For official use only (date received): 17/03/2026 14:47:26

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/Z3825/W/25/3376143

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference	APP/Z3825/W/25/3376143
Appeal By	CROUDACE HOMES
Site Address	Land East of Charlwood Drive Henfield West Sussex BN5 9FA Grid Ref Easting: 521895 Grid Ref Northing: 116445

SENDER DETAILS

Name	[redacted]
Address	Fox Cottage Church Lane HENFIELD BN5 9NY

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- ☐ Appellant
- ☐ Agent
- ☑ Interested Party / Person
- ☐ Land Owner
- ☐ Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- ☐ Final Comments
- ☐ Proof of Evidence
- ☐ Statement
- ☐ Statement of Common Ground
- ☑ Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- ☐ Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I am an ecologist and I have read through the ecological reports and have comments on the statements made within the report:

he Ecological Appraisal submitted in support of this application I feel applies an insufficient search radius for waterbodies in relation to great crested newt. The desk study and mapping identify ponds within only 250m of the site, when 500m is recommended. They have used the following guidance to exclude at least 3 ponds to the south of the application site, all of which are suitable to support GCN:

250m can be used rather than 500m when all of the following conditions are met:
(a) maps, aerial photos, walk-over surveys or other data indicate that the pond(s) has potential to support a large great crested newt population,
(b) the footprint contains particularly favourable habitat, especially if it constitutes the majority available locally,
(c) the development would have a substantial negative effect on that habitat, and
(d) there is an absence of dispersal barriers."
Given that in this instance, none of the four points listed above are applicable to the site, it is considered that survey of ponds within 500m of the site boundary is not required, and that survey of ponds within 250m represents adequate survey effort."

Furners Lane does not represent a significant barrier between the site and the missed out ponds, and I do not feel that suitable habitat on the application site can be ruled out around the site boundaries. I feel that a 500m survey effort should be required given the known presence of GCN within the area - they even state that records of GCN from these waterbodies have been returned in 2014 so there is a known population!

Section 3.2.2. states: "The nearest non-statutory nature conservation designation to the site is Henfield Common Local Wildlife Site (LWS), which is located approximately 0.4km south of the site. The LWS is designated on the basis of its varied habitats including species-rich rush pasture, reedbed and woodland" with Section 3.2.4 stating "The site itself is not subject to any non-statutory nature conservation designations. All non-statutory designations in the surrounding area are well separated from the site by existing development and given the nature and scale of the proposals, these designations are unlikely to be affected."

The increased pressure from recreational use has not been considered, with the site holding good connectivity via public footpaths to Henfield Common which is vulnerable to degradation from an increase in human activity.

I feel that further eDNA surveys for Great Crested Newt and a re-evaluation on the impact of the Henfield Common LWS is required.