

Dear Adrian Smith,

I am writing to formally object to the above planning application relating to the proposed development at Swan Meadow SN9 5DF. Planning application number **PL/2025/09744**.

My property at **71 Swan Meadow** is directly adjacent to the application site, with the rear of our property overlooking the woodland area affected by this proposal. Despite this, we were not included in the consultation process nor notified as part of the neighbourhood plan, which is a significant concern given our immediate proximity to the site.

I wish to object on the following grounds:

1. Failure to consult neighbouring residents

As an adjoining property, we should reasonably have been consulted on this application. The lack of notification has prevented us from engaging at an early stage, despite the proposal having a direct impact on our property and outlook.

2. Loss of woodland and proposed removal of trees

The submitted plans indicate the removal of approximately 18 trees within the woodland area at the rear of our property. This represents a significant loss of established woodland and would materially harm the character of the area, as well as trees that have already been removed prior to the application.

3. Previous tree removal prior to submission of ecological surveys

Over the past approximately twelve months prior to the surveys, a significant number of trees have already been cut down from the site. Please see attached photos before and after, including a video of the noise of tree cutting in April 2025.(can be sent via email if unable to upload)

Ecological surveys were subsequently carried out on 9th June 2025, after a considerable amount of tree removal had already taken place. We witnessed tree cutting on the site only 3 days before on Friday 6th June 2025.

This raises concerns that the surveys may not reflect the original condition of the site or the full extent of habitat present prior to clearance and therefore may not represent an accurate baseline for assessing biodiversity impact or net biodiversity gain.

4. Dormice and adequacy of survey findings

We are aware of the presence of dormice in the local area and understand that they have been known to inhabit or move through this woodland habitat. However, the submitted ecological survey states that there was no evidence of dormice on site.

Given the timing of the survey, following significant tree and habitat removal, and the fact that dormice are elusive and highly sensitive to disturbance, there is concern that the survey may not have been undertaken under conditions capable of reliably detecting their presence. This raises serious questions regarding the completeness and reliability of the ecological assessment, particularly in relation to a European Protected Species.

5. Impact on wildlife and adequacy of ecological assessment

While we cannot confirm the presence of nesting or roosting sites, bats are regularly observed flying over and around our garden each year, and deer and other wildlife are seen frequently in the adjoining fields and woodland. There has also been nesting of several different species of birds.

Given the known presence of bats in the area and the reliance of many species on woodland habitats, there is concern that ecological activity and usage of the site may have been reduced prior to survey work being undertaken, resulting in an underestimation of wildlife impact.

6. Construction traffic, noise, and disturbance

The construction phase of the development is likely to result in increased heavy vehicle movements, noise, vibration, and general disturbance within the neighbourhood. This would negatively affect residential amenity due to the close proximity of neighbouring homes.

In addition, construction activity adjacent to the remaining woodland would further disturb wildlife through noise, lighting, vehicle

movements, and continued habitat disruption, particularly in the absence of a clearly defined Construction Management Plan. This is a very small space to build around the trees and within the woodland area without having a significant impact.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

8. Impact on residential amenity

The cumulative effects of tree loss, construction activity, and reduced natural screening would result in increased overlooking for some residents and a detrimental impact on outlook and overall amenity for neighbouring residents.

9. Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that this application is refused, or at the very least deferred until:

- the issue of prior tree removal before submission of the planning application and surveys is fully investigated;
- clarification is provided as to whether appropriate permissions were in place;
- the adequacy, timing, and scope of the ecological surveys (including those relating to dormice) is independently reviewed and, if necessary, revisited now that the woodland area has been free from tree felling and works for several months; and
- comprehensive ecological and biodiversity assessments, based on a true and undisturbed site baseline, are made available for public scrutiny.

Thank you for considering this objection.

Yours faithfully,

Zoe Brown

71 Swan Meadow

Attached:

Photos of trees prior to June 2025

Video from April 2025 showing tree-cutting noise

Current photos of trees — noting that prior to tree cutting there was significantly more screening, whereas there are now large gaps, piles of cuttings, and much thinner lines of trees.