



From: Liz Rogers [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 July 2017 12:31
To: Simon Davis
Subject: RE: PLANNING APPLICATION Y/40/17/OUT

Afternoon Simon,

I have had another extensive looking through the GCN Presence / absence survey and population assessment (May 2017) and it fully justifies the reasons behind the survey methodology and the subsequent recommendations. It follows the guidance from Natural England who give clear information on when it is suitable to survey and the suitable times and number of visits for certain methodologies which this survey adheres to. (full details can be found here <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/great-crested-newts-surveys-and-mitigation-for-development-projects>)

In summary for each pond its details

Pond 1 - Access was declined and thus could not be surveyed, the owner did confirm the pond is dry for much for year reducing the suitability for the pond for GCN.

Pond 2 - has a positive result for GCN DNA testing with a low population of GCN. A combinations of bottle trapping, torching and netting survey methods was used, but egg searched could not take place because the only vegetation present was not suitable for egg laying. No GCN were identified during the surveys and due to the population of fish within the pond (which predate upon the eggs of GCN) and the impact from water fowl, the suitability of the pond is further reduced. Evidence of water voles was recorded within this pond which will also greatly reduce the likelihood of GCN within the pond. Also due to the distance of this pond to the site (further than 250m) the likelihood of a GCN traveling to the site goes down.

Pond 3 – There is no evidence of GCN or GCN eDNA within the pond confirming their absence from these ponds. They did torch only testing as other survey methods were not suitable due to the shallow water and

high macrophyte cover. Evidence of water vole was recorded within this pond greatly reducing the likelihood of GCN within the pond.

Pond 4 - Had completely dried out at the time of survey so no further work was required as the pond was deemed unsuitable.

Pond 5 – Was only surveyed once due to the very low water level at the first survey. Torch testing was used, as the water level was too low for other methods. The pond was deemed unsuitable for GCN

Pond 6 – There is no evidence of GCN or GCN eDNA within the pond confirming their absence from these ponds

Ponds 7 and 8 - Discounted from the survey because there are sufficient barriers stopping GCN movement from these ponds to the site.

The Terrestrial habitat onsite was originally designated as having moderate to low suitability for GCN however this has been significantly reduced because the area is regularly sprayed as part of its management with herbicide since the phase one habitat survey leading to limited cover for foraging and expanses of bare ground being present which does not provide cover from predators.

Though the site has been assessed as having an extremely low likelihood of GCN onsite, a precautionary approach was recommended including the creation of an ecological watching brief which we find satisfactory based on the findings of the survey.

Finally I am satisfied that the ecologist and firm are suitably qualified and experienced. We have dealt with them on numerous occasions and they are very professional and adhere to the CIEEM (Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management) standard code of practice.

Many Thanks

Liz



Liz Rogers

Environment Officer
Environment
Chichester District Council

<http://www.chichester.gov.uk>



-----Original Message-----

From: Simon Davis [<mailto:Simon.Davis@arun.gov.uk>]

Sent: 26 July 2017 10:04

To: Liz Rogers

Subject: FW: PLANNING APPLICATION Y/40/17/OUT

Hi Liz,

I've already had your comments on this application (attached for ease) but I have just received a representation from the local residents all about GCN and suggesting that the GCN survey is flawed. I will of course go with what you have to say but I wonder, do you have any comments on what the residents say which I could then use in my eventual committee report?

Thanks

Kind Regards

Simon J Davis MRTPI | Principal Planning Officer, Planning Department,
Directorate of Place, Arun District Council |

Location: 1st Floor, Arun Civic Centre, Maltravers Road, Littlehampton, BN17 5LF

Internal: 37874 | External: +44 (0) 1903 737874 | E-mail:

simon.davis@arun.gov.uk Visit Arun's web site at www.arun.gov.uk P Save the environment – think before you print.

