

BEREWOOD PHASE 2 RESIDENTIAL: PROTECTED SPECIES MITIGATION ADVICE NOTE



B BIODIVERSITY BY DESIGN

On behalf of Redrow

March 2014



CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 BACKGROUND 1

2.0 METHODS..... 3

2.1 DESK STUDY..... 3

2.2 FIELD SURVEYS 3

3.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS..... 5

3.1 THE WIDER BEREWOOD SITE..... 5

3.2 DESIGNATED SITES..... 5

3.3 PHASE 2 RESIDENTIAL SITE – AN OVERVIEW 5

3.4 HABITATS..... 6

3.5 FAUNA 7

4.0 IMPACTS..... 9

4.1 OVERVIEW 9

4.2 HABITATS AND FLORA 9

4.3 FAUNA 9

5.0 MITIGATION..... 10

6.0 SUMMARY 14

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 Planning Background - Berewood

In 2011 Grainger received outline planning permission from Winchester City Council (WCC) and Havant Borough Council for a mixed-use development consisting of 2,550 housing units at Newlands (now referred to as Berewood) on the western fringe of Waterlooville in Hampshire. The outline planning application was subject to a full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and also Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening.

The present document has been produced to support the Reserved Matters Application (RMA) for residential development specifically within the Phase 2 component of Berewood, hereafter also referred to as the 'Site'. The Phase 2 proposals consist of 246 dwellings together with associated access roads, car parking and landscaping.

1.1.2 Terms of reference

The present Protected Species Mitigation Advice Note has been produced to accompany Redrow's Phase 2 Residential RMA. In particular this report seeks to discharge the following condition included in the outline planning permission:

Condition 6 ii) – other matters

(f) Details of ecological mitigation measures (informed by up – to – date ecological surveys and assessment, the details of which shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority) required for each reserved matters application, including both ecological works directly related to that reserved matters area and any works associated with that development area but outside of the boundary of that area. Ecological mitigation measures should be in accordance with measures set out within the approved Environmental Statement.

The present document does not describe and assess potential ecological impacts to the same level as a detailed Environmental Statement (ES) because the Site:

- Has already been assessed in great detail in relation to the Phase 2 Infrastructure RMA (see the *Phase 2 Infrastructure Biodiversity Report*) and prior to this during the EIA for the wider scheme.
- Has already been subjected to various wildlife mitigation relating to the Phase 2 infrastructure works which has also significantly minimised risk in relation to the present proposals (relevant mitigation measures are summarised below).
- Has already been heavily disrupted by the consented and ongoing Phase 2 Infrastructure works; prior to these works the Site consisted almost entirely of an intensively farmed arable field of little ecological interest.

With respect to HRA, at the time of the outline planning application the Competent Authority decided, based on a detailed HRA screening report produced by Grainger and advice from

Natural England (NE), that a formal Appropriate Assessment would not be required. NE has looked again at its previous advice in this regard with respect to the Phase 2 Residential proposals, and has restated its view that no likely significant impact on local European Sites is anticipated (see letter from NE to WCC of the 31st January 2014).

Note that the green infrastructure phasing strategy set out in the Environmental Statement includes commitments in Phase 2 for significant new woodland buffer planting, the restoration of Newlands Meadow, and creation of the southern half of the Town Park. Please note that these habitat enhancements proposals have been set out separately in the recent Phase 2 Infrastructure RMA, Town Park RMAs and Newlands Farm Meadow: Restoration Strategy, and so are not discussed in detail in the present report.

Under the green infrastructure phasing strategy woodland management is also due to commence sometime in Phase 2 although progress in this regard will be advised upon separately.

2.0 METHODS

2.1 Desk Study

Given that proposals for the wider Berewood site have been developing over a number of years, four separate ecological desk studies have been undertaken, the most recent of which was carried out in October 2012. Local records of protected or notable species and habitats, including Section 41 listed (NERC Act) and local Biodiversity Action Plan Priority habitats and species were requested. Desk study search criteria and the list of consultees are set out in the ES.

