

**LAND AT BURDELL ROAD,
YAPTON**

ECOLOGICAL PROTECTION PLAN

A Report submitted to Persimmon Homes

Middlemarch Environmental Ltd.
Triumph House
Birmingham Road
Allesley
Coventry
CV5 9AZ

Tel: 01676 525880

Fax: 01676 521400

E-Mail: admin@middlemarch-environmental.com

Web Site: www.middlemarch-environmental.com

Report Number: RT-MME-113678-02

March 2013

**LAND AT BURNDELL ROAD,
YAPTON**

ECOLOGICAL PROTECTION PLAN

CONTROLLED COPY

01 OF 02

01 PERSIMMON HOMES
02 MIDDLEMARCH ENVIRONMENTAL

This report was compiled by
Charlotte Lea MIEEM and Indre Barsketyte MSc

Middlemarch Environmental
Triumph House
Birmingham Road
Allesley, Coventry
CV5 9AZ

Tel: 01676 525880

Fax: 01676 521400

E-Mail: admin@middlemarch-environmental.com

Web Site: www.middlemarch-environmental.com

Contract Number C113678

December 2012

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	3
1. INTRODUCTION.....	4
1.1 PROJECT INTRODUCTION	4
1.2 SITE DESCRIPTION.....	4
1.3 BACKGROUND INFORMATION	4
2. EXISTING ECOLOGY	5
2.1 STATUTORY AND NON STATUTORY NATURE CONSERVATION SITES.....	6
2.2 HABITATS.....	6
2.3 SPECIES.....	6
2.3.1 Badgers	6
2.3.2 Bats.....	7
2.3.3 Birds.....	7
2.3.4 Reptiles	7
3. POTENTIAL IMPACTS	8
3.1 BADGERS	8
3.2 BATS.....	8
3.3 BIRDS	8
3.4 REPTILES	8
4. OBJECTIVES AND TARGETS	10
5. CONTROL OF WORKS	11
5.1 TRAFFIC LIGHT SYSTEM	11
5.2 QUALITY CONTROL	11
5.2.1 Site Inductions	11
5.2.2 Ecological Permits	12
5.2.3 Ecological Certificates	12
5.2.4 Rectification Notices	12
5.2.5 Daily Record Sheets	12
5.2.6 Progress Report.....	12
5.2.7 Site Memos	12
5.3 CONSULTATION AND LIAISON	13
5.3.1 Approval.....	13
5.3.2 Progress Meetings.....	13
5.3.3 Progress Reports.....	13
6. MITIGATION STRATEGIES.....	14
6.1 BADGERS.....	14
6.2 BATS.....	14
6.3 BIRDS	14
6.3.1 Background.....	14
6.1.2 Habitat Manipulation	14
6.4 REPTILES	15
REFERENCES	16
DRAWINGS	17
APPENDICES	18
APPENDIX 1	19
APPENDIX 2.....	23

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT INTRODUCTION

In February 2013 Middlemarch Environmental Ltd was commissioned by Persimmon Homes to provide an Ecological Protection Plan (EPP) to meet a condition set out in planning permission granted for the land at Burndell Road, Yapton in West Sussex.

The proposed development involves construction of 173 new dwellings with associated car parking; public open space including play areas, access roads and highway works at a site on the edge of Yapton.

1.2 SITE DESCRIPTION

It is a flat, 7.6 ha site situated on the northern edge of Yapton, West Sussex and is centred at National Grid Reference SU 985 030.

Habitats currently on site include bare ground and ephemerals, hedgerows, scattered trees (broadleaved and coniferous), scrub (dense and scattered), semi-improved grassland; spoil heap and tall ruderal vegetation. The site is surrounded by residential properties to the south and west, arable fields to the north and industrial properties to the east.

