this application. These notes are based on the original DC but,

at the time of writing, there have been no subsequent versions submitted to the application.

Section 1.2.4 claims that the M23 is 3.7km to the SOUTH-EAST. It is 3.7 miles (6km) to the east, or 4.3 MILES (almost 7km) to the south east, by car from the proposed CWMMC/Charlwood Road junction. Notwithstanding the strange route, demonstrating that the author has little local knowledge, how can the numbers be so wrong?

Section 1.2.6 claims that the Russ Hill ridge is 1km to the north west of the site. At its nearest point, the ridge line of Russ Hill is c.2.3km from the site; another demonstration of the authors ignorance of the locality I suspect they mean the 'Rusper Ridge', which commences c.1km away at Burlands Copse.

Section 1.4.7 (bullet point 1) refers to the Nov 2015 Horsham District Planning Framework which does not include West of Ifield in its strategic allocations. A subsequent document produced by HDC, the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment: Housing Report 2018, clearly states that This site would be contrary to policies 1, 4 and 26 of the HDPF in particular. The site is therefore assessed as 'Not Currently Developable'. Nothing material has changed since this document was produced, so it must be determined that the site remains 'Not Currently Developable'.

Section 1.4.7 (bullet point 3) refers to the Rusper Neighbourhood Plan, a document which was approved by a margin of almost 9 to 1 by the voting electorate within Rusper Parish and specifically excludes West of Ifield from development.

Section 1.4.10 refers to HDC's discredited draft local plan which was rejected by the Planning Inspector mainly due to the inclusion of West of Ifield.

Section 1.4.12 quotes dates that are contradictory. The recommendation to withdraw the discredited Local Plan was delivered on 4 April 2025, not 2024.

Table 2.1 (page 2-9, final section) also refers to the two documents mentioned above (Section 1.4.7, bullet points 1 & 3) which determine that this site should not be developed.

Table 2.1 (page 2-13, third section) quite arrogantly/dismissively addresses the concerns of CBC by stating that *the Site does not include any land within Crawley Borough Council) and therefore the Crawley Borough Local Plan (2024) is not part of the Development Plan for determining this planning application.* That doesn't mean the proposed development will not have detrimental effects on Crawley. In fact, while HDC benefit from the Council Tax from 3,000 proposed new homes, the CBC area will bear the weight of infrastructure stress caused by the development. Whilst this is an inconvenient truth to both the applicant and HDC, it is a truth nonetheless and the concerns and objections of CBC must be given substantial weight when determining this application.

Table 2.1 (page 2-17, seventh section) erroneously states that *the Proposed Development may have some effects on local health and education facilities albeit that the Proposed Development itself will provide appropriate levels of such facilities within the scheme.* This is not true. Unless the applicant is pledging to provide AND FUND IN PERPETUITY, then the proposed development will NOT provide health facilities because the applicant does not have the autonomy to do so. What the proposed development will provide is a small parcel of land for the local NHS Trust to build a health facility on if they wish to do so. As we have seen in other large scale local developments, they won't. I therefore call this statement out for what it is - A SHAMELESS DISTORTION OF THE REALITIES.

Section 3.3.5 (bullet point 2) states that *the Applicant is seeking to optimise the Site's potential in accordance with the adopted local plan.* Excellent news. As the adopted Local

Plan does not include West of Ifield, then it must be time for the applicant to pack up and go home.

Section 3.43 states that *the vast majority of the Site is within a fluvial Flood Zone 1 (< 0.1% annual chance of flooding), with areas of fluvial Flood Zone 2 (0.1% annual chance of flooding) and fluvial Flood Zone 3 (1% annual chance of flooding)*. What is the next level up, and why isn't it covered? A 1% annual chance of flooding, which is attributed to the highest rated flood zone on the site, equates to flooding happening once every hundred years. As I [REDACTED] have seen substantial, impassable, flooding around Ifield Brook MANY times over the course of the 40+ years that I have known the area well it is clear that a category of flooding has been omitted from the document. There are parts of the site, particularly behind Newstead Lodge close to where Ifield Brook meets the River Mole, that have a >20% chance of annual flooding.

