

An Bord Pleanála



Inspector's Report

Reference: PL11.JP0039

Title: N80 Maidenhead realignment scheme consisting of improvements to the N80 National Road from the townland of Ballynagall to the townland of Castletown, County Laois.

Location: County Laois

Applicant: Laois County Council

Type of project: Section 177AE Appropriate Assessment

Date of Site Visit: 6th July 2016

Inspector: Philip Davis

1. Introduction

Laois County Council is seeking approval from An Bord Pleanála to carry out realignment works on the existing N80 National Road in a section between Carlow and Portlaoise close to the village of Ballylynan. All appeals against the CPO orders were withdrawn. The proposed realignment works are within the catchment of the River Barrow which is part of the River Barrow and River Nore SAC 002162. On this basis a Screening concluded that impacts that could adversely affect the integrity of this SAC could not be ruled out. On this basis, an NIS was required as part of an appropriate assessment of the proposed works.

Section 177AE of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) requires that where an appropriate assessment is required in respect of development by a local authority, the authority shall prepare an NIS and the development shall not be carried out unless the Board has approved the development with or without modifications. Furthermore Section 177V of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) requires that the appropriate assessment shall include a determination by the Board as to whether or not the proposed development would affect the integrity of a European site and the appropriate assessment shall be carried out by the Board before consent is given for the proposed development.

The Board has been requested by the local authority to approve the submitted NIS under S.177V of the Act.

Laois County Council is therefore seeking:

A determination by the Board as to whether or not the proposed development would affect the integrity of a European site.

Approval from the Board, with or without modifications, for the proposed development which requires the Board to assess:

- The likely effects on the environment.
- The likely consequences for the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- The likely significant effects on a European site.

2. Site Description

Photographs of the site and environs are attached in the appendix to this report.

N80 Maidenhead

The N80 National Secondary Road links Carlow town to Portlaoise. It is primarily a single lane road with no hard shoulder, although sections closer to Portlaoise have been improved and upgraded. The section in question runs along the edge of an upland area, where it overlooks the wide plain drained by the River Barrow. It runs mostly along the 100 metre contour line, in an area marked by uneven rolling hills of limestone till overlying shale bedrock. The area is mostly agricultural, with a mix of land qualities of dairy and beef grazing with fields mostly bounded by high hedges, with some small areas of fen and deciduous woodland.

The section of the M80 for realignment is approximately 2 km in length and located in the townlands of Maidenhead, Ballynagall, Castletown, and Coolanowle. It is very twisty section of single lane carriage way road running north-west from Ballynagall where it follows the curving natural contours of the upland area of southern Laois. It runs through a shallow valley before descending to a straighter section to a crossroads at Castletown, where there are a number of dwellings and the remains of a possible medieval settlement. The proposed realignment mostly follows the main alignment, except where a major twist in the road is to be straightened – this section runs across an area of fen, where natural drainage from the uplands to the Barrow Valley is blocked by a natural ridge, possibly a drumlin. The lands on either side are mostly agricultural, with some apparently unused land.

3. Proposal

The proposed realignment is of a Type 2 single carriageway (7 metres in width, 0.5 metres hard strip) and 2.5 metres verge on a somewhat straighter alignment – it is a 100kph design speed road.

4. Technical Reports and other planning file correspondence

The applicant submitted two main documents with the submission:

An application for approval in accordance with Section 177AE of the Planning and Development Acts 2000-2015 which includes screening for EIA and AA and a project overview, along with a summary of known impacts. This document includes plans for the proposed realignment.

A Natura Impact Statement Report.

5. Legislative Context

Part XAB of the Planning and Development Acts 2000-2010 sets out the requirements for the appropriate assessment of developments

which could have an effect on a European site, its qualifying interests or conservation objectives.

177AE sets out the requirements for the appropriate assessment of developments carried out by or on behalf of local authorities.

Section 177AE(1) requires a local authority to prepare, or cause to be prepared, a Natura Impact Statement (NIS) in respect of the proposed development.

Section 177AE(2) states that a proposed development in respect of which an appropriate assessment is required shall not be carried out unless the Board has approved it with or without modifications.

Section 177AE(3) states that where a NIS has been prepared pursuant to subsection (1), the local authority shall apply to the Board for approval and the provisions of Part XAB shall apply in the carrying out of the appropriate assessment.

