

Karen Wooden

From: bst shared
To: Sally Smith DC
Subject: RE: Berewood - Phase 2, Town Park, Newlands Meadow etc. 14.0064 14.0106

Hi Lincoln,

Many thanks for sending this through.

Some brief comments in red below, for simplicity.

Thanks

Sarah

Sarah Warriss-Simmons

Please note that this advice is given in accordance with the Service Level Agreement that has been signed between Hampshire County Council and your Council. The comments within this letter are expressed as a professional view provided to Winchester City Council and should not, therefore, be interpreted as those of Hampshire County Council.

Senior Ecologist

Ecology Team
Strategic Environmental Delivery Group,
Economy, Transport and Environment Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court West
The Castle, Winchester
Hampshire SO23 8UD
Tel: 01962 832318; Fax: 01962 832117
E-mail: sarah.warriss-simmons@hants.gov.uk; www.hants.gov.uk/biodiversity

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Lincoln Garland [<mailto:lincoln.garland@biodiversitybydesign.co.uk>]
Sent: 26 February 2014 16:35
To: Warriss-Simmons, Sarah
Cc: JWilson@WINCHESTER.GOV.UK; JLee@WINCHESTER.GOV.UK; sally.smith2@havant.gov.uk; Lincoln Garland; Mike Wells
Subject: RE: Berewood - Phase 2, Town Park, Newlands Meadow etc. 14.0064 14.0106

Dear Sarah

Further to our conversation yesterday and also your comments in the email below, please find below a summary of our responses specifically with respect to Phase 2:

- Badgers. A detailed Badger survey was undertaken in 2012 and a precautionary survey will be undertaken just prior to the commencement of works.

The application will need to be determined on the basis of up to date ecological information, so the 2012 check may be out of date. Please could you include at least the results of the up-to-date inspection carried out prior to the infrastructure works taking place (as presumably this was recently?), if not the results of a brief up to date inspection of the site currently. A pre-commencement check should still form part of the mitigation strategy for phase 2 residential – adherence to which can be conditioned in any consent.

- Extent of habitat clearance resulting from the phase 2 infrastructure. Nearly all of the Phase 2 infrastructure site was formally arable land, plus there was a small species-poor meadow. Were any vehicles to have deviated from the precise alignment of the infrastructure, this would only have been within the two fields that had been cleared of vegetation in advance (the former cleared following the harvest of the final crop and the latter by cutting [see below]). As we discussed movement of vehicles across these areas would in fact have been beneficial in preventing ruderal vegetation establishing, which could then have attracted a variety of wildlife, potentially constraining the forthcoming residential development. We stated in the ES that all fields scheduled for development would be maintained largely free of vegetation following cessation of farming activities.

This is fine – please can the nature of the site (current baseline) be set out within the report, taking into account any measures required to maintain the generally unsuitable nature of the site prior to any development actually commencing – which will again form part of the mitigation strategy.

- Reptiles. Reptile mitigation was set out, agreed and carried out in relation to the Phase 2 Infrastructure report. Although some additional precautionary measure are included in the Phase 2 residential report, nothing major is proposed. To summarise the previously agreed Phase 2 Infrastructure mitigation, *'vegetative management started on the eastern side of the small meadow and then worked in a westerly direction. The aim was to displace reptiles toward the young plantation habitat around Marrelsmoor Coppice (at its closest point only 10m away), the ground layer of which consists of tussocky grassland favoured by reptiles. Given the young age of this tussocky grassland (the plantation was established in 2009) it is unlikely to have established a noteworthy reptile population that would be disrupted by the new influx'*.

Previous work and what is now proposed should be set out in the report. The measures for phase 2 infrastructure do not automatically apply to this application (unless set out in your report), as the footprint is different and this is a separate application.

- Construction fencing. As discussed, this has already been erected. Any remaining unfenced SuDS and planting will be fenced prior to residential works commencing. Although we understand that specific haul routes were used during the Phase 2 infrastructure, there was no need to tightly constrain infrastructure activities within the arable field for the reasons discussed above. The Phase 2 Infrastructure report did make clear that agricultural activities would not be recommencing between the infrastructure and residential stages. With respect to the small meadow, the the Phase 2 Infrastructure report stated that *'given the small size of this particular meadow, much of the remaining area outside of the direct development footprint may also be damaged by construction activity'*. Once we displaced the reptiles from this meadow the very last thing we wanted to do was protect this area from disturbance and allow vegetation (and thus the reptiles) to re-establish. In summary we will only be recommending habitat protection fencing where there is important habitat to protect. If exclusion fencing is required for other reasons, then that will be for others to implement.

This is fine – as above this application will need to set out what this application will need to implement/adhere to.

- CEMP. BbD will be contributing to the Phase 2 residential CEMP.