2.2 Field Surveys

Because of the dynamic nature of wildlife and habitats there has been a need to regularly review existing ecological conditions and as a consequence ecological survey data also dates back over many years. The status of certain habitats and species has accordingly been updated with new survey data collected specifically for present proposals and the associated Phase 2 Infrastructure RMA. These surveys have included:

- Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey - May 2012 & July 2007.
- Walkover / verification survey undertaken in March 2014.
- Badger *Meles meles* survey (protected under Protection of Badgers Act 1992) – March 2014 and July 2012.
- Dormouse *Muscardinus avellanarius* survey (protected under Habitats Regulations 1994 [as amended] and Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 [as amended]) – July to November 2012 including tube survey and nut searches in adjoining woodlands (no Dormouse habitat would be affected by the proposals; survey effort was undertaken primarily in relation to the Phase 2 Infrastructure proposals).
- Bat activity and potential roost surveys (protected under Habitats Regulations 1994 [as amended] and Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 [as amended]) – daytime tree inspection (involving tree climbing and use of endoscope etc.) and activity surveys (including automated surveys) were carried out in September 2012 and between June – October 2012 respectively, concentrating effort around the wooded margins of the Site.
- Great Crested Newt (GCN) *Triturus cristatus* survey (protected under Habitats Regulations 1994 [as amended] and Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 [as amended]) - six ponds were identified within ca. 650m of the proposals and were surveyed using three separate techniques in spring 2012; as explained below mitigation undertaken in

relation to the Phase 2 Infrastructure development is considered still effective for the present proposals.

- Reptile survey (protected under Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 [as amended]) – seven artificial refuge checks between July – Sep 2012 concentrating around the margins of the Site and also within the small meadow at the southern end of the Site (Field 2).
- Breeding bird survey (relevant species and assemblages afforded some protection under Natural Environment and Rural Communities [NERC] Act 2006) – spring 2012 focused within the adjacent woodlands.

Note that because of the mobile nature of many species and the need for indirect impacts to be considered, search areas extended beyond the Phase 2 Residential Site boundary where relevant.

Detailed descriptions of survey protocols are presented in the *Phase 2 Infrastructure Biodiversity Report* and are not repeated here.

3.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS

3.1 The Wider Berewood Site

The Site is one component of the wider Berewood development. Berewood, which is 209ha in size, is located immediately west of Waterlooville. The majority of Berewood consists of fields of arable and pasture bounded by hedgerows and ditches. Various small locally designated Ancient woodlands extend in a general north-south alignment through the centre of Berewood.

3.2 Designated Sites

There are no International, European or Nationally designated sites within the Site or sufficiently close to be relevant in terms of being potentially vulnerable to any significant adverse effects relating to the present proposals.

The Phase 2 Site is within 200m of five SINC. These are:

- Newlands Row and Plant Row - Ancient woodland
- Marrelsmoor Row - Ancient woodland
- Marrelsmoor Coppice - Ancient woodland
- Alsfordmoor Coppice - Ancient woodland
- Newlands Farm Meadow - originally designated for its unimproved grassland, although much of its value has been diminished due to intermittent ploughing over many years

Newlands Row and Plant Row, Marrelsmoor Row, Marrelsmoor Coppice are all directly adjacent to the proposals. These woodland SINC are described in detail in the Environmental Statement.

3.3 Phase 2 Residential Site – an Overview

The Phase 2 Residential site is approximately 8.3ha in size and is located predominantly on arable land in the southern half of the Berewood site. The Site is bounded to the:

- East by the A3/London Road;
- West by Newlands Row, Marrelsmoor Row woodlands and a gas valve compound;
- South by Marrelsmoor Coppice and the Purbrook Gardens housing estate;
- North by an arable headland extending from the eastern spur of Barnfield Row Wood to the Milk Lane entrance point.