Section 177V(3) states that a competent authority shall give consent for a proposed development only after having determined that the proposed development shall not adversely affect the integrity of a European site.

Section 177AE(6)(a) states that before making a decision in respect of a proposed development the Board shall consider the NIS, any submissions or observations received and any other information relating to:

- The likely effects on the environment.
- The likely consequences for the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.
- The likely significant effects on a European site.

6. Consultations

The consultations were issued in relation to both the NIS and the CPO Order. The specific objections to the CPO orders were withdrawn.

Commission for Railway Regulation

Recommends that Iarnod Eireann be consulted.

Transport Infrastructure Ireland

No specific comments.

Department of Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht (DAU)

Comments restricted to archaeology. A number of recorded ancient monument and buildings on the NIAH are noted, as is the report attached with the submission. Further investigations are recommended in line with the mitigation measures proposed in the report.

Inland Fisheries Ireland

The IFI does not object, but notes the potential impact of both construction and operation on fisheries. The Board is requested to ascertain if the land take is adequate to ensure there is space for the construction of necessary containment and settlement areas for water run-off. A series of conditions are recommended (18 in total).

7. Planning Authority's Comments

The planning authority submitted a detailed response with regard to the IFI submission, acknowledging the comments, but submitting that the design incorporates all required mitigation measures with regard to invasive species and preventing run-off. It is considered that there is sufficient land take in order to facilitate settlement ponds where appropriate. It states that there is no difficulty with incorporating any of the recommended conditions.

8. Assessment

The local authority supplied two documents, the Natura Impact Statement Report, and the Application for Approval Report in relation to an approval under S.177AE (XAD of the 2000 Act, as amended). In accordance with S.177AE(6), I will address this under the following headings:

- **The likely effects on the environment.**
- **The likely consequences for the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.**
- **The likely significant effects on a European site.**

The likely effects on the environment

Overview

The section of road, and its realignment section, is in primarily open countryside in an area without any specific landscape or historic designations although part includes what was formerly demesne lands and there it clips an area of archaeological potential. The section of road to be straightened out appears to be of 20th Century or early 19th Century origin. The very oldest OS maps show what became the N80 as a road running directly across the drumlin ridge, ironically in a much

more direct alignment which echoes the current proposal. This older section of road is now inaccessible, and exists in sections as farm tracks and the entrance track to a farm complex. The area is mostly elevated relative to the plain to the north and north-east, with Athy the largest settlement (at a crossing point of the Barrow) about 8 km to the north. The Barrow, at its closest, is about 5 km to the north-east. At the north-western section of the area to be improved, there is close by a motte and some older enclosure features indicating that this may have been a substantial medieval settlement centring around Castletown House, which is several hundred metres north of the northern starting point of the proposed realignment.

The area is typical of a midlands landscape, at the interface of the uplands area of the Carlow-Laois border with the flatter topography of the Barrow catchment. The underlying geology is shale with karstified limestone on the north-eastern section, with deep overlying deposits of limestone glacial till characterising the foothills of the uplands, growing shallower at the Castletown end of the road. The land is generally moderately well drained grazing land, gradually deteriorating in quality on higher ground. Watercourses in the area run in a generally easterly direction towards the Barrow and its tributaries. These run under the existing road in a series of small culverts. The area is well wooded, with mature hedgerows of ash and hawthorn. The one obvious environmentally sensitive feature along the new alignment is a small pond with surrounding fen and carr woodland. This appears to be a natural feature where a drumlin ridge (probably of glacial till) running parallel to the road blocks natural drainage running down from the uplands. The oldest OS plans indicate that this pond was once significantly larger.

The applicant submitted an EIA Screening (Section 2.1 of the application report) which concluded that it was sub-threshold having regard to the Roads Act. I would concur with this conclusion and I would consider that there are no specific environmental sensitivities that would require a sub-threshold EIS. The submitted documentation, in addressing environmental impacts follows broadly the requirements under the EIA Regulations, but is not an EIS. I would consider the information and analysis to be broadly acceptable in extent and in the detail of the assessment and conclusions. Each section sets out mitigation measures which I would consider to be part of the application so would not necessarily require confirmation by condition.

Drainage.

The report identifies three streams along the road which are currently either culverted or drains to a pond next to the road. This pond is the most obvious environmentally sensitive feature along the realignment – it would be partially infilled by the new road works. Two of the streams will be culverted in line with NRA Design Manual standards. The inflow stream to the pond will not be directly impacted upon. It is proposed

that overall drainage will be implemented in accordance with SuDs standards.