Jacky – I have been consulted on a CEMP for Phase 2 residential RMA but this will need to be resubmitted once Lincoln has inputted into it with the relevant measures.

- Boundary treatment between houses and proposed buffer planting. We understand that the boundary treatment will be fencing. Woodland buffer planting palettes were set out in the agreed Phase 2 infrastructure reports and plans and are not repeated in the residential report.

This should be included in the report – setting out how the boundary treatment will prevent operational impacts to the buffer planting and created habitats etc.

- Swale planting. Native swale planting is shown on the landscape drawings for the residential.

OK I will have to locate these.

- Phase 2 GI. The Phase 2 residential document does make reference to other Phase 2 habitat creation proposals.

Please could you confirm which document – the DAS?

- Woodland planting around gas compound. We've checked the GI phasing strategy which shows that the planting to the west, south and the north will in fact be undertaken in Phase 13 (Figure 9.16). It may be possible to do the narrow band of planting to the north as part of Phase 2 residential but we can't promise anything.

Ok – as long as the phase 2 residential plans clearly show a gap between the phase 2 residential and the gas compound to allow space for the planting, then that's fine. I haven't got the plans with me to be able to check this. The application should make clear whether planting is being proposed as part of this phase or not.

Please let me know if you have any remaining queries on Phase 2. Looking back at my comments, I think that covers everything, thank you.

Best wishes

Lincoln

Dr Lincoln Garland PhD MSc BA CEnv MIEEM
Associate

Biodiversity by Design Ltd
Company No: 5805535

Carriage Court
20 Circus Mews
Bath
BA1 2PW
Tel: 01225 318444

Web: www.biodiversitybydesign.co.uk

This Electronic Transmission is intended only for the attention of the addressee. It may contain privileged and confidential information. If you are not the person for whom it is intended, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it.

If you have received this electronic transmission in error please notify us immediately by telephone, delete the transmission and destroy any hard copies. Biodiversity by Design Ltd has used all reasonable efforts to ensure that this message and any attachments are free from viruses.

From: Warriss-Simmons, Sarah [<mailto:Sarah.Warriss-Simmons@hants.gov.uk>]

Sent: 24 February 2014 14:50

To: Lincoln Garland

Cc: JWilson@WINCHESTER.GOV.UK; JLee@WINCHESTER.GOV.UK; sally.smith2@havant.gov.uk

Subject: FW: Berewood - Phase 2, Town Park, Newlands Meadow etc. 14.0064 14.0106

Importance: High

Dear Lincoln,

Thank you for your various emails and plans below and attached (which I've amalgamated all onto this email so I can keep track of correspondence more easily) – I thought I'd send over some thoughts before we discuss. Apologies these are brief and in bullets.

Town Park

- Lack of ecol info to assess impacts of Town Park and mitigation measures required – updated walkover? Consideration of GCN Plant Farm? Works to trees (mentioned in Landscape design statement)? Lighting proposals to minimise impacts to wildlife including bats? I understand you are proposing to provide a short mitigation advice note to support

the application, which should cover these things. This can be brief, but does need to set out the ecological issues (so anyone assessing the application – e.g. not me - knows what the impacts are, and the LPA (and contractors) know what measures will be in place when the works are carried out).

- Extent of wildflower planting and accurate and consistent representation on all plans/documents. Can a quantitative demonstration of wildflower extent be provided?
 - *Within the Landscape Design Statement figure at section 6 - The Proposed Masterplan - number 10 shows mown routes through wildflower swards. This is also indicated at number 6 on the Landscape Masterplan of Phase A of the Town Park at section 8. This is misleading as according to the soft landscaping plans it appears that no wildflower planting is proposed in these areas. At section 6.8 of the Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan it is stated that areas of meadow grassland and wildflower are proposed along the southern, western and eastern edges of Phase A of the Town Park. However as far as I can see none is proposed for the western area. I would suggest that more areas of wildflower planting should be provided, in line with the ES. For example, more could be provided around the south end of Phase A, even including between the proposed swale and pavements, and within the area between The Green, the MUGA and cricket pitch. At least a deeper band of wildflower should be provided within the arboretum if it is not possible to provide wildflower planting more widely here, or perhaps other wildflower planting could be incorporated such as a more shade tolerant/woodland mix? I would like to avoid a large area of ornamental trees over amenity grassland, in what is meant to be a section of the north-south Wildlife Arteries according to figure 9.11 of the ES.*
- Nature of wildflower areas proposed. Additional information attached discusses various different types of wildflower planting depending on the situation, however the planting plans do only show amenity grass or EM2 with no variation according to situation/part of the site. The plans will need to accurately reflect what you are proposing.
- Dog constraints
- Which SuDS features are permanent water bodies?
- The Landscape Maintenance and Management Plan does not reflect ecological measures set out in ES – needs to be revised and various queries addressed (SuDS adoption, removal of trees, oversowing?)
- Monitoring?