Figure 3.1 shows the distribution of habitats within the Phase 2 Residential Site and its hinterland. Note that most of the Phase 2 Residential Site has been disrupted by the earlier Phase 2 Infrastructure works. The layout of this infrastructure work, including various new green infrastructure (SuDS features and woodland planting), is shown on Figure 3.1 although reference should also be made to the detailed drawings provided in the Phase 2 Infrastructure RMA for precise alignments.

3.4 Habitats

3.4.1 Arable

The key component of the Site was a large field (ca. 7.3ha) between Newlands Row woodland and the A3/London Road (labelled as Field 1 in Figure 3.1). This field was not however being farmed at the time of survey and had been heavily disrupted by previously consented and ongoing Phase 2 Infrastructure works. No vegetation of any significance was present.

3.4.2 Pasture

Abutting the southern edge of Field 1 was a smaller field (ca. 1ha) – Field 2. This was previously a small meadow consisting of species-poor semi-improved grassland, but was at the time of survey also heavily disturbed due to previously consented ongoing Phase 2 Infrastructure works.

3.4.3 Hedgerows

Abutting the Site's boundary were three hedgerows:

- Hedge 1. The Site is bounded to the east by a relatively newly planted hedgerow. The hedge is species-rich including Hawthorn *Crataegus monogyna*, Elder *Sambucus nigra*, Hazel *Corylus avellana*, Field Maple *Acer campestre*, Oak *Quercus robur*, cherry *Prunus* sp., Wild Privet *Ligustrum vulgare*, Blackthorn *Prunus spinosa* and Holly *Ilex aquifolium*. Despite its diversity its ecological value is probably limited due to its young age.
- Hedge 2. A 172m hedge including a number of trees bounded the fence line of the Purbrook Pressure Reducing Station and the Site's south-western border. Its age is unclear although it is probably at least 30 years old. It is species-rich and includes Ash *Fraxinus excelsior*, Beech *Fagus sylvatica*, Bird Cherry *Prunus padus*, Blackthorn, Hawthorn, Hazel, Oak, Roses (all species) *Rosa* spp., Wild Cherry *Prunus avium*, Willow *Salix* spp. (all species except Osier). It also included introduced species including cotoneasters and Garden Privet.
- Hedge 3. A very short (ca. 25m) and gappy but quite diverse old hedgerow on a bank. It has two mature oaks and various shrub species, including Butcher's-broom *Ruscus aculeatus*, Elder, Hawthorn, Hazel, Roses *Rosa* spp. (all species), Spindle *Euonymus europaeus*. Bramble *Rubus fruticosus* is also abundant.

3.4.4 Habitats newly created under the Phase 2 Infrastructure scheme

As part of the Phase 2 Infrastructure RMA new woodland has been and is being planted buffer planted along the margins of Newlands Row, Marrelsmoor Coppice and Highfield Row, and linking Highfield Row to the wooded boundary of Purbrook Meadow. As part of the same RMA various SuDS features have also been created along the margins of Newlands Row and Marrelsmoor Coppice and along the western side of Hedge 1. Detailed descriptions of these habitat creation proposals were set out in the Phase 2 Infrastructure RMA and are not repeated here, although some of the progress is shown in Plates 1-4.

Plate 1. New woodland buffer planting along Newlands Row



Plate 2. New woodland buffer planting along Highfield Row



Plate 3. New woodland planting connecting Highfield Row and the wooded boundary of Purbrook Heath



Plate 4. New SuDS pond and woodland planting alongside Hedge 1



3.5 Fauna

The results of the faunal survey results are summarised in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Summary of Faunal Survey Results

Species	Summary findings
Badger	Signs of Badger activity were found in the surrounding woodlands although the nearest sett was in the south-west corner of Marrelsmoor Coppice over 200m from the proposals. The two fields which had been heavily disturbed by the Phase 2 infrastructure works were unlikely to have been providing meaningful foraging opportunities.
Dormice	Dormice were recorded in Marrelsmoor Coppice and Newlands Row during the most recent surveys and have been found in Marrelsmoor Row in previous surveys. As these woodlands would not be directly affected by the proposals the detailed results of the survey (which are presented in the ES and the <i>Phase 2 Infrastructure Biodiversity Report</i>) are not reproduced

