SITE INFORMATION

Date of Survey: 28th May 2012	Recorder: Regarding Badgers Mick Neeve	Time of visit: 16.30 hrs to 18.00 hrs
Weather Conditions: Warm, dry, sunny afternoon		Temp: Not measured
Site Name: 111 London Road, Cowplain, Waterlooville PO8 8XJ		Grid Ref: SU 692 112
Landowner/Tenant/Agent: Sovereign Land Development Ltd., 32 Links Lane, Rowlands Castle, Hampshire PO9 6AE		
Contact for Access: Mr IanBurton - 07747 372796		
County: Hampshie	District/Borough/Parish: Havant BC	Planning Ref. APP/10/00594

SITE DESCRIPTION

Area: Urban Garden	Nature Conservation Status: N/A		
Topography: *Flat* *Sloping* *Undulating*	Slope: Garden has a gentle slope in two planes	Aspect: Garden faces WNW House faces ESE	Altitude: N/A
Soil Texture: *Silty* *Sandy* *Clay*	Drainage: *Good* *Moderate* *Poor*	Soil Analysis: N/A *pH* *sheet no*	

The site has detailed planning consent granted for the demolition of the original house and the construction of two pairs of semidetached houses. The old house has been demolished and the site now consists of a pair of new, semidetached houses at the roadside, with fenced off garden areas with the rest of the site being cleared to the rear boundary.





A section of species poor hedge remains along one side of the site with a group of approximately 7 poor condition conifers along the opposite boundary.

The rest of the site, which has been cleared of any buildings and vegetation, has been roughly levelled with a layer of grey, clay soil.
There are piles of 'sorted' debris around the site including scrap metals, building rubble, vegetation and a mound of soil. Bricks and other building materials are stored here and there is an old caravan.





SITE SURVEY FINDINGS

Site History:

The site used to consist of a domestic house with an overgrown garden area containing several old sheds and a greenhouse. A Phase 1 Habitat Survey was conducted in July 2010.

There were records of two, small, artificial ponds, one dried up and filled with old leaves, one very silted up and containing a single Common Frog.

There was no record of any significant plant or animal species made. The survey recommended the supervision of the building roof removal by a bat expert and, although no further ecological surveys or precautions were required, the provision of woodcrete bat boxes and appropriate written advice was recommended.

The old building has since been demolished (I believe following an internal fire), the site has been cleared and flattened and a pair of semidetached houses has been constructed at the front of the site.

Water:

There was no standing or running water on site, apart from the small pit that was being used to catch and pump, off site, the rainwater run-off from the 'uphill' properties.

Boundaries:

The Southern boundary is lower than the neighbouring ground. The first part of this boundary is fenced but for some of its length it reveals various attempts at the installation of retaining 'features' and fencing to try to hold back the higher ground. The rest has a species poor hedgerow running from half way 'down' the garden to the Western boundary.

The Northern boundary is higher than the neighbouring ground and is mostly fenced. There is one small section where approximately seven poor quality, non native, conifers are incorporated into broken, make-shift, fencing.

The rear boundary currently consists of a series of weld-mesh fencing panels, beyond which are several mature deciduous trees, including Oaks, and other smaller trees, shrubs and undergrowth.

The roadside boundary retains the old Privet hedge.

Flora:

All species of trees and plants that remain on the site are common and widespread. No notable species are present but it is hoped that further development of the site will include replacement of some of the lost vegetation as domestic gardens become increasingly important to urban wildlife for food and nesting resources.

Fauna:

Herpetological species: Both ponds have now been lost to the site clearance, so no further investigation for amphibians could be carried out. However, a search beneath some of the many flat pieces of material (wood, metal, plastic, cardboard) that were strewn around the site did not reveal any evidence of them being used as refugia by reptiles or amphibians.

Mammals: A Fox was seen lying up around an area of rubble at the rear of the site. It stood up and slowly limped its way out through the rear boundary fencing. Approximately 2/3rds of its body was infected with sarcoptic mange and it had a rear right leg limp.

None of the trees on site appear mature enough or possess characteristics that would provide bat roosting potential. There was a potential for bats to have used the vacant and open house before it was demolished, so the original recommendation and planning condition to install bat boxes onto the new properties has been detailed elsewhere in this report.

Birds: Common species of birds seen on the site were Blackbird, Chaffinch, Sparrow and Wood Pigeon. If there is to be any further removal of trees, this work should be carried out between March to August inclusive to avoid the bird nesting season. Although it must be remembered that the determining factor is whether birds are nesting and not the date.

Invertebrates: Based on the results and recommendations of the original Habitat Survey Report, no specific invertebrate species survey was carried out as this was not considered necessary.

SITE SURVEY SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary:

A Previous Phase 1 Habitat Survey found nothing of any major significance on the site and since then the site has been cleared and completely degraded.

All remaining vegetation and trees on site are non native species or are common and widespread species. Any impact caused by their loss will be minimal.

Recommendations:

In accordance with the original condition 8 of the consent regarding the placement of bat boxes, it is considered reasonable that one woodcrete bat box is attached to each of the separate buildings of the development. Since only one of the two semi-detached pairs of houses has been constructed, attaching one bat box to this building would seem to fulfil this condition at present, providing that another is attached to the other building once it is completed.

Advice on the positioning and ongoing care of the bat boxes will be provided at the appropriate time. Since no idea has been given of the species of bat for which these boxes should be provided, it is considered reasonable that boxes suitable for Pipestrelle bats should be used. This is because Pipestrelle are one of the species commonly associated with modern or recently constructed buildings, so provision for this species is most likely to be utilised.