

---

**From:** Maple Cross Residents Environment Group <maplexresidentsenvironmentgrp@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** 13 April 2022 11:29  
**To:** Sturgess, Tim (Avison Young - UK)  
**Cc:** Pigott, Matthew (Avison Young - UK); Aisosa Charles; TRDC Appeals; Claire Westwood  
**Subject:** Re: Proof of Evidence

CAUTION: External Sender

Dear Tim

The email to which you refer (dated 4th March 2022) stated very specifically that "*we are no longer pursuing our challenge to the issue of public drinking water supply*".

We did not say that raw groundwater would not be an issue.

Furthermore, we clarified our position in our subsequent email dated 25th March 2022 when we reiterated:

*"With regard to Maple Lodge Nature Reserve, our position has not changed since we updated our position and submitted our Statement of Case on March 4th. This stated:*

*7.2.1 The proposed project may have an adverse effect on the quality or quantity of groundwater flowing into the reserve and the protected Section 41 Groundwater Dependent Terrestrial Ecosystem habitats within.*

*7.2.2 The Appellant has not undertaken a WFD Compliance Assessment and therefore not produced evidence confirming that the application meets the WFD environmental objectives.*

*7.2.3 The Appellant has stated "it has been demonstrated that the proposed development would have a negligible impact on groundwater levels" but the Appellant's case is partly based on estimates, assumptions and modelled data.*

*7.2.4 The Appellant has not provided, for example, actual readings of flow of groundwater into the reserve, nor of flow from the input stream. Given the sensitivity of the reserve's water levels, there needs to be robust analyses of water flow over a period of up to 12 months in order to cover all conditions. We accept that this could be resolved by the Environment Agency's requested groundwater monitoring condition in their letter dated 15th February 2022.*

*7.2.5 Also, there has been no consideration of the potential impact on Maple Lodge Marsh, the adjacent nature reserve which includes wet woodland, a Section 41 habitat. The groundwater monitoring requested by the Environment Agency should be expanded to include this site as well.*

*7.2.6 No mitigation has been proposed by the Appellant in the event that their activities do have an adverse effect on the quality or quantity of groundwater, causing potential harm to either of the two reserves' Section 41 habitats. We would expect this to be covered by condition."*

You were therefore in possession of this information prior to submitting your Proof of Evidence.

I trust this now resolves any misunderstanding.

Kind regards,

Keith Pursall  
Chairman  
Maple Lodge Conservation Society