Species	Summary findings
	here.
Bats	All mature trees along the margins of the adjacent woodlands and also all hedgerows within the Site were inspected during the daytime for their potential to support roosting bats. One tree was prioritised for further survey due to an historic record (2006) of roosting Common Pipistrelle <i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i> bats (see Figure 3.1). The tree was subjected to a detailed daytime assessment which involved climbing and careful inspection by a qualified tree climber (using an endoscope and high powered torch) who was supervised at ground-level by a licensed bat worker. No evidence of bats was found. Two features were initially identified as being of potential interest for bats, although following closer inspection these were found to be of only limited value. While in 2006 bats were recorded emerging from this tree, only two bats were observed which were probably males or non-breeding females, both of which tend to be less demanding in terms of their roosting requirements. Note that no roosting bats were identified in this tree following subsequent emergence surveys in 2007 and no evidence of roosting was found during a 2012 activity survey undertaken for the present assessment which commenced around sundown specifically opposite the tree. A moderate level of bat activity was recorded across the Phase 2 Site. Activity was typified by numerous repeat passes by what were likely to be the same bats foraging in loops. The highest level of activity was found to be along the eastern margin of Newlands Row and extending southwards (from the south-eastern corner of Newlands Row), via a connecting arable headland and remnant hedgebank, to the eastern margins of Marreismoor Row. Activity along this corridor consisted mostly of Common Pipistrelle and Soprano Pipistrelle bats. Other lesser recorded species recorded during survey included Noctule <i>Nyctalus noctula</i>, Serotine <i>Eptesicus serotinus</i> and myotis species. None of the concentrations of bat activity were sufficient to indicate the presence of a major roost close by.
Great Crested Newt	There were no ponds within the development area. The nearest viable breeding colony over ca. 0.5km from the Phase 2 Site, although a few GCNs were recorded in two heavily shaded woodland ponds closer to the Site. The nearest of these was ca. 230m west of the Phase 2 Site, although note that no GCNs were recorded in this pond in spring 2012. The results from these surveys are not presented here in detail as the risk of GCNs being impacted by the proposals during their terrestrial life stage is considered negligible, primarily due to the installation of a GCN exclusion fence prohibiting access to the Site (see mitigation section below).
Breeding birds	Twenty-two species were recorded breeding during the survey although nearly all of these were recorded within the woodlands adjacent to the Site and in an area south of the Site between Highfield Row and Purbrook Heath Road. The detailed results have been presented in the <i>Phase 2 Infrastructure Biodiversity Report</i> and are not reproduced here. In terms of birds of conservation concern which inhabit open farmland conditions only Skylark <i>Alauda arvensis</i> was recorded, although breeding was not confirmed (Skylark was heard singing over The Site on one occasion only). The subsequent significant disturbance and physical disruption to the field caused by the consented Phase 2 Infrastructure works were considered to have rendered the field unsuitable for nesting Skylark.
Reptiles	Slow-worm and Common Lizard were previously recorded in Field 2 although were no longer present, other than potentially around the margins, following significant disruption to habitat caused by vegetative management and then the Phase 2 Infrastructure works. This disruption
Invertebrates	The Phase 2 Site is predominantly being constructed within a former arable monoculture (previously sown with Oil-seed Rape) which would have been of only limited interest in terms of invertebrates. Any entomological interest that did exist is likely to have further reduced by the disruption caused by the Phase 2 Infrastructure works.

4.0 IMPACTS

4.1 Overview

A description of the Development proposals is provided in Section 1. The main biophysical changes associated with the proposed development that have potential to affect ecological resources positively or negatively in the area are related to construction - habitat removal during site clearance and increased movement and general background noise of machinery and men during construction. Potential operational effects are likely to include changes in lighting levels and increased levels of disturbance due to increased human presence etc. As discussed in the Introduction nearly all the impacts which are described have been assessed previously in detail the ES and so are only assessed here in relative outline.

