

Our Ref: 2538/02

Your Ref:

8th June 2026

Unit 5,
Triangle Business Park,
Pentrebach,
Merthyr Tydfil,
CF48 4TQ

BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

To whom it may concern,

This Supporting Covering Letter has been prepared in relation to the following applications:

- Non-Material Amendment P/26/0101 – Changing village, shepherd hut and pod area

This Supporting Covering Letter has been written to satisfy the concerns raised by the Planning Officer in relation to the applications mentioned above, these concerns are addressed below.

In relation to Preliminary Ecological Appraisal received May 2026

- Impact on trees and their root systems as a result of foul drainage requirements
 - Page 4 provides an aerial photograph combined with DataMap Wales “WOM21 Ancient Woodland Inventory” and shows the extent of ancient woodland and restored ancient woodland site in the vicinity.
 - Page 11 states: “There will be no removal of any mature trees, though there will be a loss of some understorey to allow the new camping provisions. Additional new planting is proposed to provide screening as per the landscape proposals masterplan and to replace any trees which may be removed, with the species planted to be of local provenance (grown in the UK) and native species only. The management plan as outlined in the landscape proposals masterplan will be implemented to ensure the survival of plants, and if any fail, these will be replaced like-for-like in the next winter season. Therefore, no woodland area will be lost as part of the current proposals. While the woodland habitat will be altered, the overall woodland character will be retained, with only clearance on the footprint of the small buildings (i.e. camping pods, and shepherds huts) and associated pedestrian paths. The footprint areas of each small building are not to be changed by the Non-Material Amendments being made.”

- Page 12 states “If any trees as laid out in Table 4 are to be altered or removed as part of the proposals, further investigations for bats will be required.”

In general terms, it is understood that over time trees may need to be felled and managed as they age, however the document is contradictory as mature trees are listed in table 4 and loss as a result of the proposal is a concern. The locations of drainage pipes set out in the drainage report (P26/0012) and which will serve the shepherd huts will fall within close proximity or in some cases under the trees identified to be retained.

In the first instance clarification is sought in relation to the contradictory statements in the PEA.

Response: The page 11 reference is there as a precautionary measure. The development proposed will not require the loss of the trees identified in Table 4.

In relation to the specific details in relation to foul drainage, it is noted that the plan attached to the PEA does not include the drainage routes, as such it might be that your ecologist was unaware of the potential impact in relation to the foul drainage strategy, particularly in relation to the trees with specific root protection zones ie 57, T55, T54 (this list is not exhaustive). It is recommended that either the drainage plan is revisited to ensure the pipes do not impact on the trees. Alternatively a statement is made which will set out how any pipe work will be installed. This is likely to be the most beneficial approach and this information should for example state:

- Hand digging, use of air spades, or thrust boring depending on site constraints.
- Excavation within or directly adjacent to RPAs will be supervised by a qualified arboricultural consultant.
- Any roots encountered during excavation that are greater than 25mm in diameter will be retained and bridged beneath or above where feasible. Where root pruning is unavoidable, this will be undertaken using sharp, clean tools to form a neat cut, under arboricultural supervision. Exposed roots will be covered and kept moist throughout the works to prevent desiccation.
- Pipes will be laid at existing ground levels where possible, or routed to avoid significant root zones. If excavation within RPAs results in voids, these will be backfilled using a suitable no-dig material such as clean angular aggregate to maintain soil structure and aeration.
- Upon completion of the drainage installation, all disturbed areas will be reinstated using appropriate soil or specialist backfill, ensuring that soil compaction is avoided and the existing ground levels are maintained as far as practicable.
- All site personnel will be briefed on tree protection measures prior to works commencing, and compliance will be monitored throughout the construction period.

Response: SKc04 is from the drainage strategy/calculation summary and shows the overall drainage intent and catchments only. It is not the detailed layout for assessing pipe positions relative to RPAs. C01c is the proposed foul drainage layout and shows the RPA information. The proposed foul drainage runs shown on C01c are routed to avoid the RPAs as much as possible. The drainage layout for planning purposes should therefore be taken from C01c.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'L. Hopkins', is shown within a light grey rectangular box.

Liam Hopkins, Director, Enc.