The pond is located where the natural slope from the uplands to the west meets and extended ridge, which seems to be a drumlin. It is fed by a small stream and it may receive some groundwater seepage. It is surrounded by a small area of fen and carr woodland (there is additional analysis of this habitat in the NIS). It appears to be moderately polluted from probable farm and septic tank run-off. I will address the ecological impacts in the appropriate assessment section below, but in drainage terms I do not consider that its partial loss is significant.

The proposed mitigation measures are set out in section 5.5 of the Approval Report – these are in line with NRA guidelines and best practice – I do not consider that the impacts would be particularly significant and no additional conditions above the mitigation measures set out are necessary.

Soils, Geology, and hydrogeology

The submitted report indicates that the site is over a Poor Aquifer with Extreme Vulnerability at the south-eastern end, and a Regionally Important aquifer at the northern end where it runs over karstic limestone bedrock. The bedrock is shale and karstic limestone (there are no exposed areas of rock visible in the area). I note that a well is indicated on older OS plans next to the existing alignment and very close to part of the new landtake at the south-eastern end – there is no reference to this well in the submitted documentation (although it is noted in the archaeological report) and as the area was overgrown I was unable to establish during my site visit if this well is still used – most probably not as there are no dwellings close by. This well is in part of the ‘poor aquifer’ area. No indications are given on file as to the depth to groundwater along the proposed additional works. The subsoil (glacial till) level is indicated as varying from 0.8 to 12 metres in depth.

The submitted assessment and mitigation measures (section 6.5) are in line with recommended best practice and as the immediate area is not particularly vulnerable I would consider this acceptable. However, I am somewhat concerned at the non-identification of the well and I would recommend a condition to specifically address this issue.

Air Quality and Climate

The site is rural in nature with a small number of dwellings in the vicinity. It is indicated that increasing the road from 80kph to 100kph standard will result in a small but not significant rise in CO2 emissions from its use. The mitigation measures (section 7.5) are standard construction measures which I would consider normal and satisfactory – there is nothing in the area that would require non-standard methods.

I consider this element to be satisfactory and I do not recommend that any additional information or conditions would be required.

Noise

The report identifies 7 no. properties with the potential to be affected by additional road noise from the realignment. It concludes that the impact will be neutral or a reduction for all but two, and for these the increase would be barely perceptible. Given the relatively minor alterations in the areas close to those dwellings I would consider this a reasonable conclusion so I do not consider that the addition of noise barriers or other mitigation measures would be necessary. Section 8.5.1 outlines standard mitigation measures during construction, which I consider would be adequate.

Landscape and visual

The landscape, particularly of the southern section of the proposed road, is attractive, although its wooded and undulating nature ensures it is relatively low sensitivity. It does not have any specific designation and is not close to any major tourist sites although to the north there are a number of rural tourist attractions. The most significant impact would be at Maidenhead townland, where the road will cut through one of the most attractive sections of the N80, where it twists along the valley, to create a straight section, running along an existing ridge. The works will, on the southern end remove a number of hedgerows – the northern section is characterised by lower walls and fences and so there will be significantly less impact.

The mitigation measures primarily involve the replanting of hedges. The impact will be moderate in the short term, but much less so in the longer term as hedges mature. The mitigation measures (section 9.5) state that a landscape planting plan will be prepared – no details are provided, except that the planting will be of similar native species to the existing plants and trees. I would consider this acceptable, but would recommend a condition such that the details be submitted and approved prior to works commencing.

Ecology

The proposed realignment runs across areas of grassland, minor streams, some ash/oak woodland and a small pond with associated fen. The Report states that there are historical records of badger, pine marten, fallow deer and hedgehog in the vicinity of the site, and frogs were noted near the pond. During my site visit I noted possible evidence of hares in a field west of the existing alignment. Some of the trees are potential bat roosts/foraging areas.

