

# Appendix 10.2

## Ecological Consultation Responses

## Appendix 10.2: Details of Consultations

### Email correspondence with Natural England: Julien Sclater

---

**Subject:**RE: Linhay Hill Quarry - DAS1829/167522

**Date:**Thu, 5 May 2016 15:12:28 +0000

**From:**Sclater, Julien R (NE) <Julien.R.Sclater@naturalengland.org.uk>

**To:**'Ollie Prudden' <ollie@woodfieldecology.co.uk>

**CC:**'Becky Prudden' <becky@woodfieldecology.co.uk>, Manners, Moira C (NE)

<Moira.Manners@naturalengland.org.uk>, 'Barry Wilson' <Barry.Wilson@ejwglendinning.co.uk>, Commercial Services (NE) <CommercialServices@naturalengland.org.uk>, Ramsay, Denise (NE) <Denise.Ramsay@naturalengland.org.uk>

Dear Ollie

Further to our constructive meeting today, I write to confirm the DAS advice that I provided at the meeting.

- My detailed advice is restricted to impacts upon the greater horseshoe bat interest associated with the South Hams Special Area of Conservation (SAC). I explained that I was not in a position to comment upon protected species matters, and that our *Standing Advice or Pre-submission screening service: advice on planning proposals affecting protected species* would be a means of obtaining further advice.
- The bat survey in relation to greater horseshoe bats has followed best practice, and has been presented to a high standard. We are satisfied that the bat surveys have been carried out to a good standard, and provide a robust basis to inform potential impacts.
- We are supportive of the phased approach that will underpin the mitigation and enhancement measures. The approach that you outlined ensures that the mitigation and enhancement measures will be in place and functioning as habitats before impacts occur.
- We welcome the habitat works that will benefit biodiversity, and consider that the approach will provide a range of semi-natural habitats that will provide opportunities for a wide range of species. The approach and thought that has gone into putting together the biodiversity mitigation and enhancements measures is exemplary.
- In terms of impacts upon the greater horseshoe bat interest associated with the South Hams SAC. The site falls outside potential key supporting foraging areas (i.e 'sustenance zones'), and partially falls within a 'strategic flyway'. The survey data does not indicate that the site coincides with significant greater horseshoe bat activity, and the mitigation and enhancement measures proposed adequately deal with any potential residual impacts on the limited greater horseshoe bat numbers associated with the site. On this basis, we consider the proposals are of low risk to greater horseshoe bat activity associated with the South Hams SAC. Based upon the information that you have provided, we advise that the proposals will not result in likely significant effects upon the greater horseshoe bats associated with the South Hams SAC.

Please feel free to get back to me with any queries for clarification.

This advice concludes our Discretionary Advice.

Regards,

Julien

**Julien Sclater**

Lead Adviser, Devon Sustainable Development Team

**Natural England**

Renslade House, Level 9, Bonhay Road, Exeter, EX4 3AW

Direct line: 0300-060-0456; 02080267468

---

**Subject:**RE: Linhay Hill Quarry  
**Date:**Thu, 14 Apr 2016 12:24:46 +0000  
**From:**Sclater, Julien R (NE) <Julien.R.Sclater@naturalengland.org.uk>  
**To:**'Ollie Prudden' <ollie@woodfieldecology.co.uk>  
**CC:**'Becky Prudden' <becky@woodfieldecology.co.uk>, Manners, Moira C (NE) <Moira.Manners@naturalengland.org.uk>

Hello Ollie

The approach you propose sounds sensible. Look forward to hearing from you with further details – will the info you want reviewed be part of a pre application DAS contract? (if so, you will need to submit DAS request form to our commercial services team).

Regards,

Julien

**Julien Sclater**

Lead Adviser, Devon Sustainable Development Team

**Natural England**

Renslade House, Level 9, Bonhay Road, Exeter, EX4 3AW  
Direct line: 0300-060-0456; 02080267468

**From:** Ollie Prudden  
**Sent:** 14 April 2016 12:57  
**To:** Sclater, Julien R (NE)  
**Cc:** Becky Prudden  
**Subject:** Linhay Hill Quarry

Dear Julian,

Hope you are well?

The design team have been working through a number of changes with the design of the quarry to seek to reduce the landscape and ecological impacts as far as possible, which has delayed the programme a little, hence the long silence! Now that the design has settled, the intention is to target a submission date of the end of May.

