

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 August 2026 10:31
To: Daniel.Holmes
Subject: Planning reference DC/25/2114 [REDACTED] Report - Church Farm

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr Holmes

I have now carefully reviewed [REDACTED] Ecology Addendum dated 4 June 2026, particularly the section concerning [REDACTED]. I remain concerned that the assessment does not provide sufficient evidence to allow the Council to properly determine the potential impact of the proposed development on [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]

"A site inspection was made on the 4th June 2026 to check for any evidence of [REDACTED] reported by the public in the consultation correspondence."

He records:

[REDACTED]

However, the report subsequently concludes:

[REDACTED] were identified on or adjacent to the site and appropriate precautionary mitigation for [REDACTED] would be captured through a subsequent CEMP and pre-commencement checks."

I attach recent photographs taken yesterday at the same location within the chain-link fence inspected [REDACTED]. This location is only metres from a number of documented [REDACTED] identified [REDACTED]. I have previously submitted photographic and video evidence to the Council [REDACTED].

The key concern is therefore not simply that a [REDACTED] was not identified during the June inspection. The inspection itself [REDACTED], yet the significance of that evidence does not appear to have been fully reconciled with the wider evidence already submitted by myself and the [REDACTED].

I have been monitoring this area for years and have provided repeated evidence [REDACTED]. I do not expect my observations to automatically take precedence over those of a professional ecologist. However, equally, the absence of a [REDACTED] during a single site inspection should not in itself outweigh substantial, repeated evidence demonstrating [REDACTED] use of the site and its immediate surroundings.

There is also an important distinction between a pre-commencement check, intended to identify changes immediately before construction, and having sufficient ecological information to determine the application in the first place. If significant uncertainty remains regarding [REDACTED] the site,

that uncertainty should be resolved before planning permission is granted rather than deferred to a future CEMP.

I therefore respectfully ask the Council to consider the following straightforward question:

On what ecological evidence has the significance of the confirmed active [REDACTED], and the wider evidence [REDACTED] in the immediate vicinity, been discounted or considered adequately mitigated?

Given that the proposed development lies within the River Adur Water Meadows & Wyckham Wood Local Wildlife Site, I strongly request that my previously submitted [REDACTED] surveys, photographs, video evidence and correspondence are reviewed in full alongside the [REDACTED] evidence before this application is determined.

I ask the Council to satisfy itself that it has sufficient, current and reliable ecological information regarding [REDACTED] use of the site and its surroundings, and that the potential impacts of construction and subsequent occupation have been properly assessed rather than relying primarily on future pre-commencement checks.

Finally, I would be grateful if this representation and the attached photographic evidence could be formally added to the planning record and placed before the Case Officer and, should the application proceed to Planning Committee, made available to Members as part of their consideration of the application.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

(Immediate neighbour to DC/25/2114)
Meadow View
Church Farm Walk
Upper Beeding
West Sussex BN44 3HD