1.3 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In 2010 Hyder Consulting Group carried out an Ecological Appraisal Report for the site which comprised an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey, Reptile Surveys, Badger Surveys, Breeding Bird Surveys and Bat Surveys. A summary of each survey can be found below:

- The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey identified the presence of semi-improved and improved grassland, strips of tall ruderal herbs, dense scrub, hedgerows and scattered trees.
- Targeted reptile surveys were carried out and while no reptiles were identified on the site it was not considered possible to rule out the presence of reptiles. This is due to the high level of disturbance during the surveys and the identification of optimal reptile habitat on site.
- Thirty one species of breeding birds were identified during the targeted surveys including six Red List species.
- Initial bat surveys identified that some of the trees present on site had bat roosting potential and as such bat activity surveys were carried out. These activity surveys did not reveal the presence of roosts within the trees, however a high level of foraging was identified. This shows that bats frequently use the site for commuting and foraging purposes.
- During the badger survey two badger setts were identified: one subsidiary and one outlying. These were located along the northern boundary of the site within areas of dense scrub. During the 2010 survey the subsidiary sett was active and the outlying sett was inactive. During the updated surveys in 2013 both setts were deemed as inactive.

In February 2013 Middlemarch Environmental Ltd carried out a number of reports, including the following:

- Badger Survey Report Number RT-MME-113678-01;
- Ecological Protection Plan Report Number RT-MME-113678-02;
- Reptile Mitigation Strategy Report Number RT-MME-113678-03;
- Bat Lighting Strategy Report Number RT-MME-113678-04;
- Bird and Bat Habitat Enhancement Strategy Report Number RT-MME-113678-05; and,
- Japanese Knotweed Method Statement Report Number RT-MME-113678-06

A badger survey was carried out in 2013 to update the previous badger survey from 2010 in order to determine the current status of the previously identified setts. The Ecological Protection Plan identifies the key ecologically sensitive areas present on site and methods in which to reduce the impacts upon these areas. Both the Reptile Mitigation Strategy and Bird and Bat Enhancement Strategy provide measures in which to protect and enhance the site for the species present. The Japanese Knotweed Method Statement has been developed because of the presence of this invasive species on site and provides methods to ensure it does not spread.

2. EXISTING ECOLOGY

2.1 STATUTORY AND NON STATUTORY NATURE CONSERVATION SITES

The information in this chapter is based upon the report outlines in section 1.3. There are no statutory or non-statutory nature conservation sites within 1km from the site.

2.2 HABITATS

The area considered within this report includes the following habitats:

- Bare ground and ephemerals;
- Hedgerow;
- Japanese knotweed;
- Scattered trees (broadleaved and coniferous);
- Scrub (dense and scattered);
- Semi-improved grassland;
- Spoil heap; and,
- Tall ruderal vegetation.

The site was dominated by semi-improved grassland with areas of dense and scattered scrub and tall ruderal vegetation. A number of coniferous and broadleaved trees were scattered throughout the site and stretches of hedgerows were present at the site boundaries.

2.3 SPECIES

The Ecological Appraisal Report (Hyder Consulting Group 2010) highlighted the presence and potential presence of protected species has been noted within and adjacent to the works area. These species include:

- Badgers;
- Bats;
- Birds – breeding birds; and,
- Reptiles.

2.3.1 Badgers

Two badger setts were located during badger survey done in 2010 by Hyder Consulting Group. These were monitored between January and June 2010 and it was found that a subsidiary sett was set was being constantly used during the monitoring. The outlying sett on the other hand, was inactive throughout monitoring and by the end of the monitoring period it has overgrown with scrub and no badger tracks were leading to it indicated that badgers have not been using this sett. However on the initial badger survey conducted by Middlemarch Environmental Ltd in February 2013 (Report RT-MME-113678-01) no evidence of active badger sett or evidence of badger activity such as mammal paths and snuffle holes were identified.

2.3.2 Bats

A number of trees on site have a potential to support roosting bats and the hedgerows, scrub and scattered trees provide good foraging habitat. Initial and activity surveys done in 2010 by Hyder Consulting Group did not identified any bat roosts on site however a heavy foraging and commuting activity was noted.

2.3.3 Birds

During the site visit ten species of bird were recorded, including: magpie *Pica pica*, blackbird *Turdus merula*, black-headed gull *Larus ridibundus*, blue tit *Parus caeruleus*, long-tailed tit *Aegithalos caudatus*, robin *Erithacus rubecula*, starling *Sturnus vulgaris*, kestrel *Falco tinnunculus*, song thrush *Plectrophenax nivalis* and dunnoek *Prunella modularis*.