I understand that you are proposing to amend the Landscape Design Statement Town Park. As above, the other plans including the soft landscaping plans will also need to be amended.

Phase 2 residential

I understand you have been asked to provide ecological information to support the planning application for Phase 2. You have provided a 'response to comments' document attached, and also set out some points about lighting in the email below. All this information should feed into that document in support of planning.

Some queries arising from your points:

- Is a further walkover required or are the results of surveys informing the phase 2 infrastructure application up to date enough? E.g. badgers – could there now be badger sett activity in closer proximity to the boundary of phase 2 residential works? Maybe the results of the precautionary check prior to commencement of phase 2 infrastructure works could be used?
- What extent of habitat clearance/loss through construction impacts occurred as a result of the phase 2 infrastructure works? These should have been constrained to the phase 2 infrastructure footprint but I understand much of the site has been damaged.
- If reptiles are displaced where are they displaced to and what habitat is retained in the long term?
- Important to set out construction fencing (even if this has already been erected) to all retained/newly created habitats/features). As above, infrastructure works should have been contained to the infrastructure footprint, but they haven't been, and so measures need to be in place to ensure phase 2 resi works do not stray outside phase 2 resi area into adjacent habitats/features.
- A phase 2 specific CEMP hadn't been provided – have you now seen one/contributed to one which specifically includes the ecological measures?
- What will the boundary treatment between houses and proposed buffer planting be?
- Is native and swale planting reflected on planting plans (or have these not yet been produced)?
- It would be useful if the information about what is happening elsewhere (as part of phase 2) is included within the ecological information for phase 2 resi, just to make this clear (my ongoing problem is that everything is coming forward in little bits with no overarching information and it makes keeping track and maintaining understanding very difficult).
- I imagine from what you are saying regarding planting that revised plans may be required. Which phases will planting west and south of the gas compound come forward with?

Regarding the penultimate two points on the 'response to comments' document, I am going to try and find plans to explain what I mean here (hopefully by the time we speak tomorrow).

Newlands meadow

- Position of ponds and boardwalk? Are ponds SuDs features? Timing/schedule? Detailed management proposals for grassland, ponds, and woodland? Monitoring?
- Impacts of the works? I hope you can also provide a mitigation plan for this element of the proposals, or incorporate it within the Newlands Meadow strategy document. I appreciate your thoughts regarding this being a nature conservation project – however it is being controlled through planning as it is part of the development proposals. I agree it is likely to improve habitats for GCN and other wildlife in the long run, but the LPA has to be certain about the impacts of actually implementing the proposals. Potential for direct contact with NE licensing or local NE officer? Need to discuss the likelihood of GCN being present and impacted – due to size of area and proximity to ponds, is it likely that all impacts can be avoided through precautionary measures?

Hope we can chat tomorrow,

Thanks

Sarah

Sarah Warriss-Simmons

Please note that this advice is given in accordance with the Service Level Agreement that has been signed between Hampshire County Council and your Council. The comments within this letter are expressed as a professional view provided to Winchester City Council and should not, therefore, be interpreted as those of Hampshire County Council.

Senior Ecologist

Ecology Team
Strategic Environmental Delivery Group,
Economy, Transport and Environment Department
Hampshire County Council
Elizabeth II Court West
The Castle, Winchester
Hampshire SO23 8UD
Tel: 01962 832318; Fax: 01962 832117
E-mail: sarah.warriss-simmons@hants.gov.uk; www.hants.gov.uk/biodiversity
Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Lincoln Garland [<mailto:lincoln.garland@biodiversitybydesign.co.uk>]
Sent: 19 February 2014 11:51
To: Warriss-Simmons, Sarah
Cc: Lincoln Garland
Subject: RE: Berewood - Phase 2, Town Park, Newlands Meadow etc.

Thanks Sarah

Yes you guessed right it's half term.

Will try and speak with you on monday.

As discussed I would also like to chat about the restoration of Newlands Meadow.

We do not plan, currently at least, to obtain a GCN licence or install any GCN exclusion fencing. In order to knock back the weeds we will be applying herbicides and also cutting (similar to what the farmer was doing before when the field was in agricultural production).