The reason to get in touch is to check that you would still be able to fit in a review of the remaining bat survey report, the ecological mitigation plan, and a draft of the ES chapter on the basis of us getting these to you before the end of this month?

One minor wrinkle that the end of May submission date does throw up is that some of the baseline survey data would be a month over 2 years old. We do consider this remains adequate for the purposes of the assessment on the basis that we have undertaken a thorough level of survey, have been undertaking regular site visits since, and updated the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey last year without any significant habitat changes being noted. Given the length of the quarrying proposal as a whole, there will also clearly be a need for an ongoing programme of protected species surveys in any case. We have discussed this with Naomi Barker at DNPA, and she is happy with the approach, and I would be grateful if you were able confirm if you also agreed.

kind regards

Ollie

**Ollie Prudden** MA MSc MCIEEM

## Email correspondence with Dartmoor National Park Authority: Naomi Barker

**Subject:**RE: Linhay Hill

**Date:**Wed, 1 Jul 2015 10:06:52 +0000

**From:**Naomi Barker <nbarker@dartmoor.gov.uk>

**To:**Ollie Prudden <ollie@woodfieldecology.co.uk>

Dear Ollie

Thank you for clarifying my queries on the bat and botany matters, that all sounds fine to me.

As regards a comment by NE on the Scoping Opinion, I realised this fell between the stools between the departure of my maternity cover and my return to work. I have asked the planning case officer to send the consultation to the hub, but we have not heard back yet; as you say, we aren't expecting any feedback other than the NE standing advice.

I presume this clarifies everything at this stage? I look forward to receiving your reports in due course.

With best wishes

Naomi

Naomi Barker  
Ecologist  
Dartmoor National Park Authority

Working days: Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday

**From:** Ollie Prudden  
**Sent:** 26 June 2015 16:40  
**To:** Naomi Barker  
**Cc:** Becky Prudden  
**Subject:** Re: Linhay Hill

Dear Naomi,

Thank you for getting back to me on this. Apologies for taking a while to respond to you!

In response to your queries:

Surveys:

Thank you for confirming you are happy with the scope of surveys undertaken in relation to the Extension Area. Just to confirm, the outstanding automated bat surveys were completed in April this year.

With respect to your query regarding botanical surveys, findings have not suggested that full NVC surveys would be warranted for the habitats present. I think the survey methodologies sent to you probably omitted to specifically state that additional botanical observations were gathered through the course of the year (to supplement the extended Phase 1 Habitat survey carried out in April) to produce comprehensive species lists for all habitat types. The extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey did subdivide all semi-improved grasslands into 'poor' or 'good', and a detailed species list was obtained for the latter (only one small section of a field fell in this category) which included identification of indicative NVC community.

These additional botanical records and the indicative NVC would be reported within the ecological baseline assessment of the Site.

I trust this addresses your query?

Consultations:

We have been in contact with Moira Manners of Natural England, and had sought to use the Discretionary Advice Service, however unfortunately NE have advised us that they do not have the resources to provide a full advice service. They will be able to provide advice in relation to the Greater Horseshoe Surveys and review of the draft ES Ecology Chapter once produced.

We did also ask if NE a response to the ES Scoping Opinion had been formally requested - Moira advised this hasn't happened, but that any response would be limited to directing us to the relevant NE Standing Advice. We will be in touch again soon as details of the proposals progress.

Kind regards,

Ollie

**Ollie Prudden** BA MA MSc MCIEEM

On Mon, Jun 1, 2015 at 11:15 AM, Naomi Barker <[nbarker@dartmoor.gov.uk](mailto:nbarker@dartmoor.gov.uk)> wrote:

Hello Ollie

I am sorry it has taken me so long to get back to you – I was away and now Chrissy Mason, who dealt with this site in my absence last year, is away on leave as well. I had been hoping to speak to her before getting back to you, to make sure I was as up-to-date with the situation as possible, but given the amount of time that has passed, please see below some initial comments:

Having gone through all the email correspondence that Chrissy filed, it appears to me that we were happy with the scope of surveys undertaken, as presented in 2014; having said that, I am not clear to what extent you have undertaken a botanical assessment of the fields within the application site? I note you have done an extended Phase 1 Habitat survey and also hedgerow assessments, but I was wondering whether an assessment of the fields went beyond 'improved' or 'semi-improved' – especially in fields that looked like they were semi-improved. I gather that there were some outstanding greater horseshoe bat surveys still to be completed this year.

