To: Envirotech
Stone Lea
Sedgwick
Kendal
Cumbria
LA8 OJP

Dr Henry Adams, Ecological Consultant 55 Hayclose Crescent Kendal Cumbria LA9 7NT

Tel: Kendal (01539) 722158

E-mail: henryadams@dragonfly1.plus.com

**URGENT** 

9<sup>th</sup> July 2013

Dear All at Envirotech,

## The 'Green Gap' next to Oxenholme Road, Kendal: The Strawberry field and its lapwings

I am looking forward to 'upping my game' to a much higher level of publicity etc, etc, in securing protection for Kendal's Strawberry field lapwings - before and irrespective of the Inspector's decision.

However - before doing so - I am giving you another opportunity - though very brief - to side with those people who appreciate the value of these lapwings here - rather than siding with the flow of money and power - on the developer's side.

Your 2012 'ECOLOGICAL APPRAISAL, Oxenholme Road, Kendal' failed to pick up on and value the Strawberry field breeding lapwings despite the fact that 1. they have been known by locals to have bred there for a great many years, 2. at least one person in the nearby Natural England office knows about them, 3. ditto SLDC Planning Department (though the higher levels of the Council prefer to ignore their presence) and 4. my documents describing their value exist on the SLDC Planning website database in several places accessible externally to the public over the internet - for example in relation to the recent land allocations consultation.

However I do not regard this omission as being a big error - for a brief Phase 1 survey. We can all make such mistakes of omission if time is short.

What I do regard as an inexcusable error of judgement is that when you became aware of the lapwing information - instead of taking that 'on board' and re-assessing your position in the light of that new evidence (which would have probably led you to agree with a fellow ecologist), you stubbornly started to 'dig a hole' for yourself in criticizing the lapwing case using weak arguments. Maybe some monetary allegiance to your developer client was taking precedence over the "new" evidence?

You now have a big decision to make, and urgently, which could have a big impact on your company's reputation.

I hope you realize that siding with the developer against the lapwing evidence would not look good to those ecologists UK-wide who appreciate wildlife rather than just regarding wildlife as a means to make a living. Also it would not be fair to your staff working for you to be potentially and probably unrepresentingly "tarred with the same brush" of putting developers money before wildlife.

What I suggest is that you retract your letter criticizing my assessment, and instead write openly to your client (cc'ing it to me) that [along these lines:] on reflection - giving it further thought you agree with my assessment. Also you urgently contact the Inspector likewise (also cc'ing to me) - especially if

your criticism letter went to the Inspector. The latter won't be easy - because Inspectors don't usually read or listen to any further evidence after the inquiry - but in this case you will be retracting from your position up to/including the inquiry, not adding anything new, which is surely something you must do.

OK - the developers wouldn't like you doing this at this stage - but I hope you would then feel better doing the right thing and not tarnishing your company's image.

To stop the development threats to the Strawberry field I will have no option other than to strongly and publicly criticize your position in support of the developers. However - if you completely, clearly and openly (to all parties including the Inspector), retract and support my position, then you won't become 'collateral damage' in my fight for wildlife against this over-development.

Don't be "on the wrong side of history"...

I hope I will be able to congratulate you for showing good judgement.

Yours sincerely,

(Dr T.H.L. Adams)

Dr T.H.L. Adams - Consultant Ecologist henryadams@dragonfly1.plus.com

www.dragonfly1.plus.com/topics.html - my website's 'hub' page <<<<<<<<

**NB:** read my criticism of your criticism of my submission to the Inspector (easy to find on my website). It may sound harsh but you must bear in mind I've put a lot of unpaid hours work and effort into protecting the lapwings, and you have put their survival there under threat.

Also you could read the talk I gave at the Inquiry etc.