The pond is potentially the most important habitat along the route although the Report notes that there was a visible oil slick on the surface and the water was stagnant. Although I could not gain access to the pond, from my observations this is correct – it appears to suffer

from septic tank and agricultural run-off. There is a significant wetland mosaic around it including a patch of carr (wet woodland) with willow and alder, and dense wetland vegetation around the pond. The drier woodland around it includes hazel, hawthorn and oak. The survey notes that the frog is considered internationally important and is protected under the Habitats Directive and the Irish Wildlife Act. The Report concludes that the habitat, specifically the oak/ash woodland, is not an Annex I habitat, but does have significant local ecological importance. The pond, due to its condition, is not considered of significance, except insofar as it may be related to the presence of frog.

The mitigation measures relate to construction works and mostly relate to the timing of works and pre-works bat surveys. A pre-construction frog survey is recommended to identify the population dynamics of frogs in the pond, and the excavation of the entire pond area should be avoided outside the confines of the corridor. I consider the latter element of the recommendations to be particularly significant and I would recommend it by set specifically by condition.

I do have some concerns about these local ecological impacts. It does seem, unfortunately, that the layout of the area is such that removing this section of woodland and pond is the only reasonable route to take out the largest bend in the road. It is unfortunate that the possibility of allowing additional woodland in the residual lands between the bend and the new alignment was not specifically addressed in order to provide some mitigation for the loss of this locally important woodland. The Board may wish to consider more specific conditions to ensure residual lands on the new embankments be used to establish replacement oak/ash woodland, and that the residual pond be specifically protected (not least, with improved protection from polluted run-off) to ensure its importance for frogs is maintained.

I note the comments by the Inland Fisheries Ireland about landtake and the requirement for sufficient land for settlement ponds to ensure no impacts on fisheries. The ecology report attached with the application indicates that one stream has potential salmonid spawning habitat some 1.5 km downstream of the works. I am satisfied that the design submitted has taken adequate account of the need to ensure no negative impacts on downstream fisheries.

Cultural heritage

The Approval Report includes as an addendum an Archaeological and Built Heritage Assessment of the realignment. It notes the proximity (within 50 metres) of six recorded ancient monuments including a deserted medieval settlement at Castletown, and an associated motte and bailey, graveyard and enclosure. Another enclosure is noted at the southern end. The route just clips the edge of an area of archaeological potential associated with the medieval settlement at Castletown. It is also noted that the works will impact on a number of

sites with potential archaeological interest including the watercourses, wells, and the pond.

There are two structures on the Register of Protected Structures within 500 metres – Castletown House and Kilabban Church of Ireland, both early 19th Century structures. The town goes through part of what was the demesne of Maidenhead House although there are few visible features left in this section contemporary with the main house. There is also a postbox and a vernacular building of value on the Castletown end of the works.

The route does not directly interfere or destroy any known archaeological or architectural structures of importance, but it seems clear that the entire route has significant archaeological potential. The mitigation (section 11.5) as set out requires a geophysical survey of all greenfield areas to be crossed and more detailed investigations of the watercourses and the pond. I consider this reasonable and would recommend that it be set by condition that this be carried out before any construction works are permitted. With regard to built heritage, it is recommended that a record be made of the sections of the demesne of Maidenhead House and that other features, most notably the post box, gateway to Maidenhead House, and the vernacular house be protected during construction.

Interactions and cumulative impacts

The Approval Report submitted addressed interactions and cumulative impacts and notes that there are relatively few other relevant proposals in the vicinity – the only likely major developments in the area are windfarms – the area to the west is designated as ‘open for consideration’. There are no major road schemes proposed for the vicinity, although it is intended to gradually upgrade the entire road to 100kph standard. I do not consider that there are any interactions or cumulative impacts that would require additional conditions over the proposed mitigation measures.

The likely effects for the proper and sustainable planning of the area

The current Development Plan for the area is the Laois County Development Plan 2011-2017. It has no specific policy objectives for the immediate area of this part of the N80. The N80 is identified as the most important road connecting the county with Carlow and its improvement and upgrading is regarded as a key objective (section 2.8.1 of the Plan). There are no large scale areas of zoned land in the area – as noted above, the only likely developments of scale in the area would be possible windfarms in the uplands to the west and south. The road provides a vital connection between Carlow and Portlaoise and the handful of small villages between them. The upgrading of the road would improve links in the vicinity, but not to the extent that it could facilitate significant major developments in the area

that would not otherwise have been viable. There are no specific zoning designations or local policy objectives that would be either positively or negatively affected to any major extent, although I would consider that the impact of the works would have a minor positive benefit in achieving the general strategic aims of improving traffic safety and transportation links between settlements.

