
From: Robin Smithyman
Sent: 16 July 2021 17:51
To: Aldridge, Steven
Subject: Re: Lea Castle Farm Quarry - Regulation 25

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Steve,

In respect of your email please find attached the following clarification information.

Aspects relating to Public Rights of Way

I confirm that we have received a response from the County Footpath Officer who has confirmed that they are content that the revised proposals, which incorporate all County requests. They do point out that these aspects would form part of any conditional requirements. The agreed requirements being included on the updated planning application drawings within the dropbox link below.

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/qddiw8iuqb3kx7/AADGVWQ3YSavLMmLI3a6hWPJa?dl=0>

These include the following:

i.

We think clarity on this point can be gained by providing a specific plan at a larger scale to illustrate the RPA standoffs from the existing avenue trees. Please refer to the attached plan Drawing No KD.LCF.042 (see dropbox link). This plan shows the location of all bunding adjacent to the avenue throughout the operational life of the proposed development and how they interact with the RPA from the existing avenue of trees. Again we can only stress that All tree protection will be in full accordance with BS5837:2012. An Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) would form part of any conditional aspects to be discharged if planning permission is given and all works associated with tree protection will be carried out by an experienced and qualified arboriculturist.

- vi. You have provided a response to Wyre Forest District Council's Tree Officer, but it is not clear to me whether you have specifically addressed the following points raised:
 - "The extraction phase 2 boundary is within the RPA of T19. There is a note that this will be changed to be outside the RPA but I need to highlight this to ensure it is changed if permission is granted." Yes we confirm that All tree protection will be in full accordance with BS5837:2012 this includes the RPA of T19 please refer to attached plan Drawing No KD.LCF.042.
 - The boundary of phase 2 is around 50% of T23. Granted it is outside the RPA but it's right on the edge and I have serious concerns about the protection of the tree during the extraction process." It is not unusual for works in and around trees in both rural and urban areas have 50 – 100% of some form of development wrapping around them for a temporary and/ or permanent period. The RPA has been applied and protective measures will be in full accordance with BS5837:2012. The groundwater table is ~34m below this tree so the proposals will not affect any water uptake from this source. We are in full support of the use of an Arboricultural Method Statement

x. [Document 85a Appendix](#)

Further to my email below regarding Lea Castle Farm Quarry and the submission of additional information triggering a further public consultation under Regulation 25 of the EIA Regulations. I propose to consult North Worcestershire Water Management on the submitted clarification informally ahead of the formal public consultation (under Regulation 25) to ensure that the submitted information clarifies and addresses their concerns.

Kind regards

Steve

StevenAldridge
TeamManager– DevelopmentManagement
WorcestershireCountyCouncil
CountyHall, SpetchleyRoad,Worcester,WR52NP
Tel:01905843510
Mob: 07985334367
Email:saldrige@worcestershire.gov.uk



From:Aldridge,Steven
Sent:14 June202106:56
To:RobinSmithyman
Subject:LeaCastleFarmQuarry Regulation25

Dear Robin,

à

the 'Concept Restoration' would need to be amended. The following drawings may also require reviewing: 'Initial Works', 'Phases 1 to 5 Working and Restoration' drawings and 'Final Working' drawing. Chapter 16 'Rights of Way' of the Environmental Statement should be reviewed and updated as necessary to reflect the amended proposals should as updating the length of Rights of Way and being clear what are proposed to be permissive or to be designated formal Public Rights of Way on the definitive map. The drawing titled: 'Current and Proposed Public Rights of Way' in Technical Appendix J – Leisure and Recreation' would need to be updated / superseded. The Non-Technical Summary should also be updated to reflect any of the subsequent Environmental Statement amendments including the plans e.g. the new Public Rights of Way drawing, but also any other superseded plans should be updated within it, such as the Concept Restoration, as these drawings are embedding in the document.

You appear to have provided a response to the comments raised by Worcestershire Wildlife Trust, County Ecologist, County Landscape Officer, County Footpath Officer, North Worcestershire Water Management, Wyre Forest District Council Tree Officer, Woodland Trust, and Hereford and Worcester Gardens Trust (HWGT). However, you do not appear to have provided a response / clarification regarding the following matters raised:

In response to the County Landscape Officer and HWGT, you have stated: *"I can confirm that the remaining avenue trees will be protected in full accordance with BS 5837:2012"*. Can you please clearly clarify / confirm that the topsoil bund shown on drawing titled: 'Phase 5 Working and Restoration', which appears to lie very close to the line of the avenue would not impact the avenue of trees? Should it require to be removed to accord with BS 5837:2012, then please amend this accordingly on the plans.

You have provided a response to Wyre Forest District Council's Tree Officer, but it is not clear to me whether you have specifically addressed the following points raised:

- *"The extraction phase 2 boundary is within the RPA of T19. There is a note that this will be changed to be outside the RPA, but I need to highlight this to ensure it is changed if permission is granted.*
- *The boundary of phase 2 is around 50% of T23. Granted it is outside the RPA, but it's right on the edge and I have serious concerns about the protection of the tree during the extraction process.*
- *I also have concerns about the protection of the trees T12 to 21 (most of which have a TPO) during the works. If permission is granted there will need to be a watertight AMS and a Arb Consultant retained for the phases 1 to 3 to prevent unnecessary damage to the trees"*.

You do not appear to have provided a response to the British Horse Society, namely:

- *"We request that the term 'multi-user routes' be removed from the documentation as this is not a legal term (often misconstrued as being for pedestrians and cyclists only) and could bring into question maintenance responsibilities. We seek assurance that the surface materials and dimensions to be applied to the routes meet requirements for shared use of equestrians, pedestrians and cyclists. The BHS guidance is available via: [x](#)*

Given that the submitted information has triggered a re-consultation under Regulation 25 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations. Please can you confirm if you wish to add anything to the information submitted to date, over and above the requested information / the points I have outlined above?

Kind regards

Steve

StevenAldridge
TeamManager– DevelopmentManagement
WorcestershireCountyCouncil
CountyHall, SpetchleyRoad,Worcester,WR52NP
Tel:01905843510
Mob: 07985334367
Email:saldridge@worcestershire.gov.uk



ConfidentialityNotice

Thismessageand any attachmentsare private and confidentialand may be subjectto legalprivilegeand copyright.If you are not the intendedrecipientpleasedo not publishor copyit to anyoneelse. Pleasecontactus by usingthe reply facility in your emailsoftware and then removeit from your system.

Disclaimer

Althoughthis emailand attachments havebeenscannedfor virusesand malware,WorcestershireCountyCouncilacceptsno liability for any lossor damagearisingfrom the receiptor useof this communication.

Monitoring of Email

WorcestershireCountyCouncilmaymonitor trafficdata and the content of emailfor lawful businesspurposes.

**** * of *****

of