As regards consultation with NE, the last correspondence I can find is that Chrissy asked the hub for comment, and the reply was that the developer was to approach NE's discretionary advice service – Chrissy did forward this email to Anthea; to my understanding, nothing has happened since then, certainly not within DNPA.

I hope this helps as a starting point – I'll let you know if I've missed something once Chrissy has returned and I have spoken to her.

Best wishes

Naomi

Naomi Barker

Ecologist

Dartmoor National Park Authority

Parke, Haytor Road, Bovey Tracey, TQ13 9JQ

Working days: Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday

**From:** Ollie Prudden

**Sent:** 15 May 2015 12:48

**To:** Naomi Barker  
**Cc:** Becky Prudden  
**Subject:** Linhay Hill

Dear Naomi,

Further to our phone call earlier, I would be grateful if you could:

- confirm that DNPA are happy with the scope and methods of ecological surveys undertaken at Linhay Hill
- advise on whether Natural England were consulted on the ES Scoping request

As mentioned, Anthea Hoey (Atkins) is co-ordinating a full response to the ES Scoping Opinion; which will include a number of other queries/responses in addition to those we discussed, but at this stage I just wanted to get confirmation from you particularly with regards agreement on the survey scope as soon as possible.

If you have any queries, or need further information for us in relation to the above, please let me know.

kind regards

Ollie

--

**Ollie Prudden** BA MA MSc MCIEEM

---

----- Forwarded Message -----

**Subject:** Linhay Hill - follow-up

**Date:** Fri, 11 Sep 2015 10:19:23 +0000

**From:** Naomi Barker <nbarker@dartmoor.gov.uk>

**To:** Ollie Prudden <ollie@woodfieldecology.co.uk>, becky@woodfieldecology.co.uk  
<becky@woodfieldecology.co.uk>

Dear Ollie and Becky,

Thank you for taking the time to meet and talk me through all the work you have carried out so far. As I said in the meeting, I am pleased with how much thought and effort appears to have gone into avoiding and/or minimising impacts on the ecological features present.

I have since had a meeting with our retained greater horseshoe bat consultant (Laurent Duverge from Kestrel Wildlife Consultants and Michael Oxford; I'll call them Kestrel for short), regarding the current proposals and anticipated/potential impacts on greater horseshoe bats. In essence, they thought that general procedure you are suggesting looks acceptable/appropriate.

In terms of working through the detail and also to inform an HRA, Laurent asked for more technical information though. I have a map showing the transect routes and a map showing automated detector locations within the quarry extension site but not the Alston Lane re-routing, and a summary of the overall survey effort for the quarry site; I also have a summary of survey effort for the Alston Lane replacement. You have provided me with a map showing what species roost in what buildings, and also which hedgerows/boundaries recorded the most horseshoe bats – again, so far only in the main extension area, not the Alston Lane section (presumably because that bit is still work in progress!). Would it be possible to supply info on what type of detector you deployed where at what dates, what transects you walked at what dates and times, and numbers of passes, and numbers of bats found in the houses (horseshoe bats)? Laurent was interested characterise the GHS roost a bit further – was it males only? What numbers were present? And, looking at the map, there appear to be random holes within the hedgerows as far as horseshoe use is concerned, inasmuch as some hedgerows seem to be well used but with no activity leading up to or away from said hedgerow – we were wondering if you had any thoughts on why this pattern might be occurring? He had no problem in principle with a change from pasture/hedgerow to broadleaf woodland, but was wondering if there was scope to incorporate managed rides within.

I felt it would be helpful to provide you with feedback at an early stage, but I appreciate we are not yet even at planning stage and I don't know what other factors Glendinnings are having to work through and integrate into the scheme - landscape and woodlands come to mind for starters. I understand that our landscape officer is meeting the Glendinning's consultant landscape officer on Monday. I have asked the planning case officer, James Aven, about the background to the request for air quality and noise data, but have not yet had a response.

In terms of consulting with Natural England, Kestrel advised to wait til we have the full data package together for greater horseshoe bats before doing so, so we can present them with the full picture. Please let me know if that sounds acceptable to you.

I think this covers the actions I was to take forward from the meeting, but please do let me know if there are things I have missed, or you have other queries or comments.

