

INTERNAL MEMORANDUM

To: David Cross
From: Matt Davies (Ecologist)
Ext: 5278
Memo number: 3
Date of previous memo: 13/01/2023
Date: 16/01/2023

SUBJECT: P/22/0326 | Conversion of chapel into 8 flats with associated refurbishment works, demolition of rear vestry annexe and creation of dedicated car parking area. | Brynhyfryd Chapel Thomas Street Treharris

Chapel building, garages, grassland and scrub. Nearby woodland and wooded river corridor.

Documents submitted in support of the application detailed above:

1. Bat Survey: Brynhyfryd Chapel, Thomas Street, Treharris, CF46 5AA. Version, 1.0. Date, December 2022. Ecological Services Ltd.
2. Bat Friendly Working Methodology: Brynhyfryd Chapel, Treharris, Brynhyfryd Chapel. Version, 1.0. Date, December 2022. Ecological Services Ltd.
3. Block Plan Drawing No. SD481 02. Date received, 16/12/2022
4. Proposed Elevations. Brynhyfryd Chapel, Thomas Street, Treharris, Drawing number SD48106A. Date Nov 22.

Comments and questions

- o Despite the negative results from the bat survey work (Document 1), the recommendation to undertake the works under a method statement (Document 2) is entirely appropriate given the previous possible roost record and the possibility of hibernating bats.

NB ideally, works to sensitive areas (with ecological supervision) would be undertaken outside of any cold periods during the winter months in order to reduce the risk of disturbing bats that may be hibernating.

Could a statement to this effect please be added to Document 2?

In addition there should be gaps included in boundaries for hedgehogs. This also needs to be added to Document 1 and onto the plans for the scheme. Apologies for not picking up on this before.

- o The ivy, buddleia etc on the walls of the Chapel would be suitable for nesting birds. This needs to be noted within Documents 1 and 2 with mitigation measures included.
- o As previously referred to - the seed mix included within Document 3 is acceptable. However, there is now some confusion as a result of comments from the Architect – *'The amenity area isn't available for meadow grass its a area usable for children*

and adult activities, the restricted nature of the site restricts further ground level ecological measures, and the proximity of humans will seriously effect any creatures in that area.' This seems to be at odds with the info included within Document 3?

- The applicant's architect has confirmed there is to be no external lighting.