

Laura Garth

From: DC Consultation
Sent: 27 April 2018 14:46
To: Laura Garth; Rebecca Adams
Subject: FW: Planning Application Consultation 18NP0007 Rose and Thistle, Alwinton, Northumberland, NE65 7BQ

-----Original Message-----

From: Gill Thompson
Sent: 26 April 2018 16:35
To: DC Consultation
Subject: RE: Planning Application Consultation 18NP0007 Rose and Thistle, Alwinton, Northumberland, NE65 7BQ

Dear Rebecca,

I have looked at the details for this proposal together with the Ecological Assessment and have a few comments. The proposed location is on an area of undeveloped land. This land is a closely grazed and improved field; our 1992 Phase 1 survey and all aerials from 2001 show this to be the historical use also. The ecological assessment survey was carried out on 12th January which is not a good time for an ecological assessment, but I will concur with the report's conclusion that due to the lack of features found on site it is acceptable. The features of interest that do occur on site are hedges and hedgerow trees that need to be retained and protected. The current field entrance is proposed to be utilised as the site entry, but I am unclear as to whether another entry, and therefore a loss of length of hedge, is also proposed to access the remaining area of the field. The protection of hedges and trees using fencing during construction is good practice and should be made a condition. I suggest that a new hedge of native species is planted all the way round the site to off-set the loss of any stretches of hedge and the permanent loss of the area of improved grassland.

The Hoseden burn is immediately adjacent to the proposed site which flows into the River Coquet SSSI. It is proposed to connect the facility to the mains sewer which is good and I note that Northumbrian Water have no objections. I would however point out that the sewerage connection is on the other side of the burn. I'm not sure if this is a problem, but would need confirming that it would be possible to do this with no impact on the burn. Construction of the facility has the potential to pollute or siltate the burn, particularly if there is some excavation as alluded to in the documents, and I suggest that a pollution prevention strategy is developed prior to commencement and made a condition.

I support the provision of the bat and bird boxes, but they are not shown specifically on the plans. Incorporating into the design of the building would be best practice. Drawing no. 79/17 mentions 2 no. nesting boxes, not making it clear whether they are bat or bird (as I note the ecological report is vague). I would suggest that if permission is given this element needs clarifying and at least 2 bird and 4 bat (1 each elevation) should be provided. This would not be disproportionate given the permanent loss of improved grassland proposed.

In addition to the above, the other recommendations in section 7 of the report that should be made a condition if approval is given are those pertaining to lighting, construction methodology, permeable hardstanding and tree protection.

If the conditions above are made I have no objections on ecological grounds.

If you wish to discuss further, please get in touch.
Regards,
Gill Thompson

-----Original Message-----

From: DC Consultation