Best wishes  
Naomi

Naomi Barker  
Ecologist  
Dartmoor National Park Authority

Working days: Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday

---

**From:** Naomi Barker  
**Sent:** 27 November 2015 12:35  
**To:** 'Ollie Prudden'  
**Subject:** RE: Linhay Hill - follow-up

Hi Ollie

Please see below our response and individual comments on the HRA approach you sent us. Please be aware that we have not at this stage consulted NE on this document, so any comments made at a later stage by NE might amend the approach taken. I have however consulted with colleagues and hope that our response is comprehensive and therefore the approach taken is robust. Overall the view was that the approach and items included into the approach and document are fine. Just a few comments below:

- On p 3 'Selection of Natura 2000 Sites': I was advised that NE often ask for the relevant constituent SSSIs and their interest features to be included in the list of sites to be screened. The repetition of matters considered is acknowledged, but this is what I was told by someone who carries out a lot of HRAs on this scale.
- Further down on p 3 'Loss/damage to or degradation of supporting habitat (Greater Horseshoe Bat)': There was some discussion that, whilst this broad statement includes everything that could impact upon greater horseshoe bats, it would be good to separate out the issues, ie 'land cover change', 'lighting', 'noise and vibration', etc, so we are sure that the range of potential impacts has been covered.
- There was also a suggestion to include a pathway on hydrological impacts, due to Balland Stream being present in the application area. Whilst I don't anticipate that this will go further than Stage 1 Screening, if it's been mentioned then we know it hasn't been overlooked.
  - P 4 'Consideration of other plans and projects': We feel you need to incorporate relevant plans on the Teignbridge DC side, given that the application site is on the very border of the national park. Please see here a list of current applications within the Ashburton/Buckfastleigh Area you should be aware of on the DNPA side:
    - Peartree Cross, Ashburton – extant permission.
    - Tuckers (Brewery Meadow) – current application (0441/15) – in masterplan area planning, applications and paperwork can be viewed online at <http://www.dartmoor.gov.uk/planning/planning-application-search>
    - Holne Road, Buckfastleigh – allocated housing site BCK2 in local plan. ([http://www.dartmoor.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0009/370917/DMDDPD-PublicationVersion-010813\\_Buckfastleigh1.pdf](http://www.dartmoor.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0009/370917/DMDDPD-PublicationVersion-010813_Buckfastleigh1.pdf))

- Devonia Products Mill, Buckfastleigh – allocated redevelopment site BCK3 in local plan ([http://www.dartmoor.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0009/370917/DMDDPD-PublicationVersion-010813\\_Buckfastleigh1.pdf](http://www.dartmoor.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0009/370917/DMDDPD-PublicationVersion-010813_Buckfastleigh1.pdf))
  - Buckfast Spinning Works – redevelopment of the former Axminster carpets site at Buckfast – not allocated, and no proposal as yet.
- P4 ‘Documents that will be reviewed’: to add that an SA/SEA and also HRA on the Ashburton Masterplan is expected – I’ll send it through when it arrives. There is also a Site Assessment Document of the LDF Development Management and Delivery DPD, which I attach.
- And finally, I was advised it would be helpful to append the GHS survey methods/effort to this document to inform an opinion on the robustness of the data as we progress with this.

I hope all those points make sense, but please let me know if you have any comments to make.

Your bat survey reports are with Kestrel at the moment for a second opinion, so I hope to get back with comments on those soon. A query I had at this stage was whether or to what extent you have received any pre-app advice or feedback from NE?

Thank you again for getting back to our archaeologist so quickly.

Best wishes  
Naomi

---

**Subject:**FW: bat reports for Linhay Quarry  
**Date:**Fri, 29 Jan 2016 12:27:52 +0000  
**From:**Naomi Barker <nbarker@dartmoor.gov.uk>  
**To:**Ollie Prudden <ollie@woodfieldecology.co.uk>

Hi Ollie

Many apologies for the very late reply commenting on the two bat reports you sent through in November. Hopefully, they are not too late now, and, as you will see, there are few fundamental points, so it shouldn’t cause any headaches.