As I complete this representation, on 23 Jan 2026, the areas around Ifield Brook to the west of St Margaret's Church and on the PRow to the west of Newstead Lodge have TWICE, within the last six weeks, been under several feet of water and are completely impassable. Access to West of Ifield by foot has been impossible. Twice this winter and at least once last winter does not constitute a once in a hundred years event. The Applicant's mitigation against the development adding to the existing traffic chaos in the area is the misguided belief that most people will cycle or walk everywhere (I told you before to stop laughing at the back!). As one of the proposed pedestrian routes from 'The Meadows' is often impassable (and the other proposed route has been rather wet too), this mitigation must be ignored by the Planning Officers and the assumption made that the vast majority of residents will be leaving and entering the estate by private car every day. In reality, most rational people, who aren't attempting to hoodwink others with fantasy & idealism, already know that they would be anyway, regardless of the paths accessibility.

Section 3.47 Ifield Wood is not to the east of the site, and is mentioned twice. I suspect the author meant (what the applicant refers to as) Ifield Brook Wood, but instead chose to take the lackadaisical approach to detail, care, accuracy and pride in their work that is a hallmark of this entire proposal.

Table 3.3 (page 3-10, second section) states that *the setting is protected by the proposed River Valley Park, and the retainment of the historic open parkland character around Ifield Court*. How can this be so, when it is proposed that the CWMMC cuts right through the historic OPEN parkland. How can the parkland possibly be retained and remain open with a dual carriageway and associated cycle/pedestrian tracks across the middle of it? A nonsense statement that treats the Planning Officer and general public with total contempt.

Section 4.10.2 The authors view as to what they consider to be the most important methods of public movement is not a view that will be shared by the vast majority of residents should the proposed development proceed. This view may curry favour with the climate lobby, but it in no way reflects day to day reality or the views of the majority, and to put private cars at the bottom of the list of priorities is to create wholly avoidable problems when reality bites. Don't allow the applicant to greenwash this application, for that is what these kind of statements are attempting to do.

Section 4.10.7 As I have stated in my other representations, the closure of Rusper Road to through traffic is not an acceptable option and the applicant MUST be instructed to find a viable solution to retain this important route without allowing access to and from the CWMMC, not least to enable those of us who reside in Rusper Parish, but on the wrong side of the applicants ill-considered road closure, to continue to access our parish centre

in an efficient manner without adding extra traffic to the already congested rat-run that is Ifield Green (and narrow Ifield Wood, if Rusper Road is to be closed both sides with no access from the CWMMC - the documents and verbal stories are contradictory on this point).

Section 4.10.22 With average household car ownership in West Sussex said to be 1.44 (census, 2021), the upper end of the proposed total number of parking spaces is just sufficient for the number of dwellings proposed, but takes no account of visitors. Surely even an organisation apparently as autocratic as the applicant aren't going to try to forbid potential residents of their doomed proposal to receive guests?

Section 4.13.4 I find it surprising that the proposed development will not be supplied with gas and would ask the applicant to justify why this should be so.

Section 4.13.6 I don't know who WSP are, but their calculation that the average water use will be 85 litres per resident, per day is complete fantasy. This low level of use is not achieved until a household has 6 residents (source <https://www.southernwater.co.uk/help-and-support/average-water-use-and-cost/>), but the same section says that there will be a population of 6,725 in 3,000 dwellings which equates to 2.24 residents per dwelling. Interpolating the data from Southern Water tells us that, on average, a dwelling with 2.24 residents will use around 320 litres a day, or just over 140 litres each. The applicant should be taken to task for misrepresentation of the facts in their application and the Planning Officer should take this to be a sign that nothing in these documents can be relied upon to be reflective of reality, or truthful, and should refuse the application on that basis.