4.2 Habitats and Flora

The Phase 2 Residential development would impact predominantly on former arable land and species-poor semi-improved grassland. As discussed both fields have been significantly physically disrupted through the regular passage of machinery and men in relation to the formally consented Phase 2 infrastructure works and are now virtually un-vegetated.

The surrounding Ancient woodlands and hedgerows would not be directly affected by the proposals.

4.3 Fauna

With respect to fauna impacts have been considered alongside mitigation in the next section.

5.0 MITIGATION

Mitigation measures are summarised as follows and set out in greater detail in Table 5.1 below:

- The surrounding woodlands (including root protection zones) would not be directly affected by construction activities.
- As all surrounding woodland would be retained no direct impacts on Dormice are anticipated and no mitigation is required.
- Operational impacts on the surrounding woodlands, including indirect vehicle noise and movement, and direct recreational disturbance would be offset by substantial new habitat creation and ecologically informed management being undertaken as part of the wider Berewood green infrastructure strategy; this strategy is set out in detail in the Environmental Statement and Grainger's evidence to support HRA screening and so is not reproduced here.
- Potential construction impacts on GCNs would be avoided due to the presence of a GCN exclusion fence which was installed between Site and the GCN pond complex to the west.
- Potential impacts on reptiles would be avoided through vegetative management.

Major habitat enhancements associated with Phase 2 of Berewood are being undertaken in relation to the Phase 2 Infrastructure and Town Park projects and so are not described here.

Table 5.1 Mitigation and compensation

Ecological Receptor	Proposed Mitigation / Compensation
Habitats Woodlands	No woodlands would be directly affected by the proposals. Note that the Phase 2 infrastructure works are positioned in between the proposed Phase 2 residential works and the woodlands and so there is no risk that the present proposals would impact any tree roots. Operational impacts on the surrounding woodlands, including indirect vehicle noise and movement, and direct recreational disturbance would be offset by a programme of substantial new habitat creation and ecologically informed management being undertaken as part of the wider Berewood green infrastructure strategy. This strategy is set out in detail in the Environmental Statement and Grainger's evidence to support HRA screening and is not reproduced here. The Phase 2 elements of the green infrastructure strategy are set out in the Phase 2 Infrastructure and Town Park RMAs; with respect to the former woodland buffer planting is already in place along the eastern edge of Newlands Row and western edge of Marrelsmoor Coppice. Many of the shrub species selected in woodland buffer planting have a dense thorny growth form aimed at deterring development of desire lines. Indirect noise and visual disturbance of the woodlands emanating from gardens would be further reduced by back garden fencing. Note that new woodland buffer planting proposed around the Purbrook Pressure Reducing Station is to be carried out in Phase 16 of the Berewood scheme in accordance with the Environmental Statement's Green Infrastructure Phasing Strategy.
Newly created habitat features	The new woodland planting and strategic SuDS features, created under the Phase 2 Infrastructure RMA, are off-set from and outside of the housing construction areas. There is no agreement for the house builder to utilize areas outside the boundary for laydown and storage of materials. As a precaution, however, construction exclusion fencing has already been erected along the edge of Newlands Row to protect the new tree and wildflower grassland planting and the SuDS features. Fencing will also shortly be erected to protect new planting alongside Marrelsmoor Coppice and the SuDS features on the Site's eastern boundary. Note that habitat protection fencing is only proposed where there is important habitat to protect. If exclusion fencing is required for other reasons, then that will be for others in the Design Team to propose and implement. Potential pollutants from site activities will be mitigated so far as is practical by employing the measures described within the Construction Environmental Management Plan. Where rainfall on Site discharges overland directly to SuDS features, the inherent design will settle sediments within the basins and ponds. It was the original intention that the SuDS would provide benefit during the construction phase and it can be observed currently on Site to be working effectively. The run-off from construction areas is retained for longer periods than that from the agricultural areas, promoting a greater degree of sediment settlement. This can be seen by the build-up of construction sediment in the SuDS areas, which would be de-silted following the completion of construction works within the catchment. As a precaution all SuDS basins are fitted with a pollution prevention valve, which enables the discharge to be cut off completely in the event of an accidental pollution event so that the pollutant can be contained for clean-up. Note that protective fencing is visible in Plates 1-4.

