

INTERNAL MEMORANDUM

To: Caroline Pulley
From: Matt Davies (Ecologist)
Ext: 5278

Memo number: 3

Date of previous memo: 11/03/2022

Date: 31/03/2022

SUBJECT: P/22/0006 | New bridge over the River Taff | Rhydycar Bridge (off Avenue De Clichy) Merthyr Tydfil

The following [amended] reports have been submitted in support of the application:

1. Ecological Constraints Report. Rhydycar Bridge, Merthyr Tydfil. Ecoleg, Document Ref: ECR-MTCBC-2101. **FINAL**, Issue 1, 22/11/21.
2. Ecological Addendum Report. Rhydycar Bridge, Merthyr Tydfil. Ecoleg, Document Ref: EAR-MTCBC-2201. **FINAL**, Issue 1, 28/03/22.

I am in agreement with all of the recommendations within the above reports.

Moving forward, the following is required:

- A. A report outlining the results of the bat activity surveys as recommended in Document 2 (prior to determination of planning permission);
- B. A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). This will include measures to be taken to tackle any negative impacts on otter, bats, nesting birds, fish and other aquatic life. Prevention of river pollution/silting will also be addressed and biosecurity measures will be outlined to prevent spread of invasive species.

Provision of the CEMP including ecological considerations (appointed contractor to base this on the ecological report - liaison with the appointed ecologist will be undertaken if necessary) will be subject of an appropriately worded planning condition. Written approval from the LPA ecologist will be required to discharge the condition prior to commencement of works.
- C. Under Section 14 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), it is an offence to release animals or plants listed in Schedule 9 into the wild. Schedule 9 lists species which are non-native, or native species of conservation concern. NB the list includes Japanese knotweed. We must have evidence that offences under Section 14, Schedule 9 have been avoided. Ideally, a specialist invasives consultant would be appointed to produce an appropriate method statement for the scheme, including robust biosecurity measures. This will be the subject of an appropriately worded planning condition.
- D. Full specifications/details of compensation measures (e.g., replacement of vegetation with native species of local provenance) need to be provided and clearly marked on plans.

- E. Full specifications/details of enhancement measures (e.g., bird and bat boxes added to the new bridge) need to be provided and clearly marked on plans. See below:

Bat and bird box positions to be marked on the plans for the scheme (this can be indicative for bat boxes - positions to be finalised on the ground by the appointed ecologist).

- o Bat boxes: x3 (see <https://www.greenwoodsecohabitats.co.uk/shop>):

- a) x1 'two crevice bat box'
- b) x1 'three crevice bat box'
- c) x1 'small hollow bat box'

... all to have round back and brown or sage green in colour.

These need to be erected on suitable trees along the river corridor as follows – at least 4m above the ground; away from artificial light sources; sheltered from strong winds, but exposed to the sun for part of the day (usually south, south-east and south-west – oriented towards the river); with a clear flight path to the entrances of the boxes.

- o Bird boxes: x5

- a) x2, Woodstone Swift Nest Box (<https://www.nhbs.com/search?q=swift&qview=200401>);

- b) x2, Vivara Pro Woodstone Grey Wagtail and Dipper Nest Box (https://www.nhbs.com/search?q=dipper&hPP=60&idx=titles&p=0&fR%5Bdoc_s%5D%5B0%5D=false&fR%5Bhide%5D%5B0%5D=false&fR%5Blive%5D%5B0%5D=true&qview=217209)

- a) will be installed on the bridge at a height of at least 5m over the river.

- b) will be installed on a suitable wall under the new footbridge.

NB Happy for the bat boxes to be erected on nearby trees in advance, but the bird boxes will need to wait until construction of the bridge.

- F. A statement regarding lighting:

If lighting is proposed, a lighting engineers report, with a horizontal illuminance plan illustrating any lightspill will be required. Lighting needs also to conform to the following guidance: <https://theilp.org.uk/publication/guidance-note-8-bats-and-artificial-lighting/>

As the existing bridge is unlit and has been unlit, I see no reason for there to be lighting on the new bridge. Obviously, a lighting plan would not be necessary under these circumstances. An alternative, that would also not require a lighting plan, would be to use the following (or equivalent):

https://tarmac.com/products/concrete/toptint-glow/?cs1_c=52.486243%2C-1.890401&cs1_z=7&cs1_p=

If a decision is made to allow lighting, I would prefer the lighting plan to be in place and approved prior to determination. However, if you would want to condition it Caroline, I wouldn't have a huge issue, but discharge of the condition would require written approval from myself. The condition would

require the lighting plan to be supplied and approved prior to commencement of works.