2.3.4 Reptiles

There is anecdotal evidence of reptiles, notable slow worm *Anguis fragilis* and grass snake *Natrix natrix* being present on site. Field surveys undertaken in 2010 have revealed no evidence of reptiles within the site. However the refugia were been constantly disturbed by general public during the survey period, therefore, the presence of reptiles cannot be totally ruled out. If reptiles are present on the site, however, it is considered likely that they would only be in low numbers.

3. POTENTIAL IMPACTS

The proposed works may impact upon the following ecological interests:

- Badgers;
- Bats;
- Birds – breeding birds; and,
- Reptiles.

3.1 BADGERS

No evidence of badger activity was recorded on site on February 2013 visit. This indicates that the badger setts on site are currently inactive. These setts are, however, out of the working area of the proposals and as such would not be impacted on during the works.

3.2 BATS

The effects of disturbance due to the presence of people and machinery operation are potentially significant to bat populations at the site, but temporary. There will be a reduction in foraging habitats, particularly grassland and scrub and hedgerows. However the landscaping will involve planting of native and wildlife attracting plants in addition to creating green corridors through the new development connecting to the surrounding habitat and installation of bat boxes. Therefore the local bat population will not be impacted in long term.

3.3 BIRDS

The effects of disturbance due to the presence of people and machinery operation are potentially significant to bird populations at the site, but temporary. Whilst there will be a reduction of habitats, particularly grassland and scrub, there is an abundance of suitable habitat within the local vicinity. In addition providing that an adequate number of bird boxes are provided post-development and the landscaping include planting of native and wildlife attracting species, birds will not be impacted in the long term by the development. However, if the works are undertaken in the bird nesting season there is the potential for impact upon nesting birds which are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Any potential impacts will be during the construction phase and in Chapter 5 the proposed protection measures are identified to minimise the adverse impacts.

3.4 REPTILES

The projected impacts upon reptiles will be as follows:

- Loss of foraging habitat; and,
- Loss of refugia and hibernacula.

As none have been recorded the probability of harm to individuals is low and any potential impacts are considered low. The species most at risk are identified as:

- Grass Snake; and,

- Slow worm.

The impacts will be during the construction phase and in Chapter 5 the proposed protection measures are identified to minimise the adverse impacts.

The effects on the reptile population are considered to be minor adverse in the short-term due to the disturbance caused from construction, becoming minor beneficial in the long-term as the population will be provided with a stable and managed habitat connected to the wider countryside.

DRAFT

4. OBJECTIVES AND TARGETS

The following objectives have been determined for this report:

- To ensure full compliance with Protected Species legislation;
- To ensure works minimise disturbance to site ecology wherever possible.

Targets are inter alia, as follows:

- To remove/deter all protected species from areas affected by the works;
- To relocate protected and notable species to a suitable receptor site;
- To make works areas unsuitable for protected and notable species;
- To prevent migration of protected and notable species into works areas;
- To monitor the works for impacts on other protected and notable species;
- To undertake site vegetation clearance prior to the bird nesting season wherever other protected species allow;
- To monitor the populations of protected and notable species subsequent to the works to ensure the long-term viability of these species within the locality.

The Local Authority Ecologist is to be consulted with regard to the proposed mitigation/protection strategies

5. CONTROL OF WORKS

To ensure that the works are undertaken in accordance with the EPP a series of control measures will be utilised. These measures include the appointment an Ecological Clerk of Works, who will:

- Be familiar with any Natural England licences and associated constraints.
- Approve all method statements and ensure that any relevant site environmental protocols are appended and that these controls are adhered to.
- Ensure the site team and sub-contractors comply with the site protocols. Report any failings to the Site Manager immediately. If insufficient action taken, stop the works and report to the situation to the Project Manager.
- Raise a Quality Alert for any non-compliance with the ecological protocols.
- The ECW will liaise direct with the site management team.

5.1 TRAFFIC LIGHT SYSTEM

A 'Traffic Light' system will be used to determine the status of the site. This system identifies areas of the site which are of high, moderate or low ecological value and are then assigned the colour red, amber or green respectively. These areas are categories by the following criteria:

Red zones define the most ecologically sensitive issues, or the areas most vulnerable to damage. This includes all areas that are known to support protected and notable species and nesting birds and stands of Japanese knotweed. Any works that occur within these areas must be supervised at all times by the Ecological Clerk of the Works.

Amber zones are areas of moderate to high ecological value that may directly or indirectly affected by the proposed works. This includes areas that have potential to support protected or notable species. In this zone works will proceed with precaution with regular monitoring by the Ecological Clerk of the Works.