Ecological Receptor	Proposed Mitigation / Compensation
Species	
Badger	No Badger setts would be affected and so no mitigation is proposed. As a precaution, and in keeping with best practice, an additional check for new signs of Badger activity would be undertaken shortly before works are due to commence.
Dormice	Surrounding woodlands and hedgerows would not be affected by the proposals and so no direct impacts on Dormice are anticipated. The adjoining woodlands are in fact being significantly enhanced for Dormice through new buffer planting being undertaken in relation to the Phase 2 infrastructure works.
Bats	Although Tree 1 is considered to have low potential value for roosting bats and no evidence of bats was found at the time of survey, exclusion fencing has been installed around the tree to minimise disturbance and to protect the root zone. In terms of bat foraging / commuting habitat, the woodland margins are of primary importance. Note that these are being enhanced by the Phase 2 infrastructure works which involve the construction of a series of SuDS features and new woodland buffer planting. The negative impact of lighting on bats is well known and for this reason the ES states that wherever possible woodlands would not be illuminated by street lighting. The street lighting layout has been produced by the project engineers Mayer Brown and is shown on the drawings RHW/VILLE/RD/20 and RHW/VILLE/RD/21 (N.B. these drawings show three lux contours for each street light column - 3 isolux, 2 isolux and 0.6 isolux). The street lighting layout has been submitted with the RMA and is not reproduced here. The key area of potential concern relates to the eastern edge of Newlands Row woodland. Disturbance to this woodland edge from lighting however is expected to be negligible for the following reasons: • Lux levels and the period of 'lit time' will be set as low as guidelines permit. It should be recognised that whilst the majority of older street lights indiscriminately light much larger areas than is needed, modern street lighting causes significantly less indiscriminate light spillage. • The woodland edge has already been buffered by a newly created 20m wide greenway (including footpath/cycleway). • This woodland buffer is made particularly effective by the inclusion of a 5m wide band of dense tree/shrub planting (N.B. this woodland has already been planted in relation to the Phase 2 Infrastructure RMA). • Light columns would be ca. 20m from the woodland edge and would be positioned on the western side of the street which would run parallel to the woodland edge, i.e. lamps would shine away from the woodland and the adjoining newly created greenway. • Back spillage of light from the street lamps is predicted to decline rapidly and be negligible at the woodland edge, i.e. below 0.1 lux. Note that figure RHW/VILLE/RD/20 shows that back spillage of light falls to 0.6 lux between 5m and 10m from the roadside, the relevant isolux only traversing the eastern side of the new constructed swale feature.
Great Crested	GCN exclusion fencing was installed several years ago along the northern margins of Barnfield Row and along most of the eastern side of

Ecological Receptor	Proposed Mitigation / Compensation
Newts	Plant Row to prevent GCNs dispersing into the eastern half of Berewood. Although the nearest GCN breeding pond is over 500m from the Phase 2 Site, there was previously a possibility that a small number of GCNs might migrate/disperse into the unfenced Phase 2 Infrastructure site during construction where they could potentially have been injured or killed. It was therefore agreed at the time with Hampshire County Council's ecologist (who we understand also consulted with Natural England) that this risk would be reduced to a negligible level through extending the GCN exclusion fence around the eastern margins of Newlands Row (which abuts the Phase 2 Residential Site's western boundary) and down as far as Alsfordmoor Coppice. A Natural England EPS licence was not required to extend the exclusion fence as it was assumed that preventing the movement of GCNs across the Phase 2 area would not cause any significant disturbance to individual GCNs or impact on the Favourable Conservation Status of the wider population. This assumption was made because there are no ponds or good quality terrestrial habitat to the east of the Phase 2 Site which could potentially become isolated; the busy A3/London Road, and beyond that Purbrook Village, is immediately to east of the field. The GCN fence is still <i>in situ</i> and in good condition and would be expected to serve the same purpose with respect to the Phase 2 Residential proposals (see Plate 1). No further mitigation for GCNs is therefore required. As a precaution the integrity of the GCN exclusion fence would be checked again shortly before works are due to commence and then again on a regular basis during construction. Any minor loss of amphibian habitat will in the long term be offset by the new habitat creation undertaken in relation to the Phase 2 Infrastructure (SuDS and woodland buffer planting).
Reptiles	Reasonable numbers of Slow-worm and a few Common Lizard were previously recorded along the margins of Field 2. As a precaution, vegetative management was undertaken prior to the Phase 2 infrastructure works commencing to displace any reptiles present into adjacent suitable habitat (rough grassland beneath new plantation to the west). Vegetation would be kept low (by cutting) throughout the construction site to deter colonisation by reptiles. For developments of this scale and type however, vegetation is usually controlled simply through the regular passage of men and machinery. Any minor loss of reptile habitat will in the long term be offset by the new habitat creation undertaken in relation to the Phase 2 Infrastructure (SuDS and woodland buffer planting).
Breeding birds	No woodland, hedgerow or scrub habitat would be cleared and so no mitigation is required to prevent loss of active nests. During construction and once operational there would be some level of disturbance to breeding birds in the adjoining woodlands, although this would be offset through substantial new woodland planting (including the buffer planting between the housing and woodlands) being undertaken as part of the wider Berewood development. Disturbance from street lighting is expected to be negligible for the reasons explained above.

6.0 SUMMARY

The aim of the present document has been to demonstrate that the ecological status of the Phase 2 Residential development area has been appropriately updated since the ES and to set out the mitigation that would be undertaken to protect the ecological integrity and conservation status of noteworthy and protected habitats and species.

The vast majority of the Phase 2 Residential site is of limited ecological interest, consisting of former arable land and species-poor meadow which have both subsequently experienced significant physical disruption through the regular passage of men and machinery in relation to formally consented Phase 2 Infrastructure works.

While the Site is bound in part by SINC designated woodlands, these would not be directly affected by the development. Potential future recreational disturbance would be offset by a significant expansion in green infrastructure associated with the wider Berewood proposals.

While Dormice are present in the adjoining woodlands and GCNs in a nearby pond complex, neither would be adversely affected by the proposals. As discussed, none of the woodland areas where the Dormice are present would be lost and a GCN exclusion fence has been installed to prevent GCNs entering the development area.

Reptiles are present in surrounding boundary habitat although vegetation within the construction site would be regularly managed to deter them from colonising. No suitable breeding bird habitat is present within the Site. Disturbance caused to breeding birds in adjoining woodland during construction and the future operation of the Site would be offset through a substantial Berewood-wide expansion in green infrastructure.



JOB NAME: BEREWOOD
CLIENT: REDROW
REPORT TITLE: BEREWOOD PHASE 2 RESIDENTIAL: PROTECTED SPECIES
MITIGATION ADVICE NOTE
STATUS: REVISION 2

PREPARED BY:

PRINT NAME

Dr Lincoln Garland

POSITION

Associate

SIGNATURE

CHECKED BY:

PRINT NAME

Oliver Prudden

POSITION

Director

SIGNATURE

APPROVED BY:

PRINT NAME

POSITION

SIGNATURE

REVISIONS:

Rev No.	Comments	Date
0	For Client Review and Approval	Feb 2014
1	For stakeholder consultation	March 2014
2	Final for RMA	12 March 2014

Disclaimer:

This report was prepared by Biodiversity by Design Ltd at the instruction of, and for sole use by, our client. It does not in any way constitute advice to any third party who is able to access it by any means. Biodiversity by Design Ltd excludes to the fullest extent lawfully permitted all liability for any loss or damage howsoever arising from reliance on the contents of this report. We do not however exclude our liability (if any) for personal injury or death resulting from our negligence, for fraud or any other matter in relation to which we cannot legally exclude liability.