Section 5.1.3 states that *it is not possible to predict in detail all of the specific environmental impacts and effects that may arise from the proposed works as detailed demolition and construction method statements and specifications have not yet been prepared by the lead construction contractor(s)*. If the applicant is unable to provide, or unable to admit to, the environmental impacts, then surely the Planning Authority is unable to grant permission for the development until the applicant has gone away and prepared properly? To give permission without this detail is inviting the detail, and so the mitigation, to be 'overlooked' in the future.

Section 5.8.5 states that the applicant will *undertake construction and post-construction monitoring to understand the effectiveness of the mitigation once implemented*. It's a little bit late at that stage to discover that, whilst it looked good on paper and fooled the Planning Officer at application stage, the mitigation was not at all effective.

Section 5.12.11 states that *there would be a policy of on-Site parking for personnel employed on the Proposed Development*. However, **Section 5.16.35** states that *forces, operatives and visitors will be encouraged to use a crew bus which will be made available to transport staff to and from nearby trains station during the day shift* and (it's hard not laugh whilst typing this sentence containing naïve ideological fantasy and Project manager BS bingo phraseology) *minimise car parking for construction works and encouraging them to travel by non-car modes through the induction focus* (sic). Section 5.12.11 shows up section 5.16.35 for what it is; more box-ticking fantasy and fiction added to the proposal in attempt to hoodwink the Planning Officer into believing that this is some kind of virtuous development. Hopefully the Planning Officer understands that tradesmen don't carry their tools to work on a bus, a train or a bicycle panier (they turn up in a van!) and, therefore, can see right through these underhand techniques and treat them with the contempt they deserve.

Section 5.13.11 states that *the proposed waste management strategy for the demolition waste for the entire Site has not been finalised and would be confirmed by the Principal Contractor*. Is the applicant not able draft the strategy from their *experience of developments of similar type and scale*, as they boast of being able to do in table 2-1 (page 2-4) when telling us how they have addressed a Scoping Opinion, and then oblige their *Principal Contractor* to meet the draft strategy?

Section 5.16.34 demonstrates either a lack of local knowledge or a lack of care, neither of which bode well for a successful development. Ifield Drive appears twice and some strange new road known as *Tangmere Drive* has been created.

Section 5.16.35 has a couple of points to address.

1. I don't understand what a *one-way vehicle movement* is. Well, I do, but in the context of a construction site what happens to the vehicle to cause it to not leave again?
2. There are no uncongested routes, which is one of the major problems with this proposal.

Section 6.10.8 The Applicant claims that there will be no loss of agricultural land, despite building on lots of agricultural land, purely on the basis that they could evict the custodians of said agricultural land and allow the land to lay fallow in order to claim that it is not agricultural land. It is disheartening that a public body funded by the taxpayer should stoop to these levels of deception in order to proceed with this proposed development, but it demonstrates to the Planning Officer that the application is so full of holes that the applicant deems no behaviour to be out of bounds when trying to plug them.

Section 10.8.1 Whilst I appreciate the Applicant's disclaimer that they have relied on data from third parties, this is not an acceptable excuse for inaccuracies when submitting an application for a development of this size. It is the responsibility of the Applicant to ensure that their application is correct and factual. They should not be allowed to abdicate responsibility for errors.

Section 10.9.3 describes the roundhouse discovered on the site in 2019 as being of a *Late Bronze Age date* when, in fact, the archaeological report authored by Sara Machin of Headland Archaeology and published in volume 159 of the Sussex Archaeological Collections (SAC), a report which the ES document cites in a footnote, dates it to the Middle Iron Age. Unimportant in the context of the proposed development, but worth the Planning Officer noting in the context of the disclaimer in Section 10.8.1 which states that the applicant relies on 3rd party data, but this suggests that they are incapable of transcribing that 3rd party data correctly. Have they transcribed other third party data correctly; wildlife surveys, traffic surveys; things that ARE important in the context of the proposed development?

Section 10.9.16

- HA027 & HA029 no longer exist, having fallen victim to the Great Storm of 1987.
- On the assumption that HA050 refers to the old lodge to Whitehall, this building is called Avebury Lodge, and has been called Avebury/Avebury Lodge since at least the 60s (when Whitehall still existed).

