

To: Envirotech  
Stone Lea  
Sedgwick  
Kendal  
Cumbria  
LA8 0JP

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