Policy objectives TT10/001 and TT10/002 are for the upgrading, improvement, and maintenance of the hierarchy of road transportation links between towns and cities in the County, and Policy TT10/P06 aims to facilitate investment in the road network, particularly the N80. The proposed upgrading works would be consistent with these policy objectives.

I would consider that the likely effects on the proper and sustainable planning in the area to be minor but generally positive if the mitigation measures to ensure protection of habitats and cultural heritage are implemented fully.

The likely significant effects on a European site

The application was accompanied by a Natura Impact Statement Report to facilitate an appropriate assessment by the Board as to whether the road development will adversely affect the integrity of any European site either alone or in combination with other plans and projects.

The NIS was on foot of a screening (section 3.4 of the NIS) which concluded that there were potential indirect/secondary impacts; in-combination impacts; and potential impacts from emissions on one European Site – the River Barrow and River Nore SAC site code 002162. It concluded that there were no potential impacts on any other SAC or SPA. I concur with this conclusion so I will confine the appropriate assessment to this SAC only.

The Barrow and River Nore SAC is a very large extensive SAC encompassing a number of riverine and estuarine habitats. Its qualifying interests of relevance to this proposal including the presence of freshwater species including Desmoulin's whorl snail, pearl mussel, crayfish, lamprey, shad, salmon, otter, and related plants. The conservation objectives for each of the relevant species and habitats are set out in the appendix to the NIS.

The designated area at its closest is some 5km from the proposed working area. The obvious pathway for any impact would be the small watercourses running through or near the site, which are all part of the catchment of the Barrow River. Of relevance to the proposal, the possible impact would be from emissions or other run-off from the proposed works directly or indirectly affecting the water quality or flow of the river with relevance to the species. I note that none of the

tributaries flowing towards the site are designated as SAC – it is only the main channel of the Barrow and its banks which is so designated in this part of Laois.

The Coolanowle Stream flows to the Douglas River, which meets the designated part of the Barrow some 9.5 km downstream. The small stream which serves the pond connects with the Gurteen stream which connects to the Barrow also via the Douglas River. Both these streams are very small and were barely discernible as watercourses during my site visit – the former was dry with no water running. Both run through culverts and the Coolanowle runs through what seems an artificial channel for some distance. The Coolanowle runs through a significant area of farmland. The NIS states that about 1.5 km downstream it would be suitable for possible spawning by salmonids, although this is not part of the designated SAC.

The small stream which runs into, and out of the pond appears to have been significantly impacted by pollution of the pond, which is stagnant and likely polluted from septic tank and agricultural run-off. The survey with the NIS identified a frog close by – this species is not part of the qualifying interest of the SAC. The NIS states that no species associated with the qualifying interest of the SAC was identified on or close to the streams and from my observations during my site visit I would consider it very unlikely that the streams would be suitable for spawning fish or other related species due to the very low level of flow, and the general level of disturbance from existing culverts and agricultural pollution would not render them as ideal habitats for any sensitive freshwater species.

The NIS identified the following potential actions with the potential to have a significant effect on the SAC:

Construction:

- Suspended solids;
- Pollution from other substances associated with construction such as fuel or bitumen;
- Introduction of invasive species such as Japanese knotweed, Himalayan balsam or Giant Hogweed (it is noticed that the first two are present along the N80, but not in the area of proposed works – I did not see any evidence of either species during my site visit).

Operational

- Obstruction of upstream movement of fauna;
- Pollution from contaminated water draining from the roads (including de-icing salts, combustion products or accidental spillage).

The NIS Report sets out mitigation measures in Section 4.4. All of these are standard best practice conditions associated with construction works; and the design, implementation and maintenance of roads, including management of materials on site, emergency measures to control spillages, and design aspects of culverts and settlement ponds. None of the suggested mitigation works would be non-standard for any major construction site incorporating minor watercourses. I would consider that the only 'unusual' factor in this section of road works is the presence of the pond, and I note that there are no proposals to actively improve the water quality of this pond. But having regard to the very small size of the stream leaving the pond and the distance from the designated SAC I would consider it unlikely that the pollution impacting this pond has a significant impact downstream, so maintaining an 'existing' situation would be acceptable.

There are no other significant works planned or likely in the vicinity that could have an in-combination impact on the SAC. I do not consider that the works would have a significant indirect or other impact on on-going or planned activities (such as agriculture) in the area that would have an indirect impact.

