

**Edgerton, Tayla (Agency)**

---

**From:** max wallis <[redacted]>  
**Sent:** 14 July 2017 13:36  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** Anne Greagsby; Anne Crowley; emma\_perry; green keith  
**Subject:** Northcliffe Lodge, Penarth, application 2017/00541/FUL

**Northcliffe Lodge, Penarth, application 2017/00541/FUL**

We refer to the above application plans on the vagonline website.

In assessing the completeness of this application, do you recognise that the ecological assessments cover only the Northcliffe Lodge site and not the Northcliffe Apartments part of the whole site, where the proposed access driveway runs?

The David Clements Ecology (DCE) Ecology Survey covered only the Northcliffe Lodge site, as shown in its Plan 4 (Site evaluation DCE 837 Nov 2015). The DCE Biodiversity Strategy (June 2016) used the same definition of 'the site'.

The DCE Bat and Reptile Surveys (June 2016) used the same description of 'the site' and confined their survey spots to the Lodge site. All the 30 reptile refugia depicted in the Appendix DCE 837 were there, and the bat surveyors were all stationed there, as Plan 2a,2b).

We note that these three DCE documents are the only ones referred to by the Ecology officer's brief report. Do you therefore agree that her comments would not apply to the Apartments part of the site, 0.4 ha in area and including mature woodland and wildlife habitat (incl. foraging bats).

In comparison, Treescene's Tree Survey does cover both parts of the site, detailing 8 individual trees and 3 tree groups in the Apartments section.

Would you therefore say if the Council will require further ecological information to cover the full application site, and enable public consultation on this and any other late material?

Max Wallis [redacted]

Barry & Vale FoE, planning manager.

RECEIVED  
17 JUL 2017  
Regeneration  
and Planning

D.E.E.R
RECEIVED
ACTION BY: YP/SDB
NO: 14
ACK: