

Latham, James

From: Bisset, James
Sent: 19 March 2019 12:50
To: Eaton, Victoria
Cc: Duberley, Elizabeth
Subject: M&WLP - ecology comments

Vikki,

Thought best if I went through Appendix A – the individual site assessments looking for anything obvious:

In general any sites that have water quality as a potential issue and are within the River Wye Catchment should be subject to HRA I think although likely to be mitigated we can't take that in to account at initial screening. Suggest the draft plan and HRA screening are submitted to Natural England for a more detailed comment.

Former Lugg Bridge – this is not identified as being part of the Wye SAC (which includes the Lugg up to Hampton Court Bridge) – only indicated as SSSI which is incorrect. Will need full HRA appropriate assessment

Leinthall Quarry – has River Teme SSSI been considered alongside Downton Gorge SAC?

Leominster Household Waste Site – Lugg is directly part of wider SAC lower down and so is fully part of the Wye SAC catchment – may need consideration as such (ie full HRA process on any application)

Upper Lyde (all sites) needs to include Lugg as SAC and SSSI in considerations.

Wellington Quarry (strangely this has picked up as SAC but Lyde only a mile upstream wasn't? Why are Wellington sites all different in relation to SSSI/SAC etc – surely as all together all are the same consideration?

Three Elms – need to ensure that all references to SINCs and Special Wildlife Sites are changed to and called Local Wildlife Sites in line with core strategy terminology (they are all the same level of local designation and the CS brought them all together under the better known current term of Local Wildlife Site.

Leominster Southern Ave – SAC?

Land between Little Marcle Road and Ross Rd, Ledbury – have current housing sites just to N of little marcle road and south and east of 'bypass' been considered?

I haven't checked loss of priority habitats (Habitats of Principle Importance) for these sites – I note ancient woodland has been picked up in some sites but have all the other designated priority habitats?

As in line with NPPF important trees should now also be mentioned and considered – eg the Ancient Tree Inventory listing.

I may have missed it but is Lighting and Dark Skies covered anywhere? Another specified NPPF consideration now.

Otherwise really everything ecology comes down to site specific local assessment and prioritisation of maintaining/improving habitats and habitat connectivity as they come forwards.

James

James Bisset
Ecology & Arboriculture Officer

01432 260250

jbisset@herefordshire.gov.uk

Economy and Place
Plough Lane
Hereford
HR4 0LE



Please consider the environment - Do you really need to print this E-Mail?

Any opinion expressed in this e-mail or any attached files are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Herefordshire Council. This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the addressee. This communication may contain material protected by law from being passed on. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this e-mail in error, you are advised that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please contact the sender immediately and destroy all copies of it.

Any mapping included in this email: ©Crown copyright and database rights 2019- Ordnance Survey 100024168

Latham, James

From: Cotton, Julian
Sent: 04 March 2019 15:24
To: Eaton, Victoria
Subject: Draft MWLP Consultation

Vic, briefly..

MINERALS

1. There are no great surprises here in terms of the sites and any proposed extensions etc.
2. There are no allocations that would attract an outright objection from me on current evidence. In general, any archaeological matters would be dealt with and straightforwardly as per Core Strategy LD4 and Para 189 of the NPPF. It is my understanding that Historic England are just about to bring out a new 'HEAN' (historic environment advice note) in relation to minerals. This should of course be followed.
3. As regards the 'hard rock' quarries such as Leinthall and Perton, the additional areas are not that extensive, and although there may be some direct impact on heritage assets of moderate interest locally, it is not anticipated that there would be issues of substance here. The delves I don't believe to be a problem, and may in fact be beneficial.
4. As regards the aggregate extraction zones (in particular but not limited to Wellington) it is noted that some extensive new areas are proposed. Given the sensitivity of the locations, and the hectareage involved, it is almost inevitable that some below-ground remains of at least regional importance will be disturbed by aggregates extraction here. However, there are sound and established procedures in place to deal with such findings, and these will be followed. Indeed, I am of the view that the archaeological approach followed by minerals companies in the county has generally been *exemplary* to date, so I have no wish to change things.