The NIS concluded that the proposed works, if constructed to best practice and in accordance with the recommended mitigation measure set out will not, either individually or in combination, adversely affect the integrity of the River Barrow and River Nore SAC. I concur with this conclusion. I would note that I do not consider that the additional conditions I will be recommending below (including those involving pre-archaeology works) would alter this conclusion, so long as they are carried out according to best practice and other regulatory requirements.

9. Conclusions and Recommendations

I conclude that subject to the conditions set out below, the proposed development:

- Would not have a significant negative impact on the environment;
- Would not have a negative effect on the proper planning and development of the area; and,
- Would not adversely affect the integrity of a European site.

I recommend therefore that subject to the conditions set out below, that for the following reasons and considerations approval is granted for the proposed N80 Maidenhead Realignment project.

REASONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

Having regard to:

- a) the EU Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC),
- b) the European Communities (Birds and Natural Habitats) Regulations, 2011,
- c) the conservation interests and conservation objectives of the River Barrow and River Nore candidate Special Area of Conservation (site code 002162),
- d) the provisions of the National Spatial Strategy 2002-2020, and Smarter Travel – A Sustainable Transport Future – A New Transport Policy for Ireland 2009 – 2020, and the related policies and objectives of the Laois County Development Plan 2011 – 2017,
- e) the nature and extent of the proposed road improvement as set out in the application for approval, to provide for road improvements to the N80 National Road,
- f) the information submitted in relation to the potential impacts on habitats, flora and fauna, including the Natura Impact Statement,
- g) the submissions and observations received in relation to the likely effects on the environment, and on the likely significant effects of the proposed development on a European site,
- h) the report and recommendation of the person appointed by the Board to make a report and recommendation on the matter.

It is considered that, subject to compliance with the conditions set out below, the proposed development would not have significant negative effects on the community in the vicinity, would provide an improved and safer National Road for all road users, would not give rise to a risk of pollution, would not be detrimental to the visual or landscape amenities of the area, would not seriously injure the amenities of property in the vicinity, and would not interfere with the existing land uses in the area. The proposed development would, therefore, be in accordance with the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

CONDITIONS

1. The proposed development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans and particulars lodged with the application including the Application for Approval Report, Natura Impact Statement, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the following conditions.

Reason: In the interest of clarity.

2. The mitigation measures contained in the Application for Approval Report and Natura Impact Statement submitted with the application, shall be implemented in full by the local authority and/or any agent acting on its behalf, except as may otherwise be required in order to comply with the conditions set out below.

Reason: In the interest of clarity, and to ensure the protection of a European site during construction.

3. All mitigation works as relevant set out in Section 11.5 of the Application for Approval Report submitted as part of the application shall be carried out in advance of works commencing.

Reason: In the interest of ensuring the continued preservation and recording of sites of archaeological interest.

4. The local authority shall engage the services of a project ecologist for the duration of the construction period to monitor the site set-up and construction of the proposed development in accordance with the mitigation measures proposed. This report shall include an assessment of the pond and proposals to protect the residual pond during and after the completion of works, with specific regard to the possible presence of frogs in the pond. On completion of the works, an audit report of the site works shall be prepared by the appointed person within a period of three months, which shall be maintained on record by the local authority.

Reason: In the interest of clarity, and to ensure the protection of a European site during construction.

5. Detailed measures in relation to the protection of bats during the construction period shall be determined in consultation with the National Parks and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Arts, Heritage and the Gaeltacht. These measures shall be implemented as

part of the development by the local authority and/or any agent acting on its behalf.

Reason: In the interest of wildlife protection.

6. Prior to the commencement of works a full survey and report shall be carried out by a qualified hydrologist/hydrogeologist of the spring indicated on OS maps next to proposed culvert NHD-C-1. Works shall not commence until the local authority confirms that the presence of this spring does not alter significantly the design of the proposed works or any element of the environmental impacts of the works as outlined in the Reports attached with the request for approval.

Reason: In the interest of clarity and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

7. Prior to the commencement of works a full landscape scheme shall be submitted for the agreement of the planning authority. This scheme shall include provision for the embankments to be planted with native species of trees with a similar species composition of the woodland area to be removed in the vicinity of the pond.

Reason: In the interest of wildlife protection and visual amenities.

Philip Davis,
Inspectorate.
25th August 2016