

[REDACTED]

From: colin hamilton [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 January 2026 14:26
To: Jessica Riches
Cc: [REDACTED] Jim Weston;
Alan Pivett; Nicola Swann
Subject: FW: P/59/24/DOC AND P/161/25/DOC

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. You should take extra care when clicking links or opening attachments - if you are unsure the content is safe contact the IT Helpdesk before clicking or opening.

Dear Jessica

We are aware that when Condition 30 of P/140/16/OUT was approved it accepted the proposed Brent Geese Mitigation Plan and stipulated that it must be in place before any development could commence. It was a great regret to all interested in the application that ADC did not insist also that the mitigation should be proved to succeed before development. This omission may yet prove to be the eviction of BG from Pagham village, a result that contravenes the Habitat Regulations.

We now see the installation of fencing around the whole site, which suggests that development is in the offing. Indeed it is arguable that this action is itself an act of development.

The requirements of the BGMP include:

- The planting of appropriate forage in three fields to the west of the Church Barton site.
- **The provision of fencing and 'dense hedging on both sides of the footpath which bisects the southern and central fields to a height of 'no less than 6 ft'**
- The marking of the boundaries of the fields with seven red topped white posts 2 meters in height.

It goes on the state that the landowner will keep records of actions/plantings etc which will be provided to the council and that an annual site meeting will be conducted to review progress.

While the southern field has indeed been ploughed and planted, and did indeed attract a few Brent Geese on a few occasions in early December, it appears to have been planted so late that the growth does not offer sufficient forage in the depth of this winter. None have been seen there since. Further, the central and northern fields have not been properly treated and are covered with weeds and remains of last years agricultural growth. There is absolutely no chance they will attract geese. There is also at least one marker post missing in the most contentious position, the north east corner of the northern field.

With regard to the screening of the footpath, while fence posts have been installed, the growth on the southern side appears to be wild weed growth, on the northern side a great proportion of the saplings appear to have died and none are higher than about 24 inches.

The screening required to avoid scaring geese is thus nowhere near the required standard. I doubt that a replanting in the spring will achieve the required standard within the next year.

With regard to the BGMP included in P/161/25/DOC, relating to the Church Barton development, my interpretation of the document suggest that it effectively says 'Not our problem as it is sorted out by the P/140 BGMP. However, **'Stock fencing will be installed around site boundaries to alleviate the pressure of dogs accessing surrounding areas when off lead'**.

This action alone is entirely inadequate. The site boundary, since it is within 100 yards of the adjacent mitigation fields must be treated in exactly the same way as the southern footpath, by the **1**

With respect to the approved P/59/24/DOC, would you now please;

- confirm that no further development will take place until the landowner has fully complied with the BGMP.
- Place a copy of this email on the file.

Could you also please confirm that the installation of the fencing around the P/140 site is not an act of development.

Would you also please place this email on Ocella as an objection to P/161/25/DOC until such time as adequate fencing/hedging has been included in the BGMP.

Thank you so much.

Yours sincerely

Colin Hamilton