WASTE / EMPLOYMENT LAND

I have no particular comments to make here: In most cases I have already had an input via the usual pre-apps applications etc.

Regards,

Julian

Julian Cotton, Archaeological Advisor, Herefordshire Council

Latham, James

From: Duberley, Elizabeth
Sent: 25 March 2019 11:18
To: Eaton, Victoria
Subject: RE: Minerals & Waste Draft Plan

Morning Vicky,

Just a couple of thoughts on the MWDP:

- 5.4.6 landscape character – should it say *local landscape character* and also reference to the LCA SPG.
- 5.4.9 significant development of agricultural land – is the word *significant* necessary – what is meant by this ?
- 5.4.14 Hfds Biodiversity Action Plans whilst these are updated they don't have a great deal of significance for HC would it be better to refer to *nationally identified habitats of principal importance* - in an ideal world we would update the HC Biodiversity Guidance!
- 5.4.16 LD3 Green Infrastructure should a link be made with the HC GI Strategy ?
- 5.4.18 Should say *biodiversity net gain*

Thanks

Liz

Herefordshire.gov.uk

Liz Duberley
Principal Natural Environment Officer
01432 260788
07792 880565
Elizabeth.Duberley@herefordshire.gov.uk

Economy and Place Directorate
Plough Lane
Hereford
HR4 0LE



Please consider the environment - Do you really need to print this E-Mail?

Any opinion expressed in this e-mail or any attached files are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Herefordshire Council. This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the addressee. This communication may contain material protected by law from being passed on. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this e-mail in error, you are advised that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please contact the sender immediately and destroy all copies of it.

Latham, James

From: Idf
Sent: 08 April 2019 10:24
To: Eaton, Victoria
Subject: FW: Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan Consultation - comments needed

Importance: High

See attached comments.

Kev

From: Knight, Matthew <Matthew.Knight@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 April 2019 10:12
To: Idf <Idf@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan Consultation - comments needed
Importance: High

Comments from Historic Buildings and Areas are:

- 5.4.21 – For the Historic England guidance, what would the status of this be with regards the plan and would GPA3 be relevant in terms of the setting of assets?
- Is there consideration of the impact on noise on setting of heritage assets please?
- Very positive that small scale ‘delves’ for stone extraction are permitted.

Regards

Matthew

From: Wheatley, Juliet <jwheatley@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 March 2019 09:07
To: Duberley, Elizabeth <Elizabeth.Duberley@herefordshire.gov.uk>; Knight, Matthew <Matthew.Knight@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Cc: Cotton, Julian <Julian.Cotton@herefordshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan Consultation - comments needed
Importance: High

Hi both,

Please could you arrange for a landscape, ecology and building conservation officer review of this draft doc and return of any comments to Vikki Eaton by Friday 1st March please. (If you need to speak to Vikki she’s normally in office on Tuesdays and Fridays). Apologies for the short notice – it appears our team may not have been consulted as part of the main consultation on this. Julian has already done his comments.

It seems to me the Forward Planning consult system would be more robust if internal consults could be via Civica. I’ll raise this at the next DM managers’ meeting/speak to Kevin Singleton & Helen about this.

Regards,

Juliet Wheatley | Service Manager, Built & Natural Environment

Latham, James

From: Pickup, Rebecca
Sent: 11 March 2019 16:32
To: Gilson, Susannah
Subject: FW: Draft Minerals and Waste Local Plan Consultation

Hi Susannah

Apologies I missed the consultation date.

In case we can still comment. In general we have no comment. However on consultation with our Environmental health colleagues would it be possible to include noise within section 5.7? Comment below:

Could noise be included either with Vibration or as a topic in its own right, as specialist noise consultancy advice would likely be required to ensure minimum impact is assured from the proposed activity.

Best wishes
Rebecca

Herefordshire.gov.uk

Rebecca Pickup
Specialist Registrar in Public Health
01432 260759

Adults and Wellbeing Directorate
Plough Lane
Hereford
HR4 0LE

rebecca.pickup@herefordshire.gov.uk

Please note my usual working days are Monday, Tuesday and Thursday