I thought you might like to see this quote from Laurent direct: *‘My general comments regarding the reports are that they are two of the best I have ever come across. I thought they were very well structured, clear, gave concise and relevant information, and certainly showed their decision-making process well. A very good (excellent?) piece of work which should be used to illustrate how to provide an ecology report.’.*

In essence, we have no fundamental comments on the survey methods and effort, the data analysis, evaluation and interpretation. They all follow best practice, and comprehensive, and clearly described. It might be useful to combine the evaluation for the two sites into one integrated piece of work, but that would be more for ease of understanding rather than it changing the site value or other interpretative comments you have made. Please see here a few comments from Laurent direct on a few points:

*If I were to be nit-picky, I would have liked to have seen:-*

- *the use of DNA analysis to confirm the “probable” brown long-eared bat roost records (in the main report), and*
- *a repeat visit to building LW3 (in the Waye Lane Report) in early- to mid-July, to confirm that the LHBs were indeed breeding there*

*I generally agree with their overall site evaluation, but slightly disagree with some of the species-specific evaluations where:-*

- *In the main report*
  1. *Given the rarity of Barbastelles, and their regular occurrence on site, I would have judged the site to be of county importance to this species*
  2. *Given the evidence from the desk study, and levels of LH activity on site, I would have judged the site to be of county importance to this species*



- *In the Waye Lane report:-*

1. *Again I would have rated the site as of county value for barbastelles.*

You mentioned that there had been some revisions in the proposals, so I look forward to hearing more about those in due course. You had already drawn up a comprehensive habitat creation and hedge relocation scheme when we met last year, which I presume has become amended given changes in proposals. Having thought about the matter a bit further, and also from having read your report numerous times, I am wondering what scope there is to think beyond the application site, in the sense of looking at available habitat data from the surroundings that might give an indication where good foraging areas are, to then be able to 'guide' bats to these foraging areas and also potential roosting sites, as well as creating some foraging habitat within the application site.

I assume you have spent some time doing a watching brief on the archaeological investigations on 4 areas of hedgerow. Hopefully that has been going smoothly.

Apologies again for the amount of time it has taken to get back to you on this. If you have any comments or queries, or would like to discuss anything else, please let me know.

With best wishes  
Naomi

Naomi Barker  
Ecologist  
Dartmoor National Park Authority

---

**Subject:**RE: Linhay - Mitigation and Enhancement Plan

**Date:**Tue, 5 Apr 2016 14:37:18 +0000

**From:**Naomi Barker <nbarker@dartmoor.gov.uk>

**To:**Ollie Prudden <ollie@woodfieldecology.co.uk>

Dear Ollie,

Thank you for the updated ecological mitigation and enhancement strategy – I am pleased that you have looked well beyond the application site in terms of enhancement and management measures, and remain pleased that you looking to translocate and plant new hedges, as these form an important part of what makes that particular landscape special for biodiversity.

Given the complexity of the updates, it would be useful to talk through the changes – maybe once you have finalised the balance sheet and the landscape strategy. Were you thinking of a phonecall, as I am wondering if it would be appropriate to have a meeting with our landscape officer as well, to ensure we are all up to date with proposals, and avoiding later differences of opinion? I will provide our landscape officer with the drawing you sent through, and I will ask him what level of conversation he would find most useful at the present time, if that is ok.

Best wishes  
Naomi

Naomi Barker  
Ecologist  
Dartmoor National Park Authority

Working days: Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday

---

**Subject:**RE: Linhay - Mitigation and Enhancement Plan

**Date:**Wed, 13 Apr 2016 09:22:15 +0000

**From:** Naomi Barker <nbarker@dartmoor.gov.uk>  
**To:** Ollie Prudden <ollie@woodfieldecology.co.uk>

Hi Ollie

I have booked a meeting room here on Friday from 10am (it's tiny, the only one that was left at this short notice!).

Re the age of the surveys: I can only comment on the bat surveys, as I haven't seen the reports for the habitats or other taxonomic groups. The bat surveys you carried out were very comprehensive, and recorded a lot of bat evidence. The habitat hasn't changed in the last two years, so in terms of bat activity over the application site there is unlikely to be a significant change that would warrant a resurvey.

In terms of surveying the roosts, or potential roosts, ie trees and buildings: It is my understanding that none of the buildings will be affected directly by the proposals, and again you found a substantial amount of evidence within the numerous buildings you surveyed. As long as connectivity for bats remains, so that they can still access the roosts and access suitable foraging habitat appropriate to that level of bat use, then I don't think further surveys would provide additional information that would add information or change mitigation proposals. I think you said that tree roosts, or potential tree roosts, would need to be checked throughout any extension phase, but I wouldn't expect a new suite of surveys for the submission.

In terms of the other surveys, if they were carried out with the same thoroughness as the bat surveys, and you can demonstrate that the habitats haven't changed, ie it is unlikely that the situation has changed, then I would consider their age acceptable to inform the value of the site, assess impacts and formulate the mitigation and enhancement strategy (taking into account one would need to resurvey for things such as badger setts anyway throughout the course of any quarry extension).

