I wish to object to the proposed changes to the approved layout, particularly the reduction/reconfiguration of the Public Open Space (POS), the removal of the pedestrian pathway through that space, and the insertion of additional built form into an area previously presented as part of the landscape and public-realm strategy for the development.

A key concern is that the ecological information submitted in support of this application does not appear to have been properly updated to assess the current proposal.

The Ecological Impact Assessment submitted with this application appears to be effectively the same document prepared for the earlier 2020/93954 scheme. It remains dated 14 January 2023, retains the same document reference, and continues to assess a scheme described as having been reduced from 59 dwellings to 42 dwellings. It does not appear to assess the current 2026/91484 proposal, which would introduce a further dwelling and alter the approved layout.

Similarly, the submitted Ecological Design Strategy appears to have been prepared to assist with the discharge of conditions attached to the earlier 2020/93954 permission. It continues to rely on figures and mitigation associated with the approved 42-dwelling scheme, including the previously identified areas of community open space, domestic gardens, mixed scrub/dwarf shrub on green retaining walls, hedgerow planting and built land.

This is important because the current application is not simply a minor ecological matter. The proposal appears to:

- reduce and reconfigure the approved POS;
- remove the pedestrian pathway through the POS;
- insert an additional dwelling into an area previously forming part of the open-space/landscape arrangement;
- alter the relationship around retained trees and the dry-stone feature;
- and change the balance between built development, private garden space, public open space and landscaped mitigation.

In those circumstances, it is not sufficient for the applicant to rely on ecological documents prepared for the earlier approved layout without demonstrating that the ecological, landscape, public open-space and biodiversity assumptions remain valid under the revised layout.

The original approved scheme relied upon POS, retained trees, landscaped areas and pedestrian permeability as part of the planning balance. The removal of the pathway and reduction in functional POS therefore requires proper assessment in its own right. It should not be treated as a neutral change simply because some ecological documents have been resubmitted.

Before this application is determined, the applicant should be required to provide updated information clearly comparing the approved 2020/93954 layout with the proposed 2026/91484 layout, including:

- the approved and proposed POS areas;
- the approved and proposed community open-space provision;
- the approved and proposed domestic garden areas;
- the approved and proposed built land/hardstanding areas;

- the ecological and biodiversity implications of the additional dwelling;
- the impact of removing the pedestrian pathway;
- and whether the previously relied upon biodiversity and ecological mitigation figures remain accurate.

In the absence of an updated assessment, the Council cannot safely conclude that the ecological, landscape, public-realm and open-space impacts of the revised proposal have been properly considered.

For these reasons, I object to the application unless and until the applicant provides properly updated ecological, biodiversity, landscape and POS information assessing the actual 2026/91484 proposal rather than relying on documents prepared for the earlier 42-dwelling scheme.

In addition, the submitted Ecological Design Strategy refers to ecological enhancement measures including swift boxes, bat boxes and hedgehog access holes. From what is currently visible on site, I have not seen evidence that these measures have been incorporated into the dwellings or fencing already constructed. This raises a further concern about reliance on historic ecological mitigation documents without a clear up-to-date assessment of what has actually been delivered, what remains deliverable, and how the revised 2026 layout affects those commitments. The Council should satisfy itself that the ecological mitigation required under the original permission has either been implemented or remains secured and deliverable before placing reliance on the same documents in support of the current application.