

INTERNAL MEMORANDUM

To: David Cross
From: Matt Davies (Ecologist)
Ext: 5278
Memo number: 1
Date of previous memo: -
Date: 26/05/2023

SUBJECT: P/23/0125 | Retrospection permission for the construction of a new footbridge, works to demolish, alter and extend existing platform north of the railway line and construction of a new platform south of the railway line with associated ancillary works | Land At Quakers Yard Station Tramroadside Treharris

Documents submitted in support of the above application:

1. Bat Constraints Technical Note: Quakers Yard Station | A01 | 02/11/21
2. Bat Tree Report: RS1MER Trees | P03.1 (watermark - 'Document Under Review'). Most recent survey dated 31/05/22
3. Dormouse Survey Report: Quakers Yard Station | A01 | 12/10/21
4. Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan | Rev 1.0 | 07/04/23

Comments:

1. I assume the x3 trees with suitability for bats referred to in this report (QY1 [low], QY2 [moderate]. MER10 [moderate]) have all now been removed?
 - i. MER10 was reported as not adequately surveyed (only a single dusk survey had been undertaken) and was recommended to only be removed under licence. A copy of the licence and method statement is required.
 - ii. QY2 also had moderate suitability, but was only the subject of a single [endoscoping] bat survey – should this not have had x2 surveys given its moderate suitability?
 - iii. There was a recommendation for the removal of QY1 under a precautionary method statement – a copy of the precautionary method statement is required.
2. The report states the dusk emergence surveys undertaken did not conform to BCT guidance and are therefore invalid. MER10 was subject to a second dusk emergence survey and the results indicated a likely absence of bats. Does this mean the second dusk emergence/dawn re-entry survey of MER10 conformed to BCT guidance? This is not clear.

NB this document appears to supersede Document #1.

Document #2 states that if trees with moderate suitability were to be felled, this would require a derogation licence from NRW. A copy of the licence and method statement is required. The recommendation for low suitability trees is removal under a precautionary method statement. A copy of the precautionary method statement is required.

Document #2 is not a final version, but watermarked as a 'Document Under Review'. A final version is required.

3. No comments required.
4. This is acceptable – given this is a retrospective application, at what stage is the plan?