Green zones are areas with low ecological interest. Works will proceed unsupervised by the Ecological Clerk of the Works but best practice to be adopted at all times. Works will cease if any ecological issues such as nesting birds are identified.

The various areas are identified on Drawing Number C113678-02-01.

5.2 QUALITY CONTROL

To ensure compliance with legislation, planning issues and to provide an audit trail on site activities will be controlled and monitored.

5.2.1 Site Inductions

These will highlight key issues, key operations and key times of year and key areas in relation to ecology. They will include:

- Discussion about the Traffic Light Map;
- Site activity method statements;
- Reporting hierarchy; and,
- Permit system.

5.2.2 Ecological Permits

Ecological Permits are to be required for working in the red or amber areas and undertaking the activities detailed above. These will be valid for specific time periods and should be renewed at least once a month.

5.2.3 Ecological Certificates

Once an activity has been completed or working in a designated area finished a certificate will be signed by the Environmental Manager to confirm it has been carried out to an acceptable standard.

5.2.4 Rectification Notices

Rectification notices will be issued by the ECW to the site manager/representative of the site team for implementation of action required. These will be signed on completion by the site manager or a representative of the site team and counter signed by the ECW.

5.2.5 Daily Record Sheets

The ECW will record the activities and observations onto a Record Sheet during visits to the site.

5.2.6 Progress Report

The ECW will produce a regular report, based on the record sheets highlighting any issues raised during the programme. The report will include copies of:

- Ecological Permits;
- Ecological Certificates;
- Rectification Notices; and,
- Site Memos.

5.2.7 Site Memos

There will be instances when there may be a need to amend the proposed method of working, extent of works, mitigation/protection etc. The proposed changes will be summarised on the memo with any drawings, reports referenced etc.

The same form will be used for the reply, again including any drawings, reports etc.

5.3 CONSULTATION AND LIAISON

5.3.1 Approval

The EPP should be agreed with the Project Management Team, stakeholders such as the Local Authority Ecologist and Natural England (if required) prior to works commencing.

5.3.2 Progress Meetings

The ECW should attend site progress meetings. Whilst working at sensitive times and areas this should be weekly, other times as appropriate. If considered appropriate stakeholders should be invited to the meetings.

5.3.3 Progress Reports

These should be circulated to all stakeholders and management team.

DRAFT

6. MITIGATION STRATEGIES

The following Sections provide outline details of the Mitigation Strategies for each of the main ecological interests to be affected by the works.

6.1 BADGERS

The two currently disused badger setts on site will be clearly marked and a 30 metre exclusion will be installed around the setts in order to preserve the integrity of the setts during the development. Any excavations that need to be left overnight will be covered or fitted with mammal ramps to ensure that any badgers and other animals that enter can safely escape. If any works do need to occur within 30 m of these setts, they must be agreed by an Ecological Clerk of Works.

6.2 BATS

Three conifer trees at the northern boundary of the site offer good potential for roosting bats therefore all the suitable features will be inspected before the works start to ensure that bats are not currently utilising these features for roosting. For full mitigation works relating to bat species please see Bat Lighting Strategy (Report RT-MME-113678-04) and Bird and Bat Habitat Enhancement Plan (Report RT-MME-113678-05).

6.3 BIRDS

6.3.1 Background

Nesting birds are protected from harm and disturbance (see Section 3.1). The scrub, arable field and scattered trees on site have the potential to support a variety of common nesting birds, such as skylark or house sparrow which were recorded on site.

To reduce the potential impact of the works on these species it has been determined that wherever possible habitat manipulation should be undertaken outside of the nesting season (February to September inclusive).

6.3.2 Habitat Manipulation

To discourage bird species from nesting within the works area will require the following works:

1. Removal of scrub/trees to discourage tree-nesting species
2. Continual activity between February and September will assist in discouraging nesting birds.

Whilst the principle of removing vegetation from the site outside of the bird nesting season is acknowledged as important, it may not be possible to complete all vegetation clearance. It is therefore proposed to implement a search & supervision procedure with an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECW).

1. The ECW will check all areas of vegetation to be removed between February and September (inclusive) for nesting birds, prior to works commencing.