Section 10.10.24 makes wild claims of *predicted reductions in traffic flow on Rusper Road and Ifield Green* and suggests that there will be *a beneficial effect on what remains of the rural character of Ifield Village conservation area's medieval road network*. With Rusper Road and Ifield Green being the only route to Rusper, should the Planning

Officers make the mistake of permitting Rusper Road to be closed between Furlong Farm and Old Pound Cottage, who on earth has predicted there will be reduced traffic flows? This nonsense is beyond belief and should be treated with the disdain that it deserves.

Appendix 10.1, section 4.2.6

- LB15 is Harrow Cottage, not Harlow Cottage (the 1st of many erroneous references to this building). Transcribing third party data... (section 10.8.1)
- LB18 is Ifield Water Mill, not Ifield Water House. This error is also repeated later in the document. Transcribing third party data... (section 10.8.1)
- LB17/25/26/27/28. As advised under section 10.9.16, two of these buildings have been lost. They are mentioned many more times, but this will be my last reference to them.

Appendix 10.1, section 4.3 The list of previous archaeological works within the 500m study area excludes two quite successful investigations:

- That undertaken at Ifield Millpond during 2014 & 2015. Andrew Margetts' report can be viewed in SAC 158.
- That undertaken at 'The Maples' site (Land East of Emmanuel Cottage) with Wessex Archaeology's report being compiled in Feb 2017

In addition, the list of previous archaeological works within the site excludes the Headland Archaeology excavation of the Middle Iron Age Roundhouse (SAC 159) mentioned in Section 10.9.3. The cynical person might conclude that the exclusion of such an important on site discovery from this section within the context of the history of Ifield was deliberate...

Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.4 refers to a short tributary stream of the Ifield Brook which leads to the pond adjacent to Ifield Barn Theatre. Firstly, this doesn't lead to (or, indeed, away) from the pond. Secondly, this is the original, natural path of Ifield Brook (from before the millpond was created to power the finery forge in the 1560s) and later, once the 2nd iteration of Ifield Water Mill was constructed on the site of the current Mill, the Mill Race. It has only been within the last 80 years that a channel was dug between the race and (man-made section of) Ifield Brook (at roughly TQ245371) that the old sections have become paleochannels prone to flooding in the winter months.

Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.5 refers to paleochannels and an oxbow pond to the south of Ifield Court. These features are part of the original, natural path of the River Mole before a section was canalised into the path we see today sometime between 1795 & 1808. Other appendices to Chapter 10 recognise this as does section 4.5.28 of this appendix.

Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.19 states that the medieval Ifield Court (house) burnt down in 1806, and this is repeated numerous times in numerous appendices. I'm not sure which third party data source this has been taken from, but if the tithe map (surveyed 1839) is studied as a third party data source then it will be noted that the house existed and was occupied at that time. The OS map of 1870 shows no such building on the island, but does show the new Ifield Court outside of the moat. The building was therefore lost sometime between 1839 & 1870.

Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.21 states that *some of the forge cinder by-product can be seen in the mill stream which once powered the bellows*, but the mill stream didn't power the bellows - the forge (and the first mill) was not located where the current mill is and were powered by what is now Ifield Brook. A bit of research, such as reading the Millpond

excavation documented omitted from Appendix 10.1, section 4.3, would have drawn this to the authors attention.

Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.21 The Friends Meeting House is a Grade 1 listed building, not the Grade 2* quoted. It was constructed in 1676, not 1475 as quoted. The adjoining Meeting House Cottage is, however, Grade 2* and was constructed c.1475. The applicant and their agents need to pay a lot more attention to detail. I hope somebody is being as equally diligent with this application on the subjects I am not versed in, such as the flora and fauna aspect, because I suspect the sections relating to other topics are riddled with careless errors that are not becoming of a major planning application that can even be considered for approval. This isn't an issue with 3rd party data, this is an inability to interpret and transpose (simple) third party data.

Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.25 The Manor (or park) of *Beaubusson* did not extend into the site, though it was very close at the south western extremities of Ifield Golf Course. A sizeable length of the park pale still exists south of Stumbleholme Farm along what would later become the parish boundary between Ifield and Beeding (Bewbush).

Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.26 suggests that the location of the riverbank bloomery has been mis-plotted. It hasn't. The geo physics anomalies are on a different side of the brook to where the bloomery logged on the HER is located. The lady who found the bloomery has personally told me where it is, though I have been unable to access due to the high density of brambles overhanging the brook at the site.

Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.34 states that Ifield Forge was destroyed in 1683. The forge was destroyed by William Wallers Parliamentarian forces during the civil in 1643. 1683 saw the building of the SECOND mill to be powered by Ifield Millpond, on the site of the current mill. It also says that it was succeeded by the Grade 2 Listed Ifield Mill. It wasn't. The current, third and Grade 2 listed mill was built in 1817. To fill the gap, the first mill was built on the site of the forge in c.1660

Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.36 suggests that Ifield Steam Mill no longer exists and determines that *the potential below-ground remains of these structures are of low heritage significance*. Ifield Steam Mill is very much extant and is a locally listed building, referenced numerous times throughout Chapter Ten and its appendices!

Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.37 mentions *a large depression in Ifield Golf Course within the Site (that) may have been associated with this extraction activity*. This quarry is at the end of a narrow seam of limestone. Limestone was a common flux in blast furnaces. There was a blast furnace sited 1km to the south-south-east at Bewbush by 1567 which operated until 1643. Dots joined.

Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.44 mentions The Hyde, but calls it a 19th century lodge and shows an image of Avebury Lodge, which HA50 erroneously called Whitehall Lodge in section 10.9.16. The Hyde is certainly considerably older than C19 and is 80 yards in the direction shown by the public footpath sign on the right of plate 10. The author manages to attribute the correct name to a photograph of The Hyde in 4.6.10 (plate 40) which is a further demonstration of the lack of care and attention paid to the creation of this document. To absolve responsibility for these errors to a third party when the information is obviously known beggars belief and the Applicant should be taken to task.

Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.47 (Plate 10) Would it not be better practice to use the modern name of Emmanuel Cottage, for clarity?

Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.53 See my comments regarding the date that Ifield Court was destroyed under Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.19. This error is repeated several times, but this will be the last time I highlight it.

Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.53 The Lord of The Manors name was Sir John Frederick Drughorn. I have no idea where the author has sourced the 'Bartholomew' suffix from, but it is repeated several times. Perhaps this is an attempt to stop people discovering that Ifield Golf Course was funded by Drughorn before being sold to members at a reduced rate for the 'benefit of the parish', not for building homes and schools on. The covenant may yet come to light...

Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.55 'Bartholomew' is used again, but the order of the names has changed! So sloppy.

Appendix 10.1, section 4.6.11 Rectory Farm has not been called Church Farm for at least 60 years. As with Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.47, would it not be good practice to provide the clarity of using the modern name? It's also important to note that what is now Ifield Barn Theatre is the former tithe Barn and pre-dates Rectory Farm by some 500 years. The implication made in this paragraph is that the building is contemporary with Rectory Farm, which is far from the truth.

Appendix 10.1, section 4.6.18 Did anything other than apathy prevent the author from checking a modern a map to determine whether the ponds are extant?

Appendix 10.1, section 4.6.25 Ifield Park is a care home, not a residential development, and has been for many decades.

Appendix 10.1, section 4.7.5, in discussing Hyde Hill Woods, makes no mention of the well preserved abandoned pond, bay and associated earthworks at TQ 23660 36370 (recorded on the Historic England Research Records as Monument Number 399685) which, it is suggested, may be the site of a mill mentioned in the 'Nona Returna' of 1341 and is given a period name of *Early Medieval, Medieval* on the Heritage Gateway record. The apportionments to the Ifield Tithe Map show ref. 722, in the south west corner of the golf course, as being called 'Pond Field'.

Appendix 10.1, section 4.8.5, dismisses the quarry on Ifield Golf Course (shown in plate 56) as being a feature contemporary with the Golf Course construction due to the lack of recorded ore deposits here, but fails to recognise that this quarry is at the end of a narrow seam of limestone, as covered by my comments to Appendix 10.1, section 4.5.37.

Appendix 10.1, section 4.8.6, discusses three ponds shown on old maps, including one to the South West, and claims that only one, that in the grounds of the Hyde, is extant. Even the most cursory glance at a modern map (or at the actual site that the Applicant proposes to destroy) would have shown the author that the one to the south west (which is also on the seam of limestone) is also extant. It's not a small pond!

Appendix 10.1, section 5.1.2 again refers to *Ifield Water House* when discussing Ifield Water Mill and *Harlow Cottage* when discussing Harrow Cottage. That dastardly third party data...

Appendix 10.1, section 5.1.5 again refers to Ifield Court having burnt down much earlier than it actually did.

Appendix 10.1, section 5.1.13 says that St. Margaret's Church was *built in the 12th Century with 13th, 14th & 19th century additions*. The author must have had his finger one key to the left for the first date, as it was built in the very early C13, and had no C13

additions. More erroneous third party data? No; every available source of information consistently says C13.

Appendix 10.1, section 5.1.22 states that the Ifield Brook Meadows part of the conservation area is former agricultural land, but I'm curious to know the source of this information. I'm sure it may well have been many centuries ago, perhaps at the time of Domesday, but the implication is that it was agricultural in recent times. The tithe map shows it to be primarily a lawn to the Rectory, as well as sections of meadow, garden & orchard, with a tiny amount of pasture land to the immediate south of the churchyard being the only piece of agricultural land.

Appendix 10.1, section 5.1.24 claims the *envelopment of Ifield by Crawley New Town*, but this is a blatant untruth which comes across as a crass attempt to downplay the persisting rural nature of old Ifield and, in particular, the Conservation area. The planning application consistently refers to the open-to-the-countryside nature of Ifield, so this statement is puzzling. Of course, it may just be an ignorance of the meaning of the word *envelopment* on the part of the author, but either way this section only serves to further damage the integrity of this ill prepared proposal for an ill considered development.

Appendix 10.1, section 5.1.25 correctly observes that Ifield Green (the road) *retains a strongly rural character, with a narrow winding road and dense vegetation*, yet the Applicant proposes that this will be the new route to Rusper from Ifield should the Planning Officers agree to their unacceptable intention to isolate the residents of the far east of Rusper Parish from their Parish centre by closing Rusper Road to through traffic.

Appendix 10.1, section 5.1.28 claims that *it is unclear if the pound survives*. Facing the pound with his eyes open would provide the author with the clarity he seeks.

Appendix 10.1, section 5.1.41 discusses the heritage significance of a building known as 'The Tweed', located in Tweed Lane, but somehow manages to exclude from the discussion the most significant part of the building's heritage - that it was once the Parish Workhouse.

Appendix 10.1, Appendix A (page 99) the section devoted to the *Non-Designated Assets and Historic Environment Features recorded by the HER within 500m Study Area* makes no mention of the abandoned pond, bay and associated earthworks at TQ 23660 36370 that I mentioned in greater detail in my response to Appendix 10.1, section 4.7.5. A further example of poor quality work as this is listed on the HER and the title of this section explicitly states that this is where the data is sourced from.

Appendix 10.1, Appendix A (page 104) the section devoted to *Non-Designated Historic Buildings/Structures Identified During This Assessment* repeats the earlier error of referring to Avebury Lodge as Whitehall Lodge. Although it was built as the lodge to Whitehall, I have never seen a single map refer to this building as Whitehall Lodge. In the early days of the buildings existence maps simply labelled it 'lodge', and from the 1960s onwards the 1:1,250 OS maps label it Avebury Lodge. This is also what the nameplate on the building says, a nameplate that you would have expected the assessor to have noticed were he giving his job the attention that should be necessary!

Yours sincerely

██████████