

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

Sent: 23 October 2025 12:09

To: Davidson, Joanne (East Area Development Manager)

<Joanne.Davidson@newport.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: 25/0736 - Uskmouth

Hello Joanne,

I do not agree with the view that the proposed development is likely to have a significant effect upon the River Usk SAC. As set out in the GI Statement, *'The site constitutes brownfield land within a former Power Station site and is therefore wholly industrial in nature. The application site itself comprises an existing electrical banking compound, hardstanding and industrial structures. There are no features of biodiversity value within the site itself, save for a very small, grassed area including 1 no. tree to the immediate north of the banking compound, where the new access tracks are proposed.'* The site is also separated from the River Usk habitats by further industrial area.

However, NRW have advised that if we attach the CEMP condition they have proposed, then there would be no adverse effect on the integrity of the River Usk SAC. If we attach that condition we are effectively accepting that an Appropriate Assessment is needed. This being the case, our assessment would be that NRW have advised there are potential pathways for a significant effect upon the River Usk SAC, but that if we attach the planning condition they have proposed, they have confirmed there would be no adverse effect on the integrity of that site. As long as we record this reasoning in the Officer's Report, then there is no need to set out a separate AA document nor to ask the Applicant to provide a shadow HRA. We would normally consult NRW on an Appropriate Assessment, but in this instance the consultation would just be to confirm that we will attach the CEMP condition they have proposed, and that if we do so then we accept their advice there would be no adverse effect on the integrity of the River Usk SAC.

I should point out that today is my last day in the office until Monday 3rd November, so I may not be able to provide any further comment on this case.

Matt