We will also of course be excavating two ponds and doing woodland planting but we envisage these works being completed before our restored meadow is established and providing refuge for GCNs etc. (we obviously don't want to churn the restored meadow up with machinery)

Best wishes

Lincoln

Dr Lincoln Garland PhD MSc BA CEnv MIEEM
Associate

Biodiversity by Design Ltd
Company No: 5805535

Carriage Court
20 Circus Mews
Bath
BA1 2PW
Tel: 01225 318444

Web: www.biodiversitybydesign.co.uk

*This Electronic Transmission is intended only for the attention of the addressee. It may contain privileged and confidential information. If you are not the person for whom it is intended, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it.
If you have received this electronic transmission in error please notify us immediately by telephone, delete the transmission and destroy any hard copies. Biodiversity by Design Ltd has used all reasonable efforts to ensure that this message and any attachments are free from viruses.*

From: Warriss-Simmons, Sarah [<mailto:Sarah.Warriss-Simmons@hants.gov.uk>]
Sent: 19 February 2014 11:35
To: Lincoln Garland
Subject: RE: Berewood - Phase 2, Town Park, Newlands Meadow etc.

Hi Lincoln,

Thanks for your email. I'm not going to have to look at this before I leave the office today. Can I suggest I have a look on Thursday and then we speak on Monday or Tuesday next week (if you're back from half term then?).

Thanks

Sarah

From: Lincoln Garland [<mailto:lincoln.garland@biodiversitybydesign.co.uk>]
Sent: 19 February 2014 10:52
To: Warriss-Simmons, Sarah
Cc: Lincoln Garland; Mike Wells
Subject: Berewood - Phase 2, Town Park, Newlands Meadow etc.

Hi Sarah

I hope all is well.

Thanks for the positive comments regarding our plans for combining the arboretum and wildflower grassland.

We have now been asked by Redrow to produce a report for the Phase 2 residential and hope to have this finished soon. We note that you specifically asked about the street lighting layout and how this might affect adjoining habitats. Please find attached the street lighting layout.

Perhaps the key area of possible concern relates to Newlands Row woodland which bounds the western side of the development.

- As you will see the lighting columns have been positioned on the western side of the adjacent road so that they shine away from the woodland.
- In between the lighting columns and the woodland is a greenway buffer including new dense shrub planting (5m wide); this was all set out in the Phase 2 Infrastructure RMA.
- Although no scale bar is included we are told by the project engineers that the lighting columns are ca. 20m from the existing woodland edge.
- Back spillage of light falls quite rapidly to 0.6 lux between 5m and 10m from the lighting columns; as you will see the relevant isolux only traverses the eastern side of the newly constructed swale feature.
- Back spillage of light would be negligible along the existing woodland edge. The plans do not include lux contours below 0.6 but we are told that light levels are likely to be below 0.1 isolux at the woodland edge. We had already assumed this based on the rapid decline to 0.6 lux.

Very little housing backs on to Marrelsmoor Coppice. For those very few houses that do, it is their gardens rather than the road which faces the woodland (see southern spur in second attachment).

As can also be seen from the second attachment the street lamps do directly abut the hedge and fence line bounding the gas valve (but shine away from them). There is not much we can do about these though as the road can't be set back any further. With respect to commuting bats we found that they appeared to fly straight between Newlands Row and Marrelsmoor Row rather than loop around the gas valve site.

With respect to Phase A of the Town Park this area is an intensively farmed arable field of limited ecological interest. We therefore propose producing only a short mitigation advice note (1-2 pages) to provide advice on minimising risk to species such as reptiles (N.B. as discussed the GCN exclusion fence is already in place and being extended the full length of Plant Row).

As for the Newlands Meadow restoration project, do you know the person at NE who deals with protected species. We see the conversion of this arable field back to a wildflower meadow as a pure nature conservation restoration project, rather than a development control matter. We are hoping we can agree a practical approach with them so that we do not have to jump through complex licensing hoops and spend huge sums on GCN fencing. Restoring the

field back to meadow (but also including new woodland and two new ponds) is intended inter alia to improve things for GCNs.

Does all of this seem reasonable to you? You mentioned that you may be available for a chat this week. Are you about today? Unfortunately I'm on leave Thursday and Friday.

Best wishes

Lincoln

Dr Lincoln Garland PhD MSc BA CEnv MIEEM
Associate

Biodiversity by Design Ltd
Company No: 5805535

Carriage Court
20 Circus Mews
Bath
BA1 2PW
Tel: 01225 318444

Web: www.biodiversitybydesign.co.uk

*This Electronic Transmission is intended only for the attention of the addressee. It may contain privileged and confidential information. If you are not the person for whom it is intended, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it.
If you have received this electronic transmission in error please notify us immediately by telephone, delete the transmission and destroy any hard copies. Biodiversity by Design Ltd has used all reasonable efforts to ensure that this message and any attachments are free from viruses.*

*** This email, and any attachments, is strictly confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended only for the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or other use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please contact the sender. Any request for disclosure of this document under the Data Protection Act 1998 or Freedom of Information Act 2000 should be referred to the sender. [disclaimer id: HCCStdDisclaimerExt] ***