

From: Harris, Matthew (Ecology Officer) <Matthew.Harris@newport.gov.uk>

Sent: 27 January 2026 14:11

To: Quinn, Vicky (Senior Planning Officer) <Vicky.Quinn@newport.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: 25/1056 - Bramley, Catsash Road

Hello Vicky, this site supports a range of semi-natural habitats, and the species they support, which would be impacted by the proposed development.

Mitigation of these impacts is set out in the form of :-

- Retained habitats and features such as trees
- Biodiversity measures in the Landscape Proposals
- Biodiversity enhancements and green infrastructure recommendations set out in the ecological Site Assessment Survey of 20th August, and
- A Construction Environmental Management Plan.

In principle I do not disagree with these proposals, but have the following comments.

The application does not propose any work to the section of the site north of the access road. Therefore I will assume that there will be no ecological impact in that area. The Landscaping Proposals show an embankment and landscaping to the south of the site including planting of Alder, Field Maple, Guelder Rose and Blackthorn. This is an unusual mix for this location, and is likely to lead to concerns from neighbours over tall trees and suckering blackthorn. If this embankment feature is to be planted with woody vegetation, which I would support, then a better planting mix might include Hazel, Elder, Guelder Rose, Dog Rose, Holly and Hawthorn, for example. These are more typical of this area and would also support Dormice populations, as these have been referred to in the ecological Site Assessment.

Planting Reedmace (*Typha latifolia*) may very rapidly lead to total colonisation of the pond, to the exclusion of other species such as Water Lily. While a small area of reedbed is to be welcomed in ecological terms, a pond with some open water would be better for biodiversity overall. Therefore I advise not planting Reedmace but instead focussing on Iris species including the native Yellow Flag Iris, together with other native aquatic and marginal plants such as Purple Loosestrife, Greater and Lesser Spearwort, for example.

I support all of the mitigation measures set out in the ecological Site Assessment Survey, and we should secure their implementation by planning condition. The same report makes reference to the need to take a green infrastructure approach at this site, so it is in effect a GI Statement. Where reference is made to incorporating new bat roosting and bird nesting features into the new building, the Applicant's Ecologist can advise on the make and model and suitable positioning of these features. Bat / bird boxes such as these are readily available commercially, are inexpensive, and can be tailored to the style and colour of the finish of the buildings. Features which are integrated into the buildings rather than attached to the outside are preferable as they are more secure in the long-term and less prone to interference by the public.

The CEMP refers to '*Works will follow the recommendations in the approved Bat Survey and Green Infrastructure Statement. No works will occur in a manner that blocks bat access or disturbs potential roosting areas.*'. No bat roosting has been identified in site nor has a standalone GI statement been submitted, so I can only assume these points were included in error. Therefore the CEMP should refer to the recommendations of the ecological Site Assessment Survey, and incorporate those measures into the construction management plan. Specifically, timing of works to avoid harm to nesting birds and/or dormice, and directional site clearance to allow reptile to escape, and other measures set out in the ecological Site Assessment, should be referred to in a CEMP secured by planning condition.

Matt