

[REDACTED]

Sent: 11 June 2026 16:48
To: Planning
Subject: DC/25/2114

Categories: Comments Received

Dear Mr Holmes

Having reviewed the Ecology Co-op Ecological Impact Assessment, I note that in Section 4.1.1 the report states:

“The site also lies within the SSSI Impact Zone for Beeding Hill to Newtimber Hill SSSI, and Natural England will need to be consulted on this matter.”

In light of this recommendation by the applicant’s own ecological consultant, I would be grateful if you could confirm whether Natural England has in fact been consulted regarding this application and, if so, whether any response has been received.

Given that both Place Services and the Council are considering ecological matters arising from the application, I am sure all parties will wish to be satisfied that the consultation recommended within the Ecological Impact Assessment has been undertaken and taken into account before any decision is reached. I would therefore be grateful for clarification on this point.

I also note, in the Eco Co Op and Place Services reports, the conclusion that a wildlife-sensitive lighting scheme is proposed to mitigate potential impacts on bats. The Barbestelle bat has clearly been recorded at this site. I appreciate that such measures may help reduce lighting associated with the development itself. I would ask that the Council consider the practical reality of the site’s future occupation.

Whilst lighting installed as part of the development may be subject to control through planning conditions, future residents will be entitled to install domestic security lighting, garden lighting, decorative external lighting, and other sources of illumination within their properties. Furthermore, the routine use of vehicles entering and leaving the site will inevitably result in headlights illuminating surrounding habitats, particularly during the hours of darkness.

Consequently, there remains a legitimate concern that the cumulative effect of domestic lighting, security lighting, garden lighting and vehicle headlights may create a far greater level of light disturbance than that envisaged within the submitted lighting scheme. This is particularly relevant given the acknowledged presence of bats in the area and the importance of maintaining dark corridors for commuting and foraging.

I therefore respectfully request that the Council satisfy itself that the assessment of lighting impacts reflects the long-term reality of residential occupation and not solely the controlled lighting arrangements proposed as part of the development. As these matters have now been expressly brought to the Council's attention, I wonder if they are being treated as material considerations in the determination of the application. If the Council concludes that the proposed lighting mitigation remains adequate notwithstanding these foreseeable future sources of illumination, including domestic security lighting, garden lighting and vehicle headlights, I would be grateful if the reasoning for that conclusion could be clearly explained within the officer's assessment and decision-making process. I would also be grateful if the Council could confirm whether any comments received from Natural England have been considered or addressed.

Kind Regards

