

Andy Watt

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 July 2026 10:23
To: Andy Watt; planninginfo
Subject: Re: Planning Application DM/26/1477 — Land Adjacent to Nightingales, The Street, Bolney — updated consultation date

Dear Mr Watt,

Could you let me know please the date that the consultation period for DM/26/1477 has been extended to?

Infiltration testing was apparently performed on the 23rd/24th July, in the midst of a declared drought (as it also was for DM/26/0764). If the applicant uses the results from this testing to attempt to support the application, I will be challenging their use, so need to know when the consultation is due to end.

BRE Digest 365 (Soakaway design) and the CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753) require infiltration to be assessed against worst-case conditions, including the highest expected (winter) groundwater level and representative antecedent soil wetness. The site lies on Weald Clay, a shrink-swell soil. In prolonged dry weather this clay desiccates and cracks, opening preferential flow paths (fissures and macropores) down which test water drains rapidly, producing an artificially high infiltration rate. When the clay re-wets in autumn and winter it swells, the cracks close, and infiltration collapses towards zero. A test carried out in dry conditions therefore records a rate that does not exist when the soakaway must actually perform.

These requirements are reflected in national standards the applicant must satisfy. The Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs' National standards for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) (updated 30 July 2025) provide, at standard 4.16.2: "The design of systems which discharge surface water runoff to ground should accommodate wet winter conditions and evidence from groundwater records at or in the vicinity of the site should be used to demonstrate the maximum likely groundwater levels. This should include sufficient data collected to demonstrate seasonal groundwater levels to inform the assessment and design." Standard 4.16.1 further requires, for systems wholly relying on infiltration, "a minimum depth of unsaturated ground of 1m between the base of any infiltration feature and the maximum likely groundwater level." A BRE 365 test carried out in July, during a declared drought and at the seasonal low point of the water table, satisfies none of these requirements: it does not accommodate wet winter conditions, yields no seasonal groundwater data, and cannot demonstrate the required unsaturated depth above the maximum likely (winter) groundwater level.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

[REDACTED]

Re: Planning Application DM/26/1477 — Land Adjacent to Nightingales, The Street, Bolney — report of site disturbance affecting outstanding ecological surveys

Dear Mr Watt,

I write further to my objection to the above application to report site activity that bears directly on the outstanding ecological survey requirements and on the temporary holding objection issued by the Council's ecological adviser, Place Services, on 14 July 2026.

On 23 July 2026 and continuing today on 24 July 2026, persons apparently acting on behalf of the applicant commenced excavation on the application site, apparently in order to undertake BRE 365 infiltration / drainage testing. The works have involved tracked plant which has flattened and

compacted a larger area of the site than the excavation itself, together with associated noise, dust and vibration.

This concerns me because the site remains subject to outstanding survey requirements and to Place Services' holding objection, which requires the results of reptile surveys before the application can be determined. The habitat the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal identifies as supporting reptiles — modified grassland and log piles — is precisely the habitat that tracked plant flattens and compacts. The disturbance may therefore:

- (i) prejudice and undermine the required reptile survey, by altering the habitat that survey must assess in its baseline condition;
- (ii) risk offences in respect of reptiles (section 9, Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981), great crested newts and other European Protected Species that use log piles and rough grassland as terrestrial refuges (regulation 43, Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017), nesting birds (section 1, Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, given the season), and badgers (section 3, Protection of Badgers Act 1992, given the vibration and tracking);
- (iii) damage the root protection areas of boundary trees through soil compaction, contrary to the submitted Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan; and
- (iv) compromise the pre-development habitat baseline for mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain, noting that the biodiversity metric assesses pre-development value disregarding any degradation of habitat (so that such works cannot reduce the net-gain obligation).

I would be grateful if the Council would:

- (v) record and investigate this activity;
- (vi) ensure that the outstanding surveys (reptiles in particular, and any others required) are undertaken and assessed on the basis of the habitat as it was prior to this disturbance, and that the Biodiversity Net Gain pre-development baseline is established under the degradation provisions;
- (vii) refer this matter to Place Services and, if appropriate, to the Council's planning enforcement team; and
- (viii) make no determination on the application until the outstanding survey information required by Place Services is available, consistent with its holding objection.

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt and let me know how these matters will be addressed.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted block]

Hi Andy,

Given that the deadline is today, this should be the final version of my objection to DM/26/1477 (unless the consultation period is extended). Please use this in place of earlier versions. Amongst other tweaks, it has been updated in response to the WSCC Highways consultation response (desk-based study, the remit of which does not include the private track) that appeared online today.

Many thanks,

[Redacted signature]

Weald Chase
The Street
Bolney
West Sussex
RH17 5PF

Sent with Proton Mail secure email.

[REDACTED]

Hi Andy,

Apologies - spotted some errors in my objection letter, so have updated. Please apply this version instead.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

Weald Chase
The Street
Bolney
West Sussex
RH17 5PF

[REDACTED]

Hi Andy,

Further to my earlier invalidation request regarding DM/26/1477, please find attached my objection letter for the same planning application.

Could you confirm receipt please.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]

Weald Chase
The Street
Bolney
West Sussex
RH17 5PF

Sent with Proton Mail secure email.

[REDACTED]

Hi Andy,

Please find attached a letter requesting that DM/26/1477 be

invalidated as a result of multiple, material errors within the application documents. Could you confirm receipt please and let me know what is decided as a result? I will be separately providing an objection to this particular proposal, but will hold off submitting that for the moment whilst waiting to see if the application is invalidated (and resubmitted once corrected).

Many thanks,


Weald Chase
The Street
Bolney
West Sussex
RH17 5PF

Sent with Proton Mail secure email.