

[REDACTED]

From: max wallis <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 14 November 2016 14:47
To: Planning & Transportation (Customer Care)
Cc: emma_perry; green keith; Anne Greagsby; Nataniel Martinez
Subject: Re: Northcliffe Lodge development: App No. 2015/01449/FUL

Planning Case Officer, Mrs. Y. J. Prichard

Vale of Glamorgan Council

Northcliffe Lodge development: App No. 2015/01449/FUL

Further Objection and Information requests

Please find our attached letter dated 12 November 2016. We seek clarification of site areas and ownership, on the future of the derelict historic building and future public foot-access.

We note that Mr Martinez as adjacent landowner writes that he did submit an objection when Mrs Crofts was case-officer. This may be in the pre-application file, could you please supply a copy or post it up in the current file?

We also entered a request for information on 9th October. Could you please confirm this is being dealt with?

With thanks,

Max Wallis [REDACTED]

3 Penarth Head Lane, Penarth CF64 1BB

Friends of the Earth, Barry & Vale

On 9 October 2016 at 11:52, max wallis <[REDACTED]> wrote:

case officer Mrs. Y. J. Prichard

Disclosure of records of Inspection for Bats on the Northcliff Lodge site

The high potential for bats roosting in the on-site trees and structures is of course accepted by the applicant's consultants David Clements Ecology Ltd. The June 2015 report from the tree consultants Treescene recommendations included further investigation of suspected defects that require more detailed assessment and potential for wildlife habitat. They reported much obscuring by ivy and other vegetation. By 'habitat' in 'suspected defects', it is presumed that they included bat roosts.

The DCE report of Dec. 2015 says “all the trees within the site boundary are mature specimens and were subject to a ground level inspection for their potential to support roosting bats following the BCT Guidelines (2012)”. It reported the results as “No trees within the site were felt to be more than a category 2 tree (BCT guidelines, Appendix 5) with only a few limited features suitable for bats.”

DCE’s *Additional Biodiversity Strategy* of June 2016 states that nearby gardens are well used by foraging pipistrelle bats (as residents know) but offers no data on this. Curiously it does not report what residents know well, that the Lodge grounds are also well used by foraging bats (which may be pipistrelles). It does not say how the bats were identified as pipistrelles and not rarer species, as could readily be determined by normal bat detectors.

This document further reports “visual inspection for (*should read ‘from’*) the ground for their potential to support roosting bats. No trees within the site were felt to be more than a category 2 tree (BCT guidelines, Appendix 1). No data are provided on this.

The BCT guidelines (3rd Edn, issued January 2016, endorsed by the Chartered Institute CIEEM) describe ‘preliminary ground level roost assessment’ as a

detailed inspection of the exterior of the tree from ground level to look for features that bats could use for roosting. It prescribes systematic inspection around all parts of a tree and recording results in standard format. All trees surveyed should be numbered and marked on a map or plan of the site...should at least record the location (grid reference) and tree species....enable ecologists to locate the tree on subsequent visits...marking individual trees with a tag or some tape may be essential.

Could you therefore obtain from the applicant DCW’s records of their ‘ground level inspection’ of Dec. 2015 and their ‘visual inspection’ of June 2016? Also please ask for records that show the bats were pipistrelles and did not include other species.

We would welcome a copy of the records as soon as you receive them. If you post them on the website, please let me know when you do so.

With thanks,

Max Wallis [REDACTED]

3 Penarth Head Lane, Penarth CF64 1BB

Friends of the Earth, Barry & Vale