Should for any reason this application not have been determined within the next year, ie by the time we get round to the next survey season, then I think we would need to review whether there is a need for updated survey information.

Hopefully this answers your query, but please let me know if you have comments on any of the above – happy to chat through on Friday as well.

Best wishes  
Naomi

**From:** Ollie Prudden  
**Sent:** 12 April 2016 16:41  
**To:** Naomi Barker  
**Subject:** Re: Linhay - Mitigation and Enhancement Plan

Hi Naomi,

Good to speak to you earlier, and thanks for being able to meet so quickly, it's really appreciated.

Just to confirm, its 10am on Friday 15th at your offices.

I would also be grateful if you could drop me an email confirming our conversation that you were happy with the age of survey data - apologies if this is belabouring a point! As discussed, based on a submission date of the end of May, some of the baseline data will be a month over 2 years. We do consider this remains valid on the basis that we have undertaken a through level of survey, been undertaking regular site visits and updated the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey last year without any significant habitat changes being noted.

kind regards

Ollie

**Ollie Prudden** MA MSc MCIEEM

---

**Subject:**RE: Linhay Hill Quarry - ES chapter Appendices and Supporting Documents

**Date:**Tue, 3 May 2016 12:36:40 +0000

**From:**Naomi Barker <nbarker@dartmoor.gov.uk>

**To:**Ollie Prudden <ollie@woodfieldecology.co.uk>

Hi Ollie

I have had a chat with my legal and planning colleagues about the queries below, please see the comments in red. Hopefully they address your queries satisfactorily, but let me know if you have any further queries or comments.

Cheers

Naomi

On 22/04/2016 12:41, Naomi Barker wrote:

Hi Ollie

Thanks for your time last week and also the additional info in your email from Wednesday.

To clarify: I was to enquire to what extent, or in what format, one might want to set up a steering group, or similar, to oversee the long-term implementation of habitat mitigation and restoration of the overall quarry, both during the active stage and then post-quarrying stage?

To some extent this is covered by the ROMP, though I understand there are discussions that, in the case of any planning approval, there would be a steering group to oversee the long-term implementation, on which DNPA would have a seat.

You were seeking clarification on how often, or at what stages, we as a planning authority would expect there to be updated survey information for the application site, as things change over the decades? I think we were clear on duties relating to protected species and licensing, it was more the area of general habitat value and context, and keeping up to date with what species and habitats are present in the application site, and the value that the application site has in the wider landscape? You also wanted to have some comment from myself on what would be considered a reasonable monitoring strategy for impacts, mitigation and restoration?

The consensus was that it would be most pragmatic to carry out necessary surveys prior to any works commencing per given phase, and as per protected species guidance, to adequately inform working methods and requirements. In terms of a monitoring strategy, this would obviously depend on the ecological receptor, and also the nature of the impact and mitigation, and stage of any establishment (ie more frequent in the early stages, and more frequent for habitats that change at a faster pace than those that take longer to establish, eg woodlands), so one would need to work through those one by one to draw up the monitoring strategy.

And finally you wanted a steer on what documentation is provided to us at what stage, or rather, at what stage one would go from outline principles and concepts to detailed matters?

Apparently we cannot answer this question at this stage, as it depends on a whole raft of considerations of which ecology is just one, and this will become teased out during the application phase.

This is the area where there is considerable cross-over between myself and our legal team; I will speak to our legal officer, and will also ask colleagues of mine in other national parks with quarrying experience. I would be grateful though if you could confirm for me whether the three points above cover what we discussed.

With best wishes

Naomi

**From:** Ollie Prudden  
**Sent:** 20 April 2016 15:01  
**To:** Naomi Barker  
**Cc:** Becky Prudden  
**Subject:** Linhay Hill Quarry - ES chapter Appendices and Supporting Documents

Dear Naomi,

Thanks for taking the time to meet with us last week, and I hope its given you a clearer picture of the proposals and the ecological mitigation and enhancement strategy.

As discussed at the meeting, I've attached a brief table setting out what we are intending to include as ES Ecology chapter appendices and supporting documents. Do let us know if you have any comments or queries.

I have also attached the latest draft Biodiversity Budget - there will be further minor changes to this, but nothing that changes it substantively.

kind regards

Ollie

--

**Ollie Prudden** MA MSc MCIEEM