2. Any nesting birds recorded will be provided with a clearly defined exclusion zone to prevent disturbance. The exclusion zone will be retained until the bird/birds have abandoned the nest site naturally.
3. No works will be undertaken within the exclusion zone without prior consultation with and supervision from the ECW.

It is important to note that the removal of vegetation to the above specifications reduces the likelihood of nesting activity by species previously recorded within the site. No operation is guaranteed to prevent all bird species from nesting, and therefore care should be taken prior to works of any nature that nesting birds are not within the works area.

For the post development works regarding birds please see Bird and Bat Habitat Enhancement Strategy (Middlemarch Environmental Report RT-MME-113678-05).

6.4 REPTILES

There is indirect evidence to suggest there will be populations of reptiles within the works area. Due to the lack of evidence from field surveys for the presence of reptiles, no trapping and translocation will be undertaken, but all vegetation clearance and soil strip will be supervised by a suitably qualified ecologist. If reptiles are subsequently found then trapping and translocation will be carried out.

The proposed protection to reptiles will include the following elements:

- Supervision of vegetation clearance and soil strip; and,
- If reptiles are found trapping and translocation will be undertaken, if none are found no additional mitigation during the construction period will be required.

The strategy will require discussion with the local authority ecologist.

1. Removal of scrub etc across the whole site. The stumps are to be left 150 mm high. Vegetation clearance is to be using hand held machinery and vegetation dragged to designated points for chipping/burning. To avoid harming any hibernating fauna, works should not disturb the topsoil.
2. The site should be subject to habitat manipulation, in the form of a topsoil strip in a directional manner towards the southern boundary. Works are to be carried out in suitable weather conditions only (no rain and temps 9° c plus) and under the supervision of an appropriately qualified and experienced ecologist.

REFERENCES

English Nature (2001) *Great Crested Newt Mitigation Guidelines*. English Nature, Peterborough.

Gent, A. H. (2004) *Pers. Comm.* Chief Executive Officer, Herpetological Conservation Trust, Boscombe.

Hyder Consulting Group (2010). Land at Burndell Road, Yapton – Updated Ecological Appraisal Report WX82162/C1162/AW/Yapton/v1.

Middlemarch Environmental Ltd (2013). Land at Burndell Road, Yaton: Badger Survey Report Number RT-MME-113678-01.

Middlemarch Environmental Ltd (2013). Land at Burndell Road, Yaton: Reptile Mitigation Strategy Report Number RT-MME-113678-03.

Middlemarch Environmental Ltd (2013). Land at Burndell Road, Yaton: Bird and Bat Enhancement Strategy Report Number RT-MME-113678-05.

Middlemarch Environmental Ltd (2013). Land at Burndell Road, Yaton: Japanese Knotweed Method Statement Report Number RT-MME-113678-06.

DRAWINGS

Drawing 1: C113678-02-01

Traffic Light map

DRAFT



C113678-02-01

Legend

- Site boundary
- Red - High Ecological Risk
- Amber - Moderate Ecological Risk

Project	Yapton	
Drawing	Traffic Lights Map	
Client	Persimmon Homes	
Drawing Number	C113678-02-01	Revision 00
Scale @ A4	1:2,750	Date February 2013
Approved By	CC	Drawn By JS
 MIDDLEMARCH ENVIRONMENTAL Triumph House, Birmingham Road, Allesley, Coventry CV5 9AZ T: 01676 525880 F: 01676 521400 E: admin@middlemarch-environmental.com		
This drawing is based on the drawing "Survey June 10-A.dwg" supplied by the client.		

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1 Relevant Wildlife Legislation
- Appendix 2 Ecological Permit
 Ecological Certificate

DRAFT

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF RELEVANT LEGISLATION

REPTILES

Grass snakes and slow worms are listed on Schedule 5 of the 1981 Act, and is subject to certain of the provisions of Section 9, which make it an offence to:

- Intentionally kill or injure common lizard [Section 9(1)]
- Sell, offer for sale, possess or transport for purpose of sales, and live or dead animal, or any part of, or anything derived from, such an animal [Section 9 (5)]

English Nature (2004) state that where it is predictable that reptiles could be killed or injured by operations, such as site clearance, this could legally constitute intentional killing or injuring.

BIRDS

No birds with special protection measures are anticipated within the boundary of the works area. Therefore the general legislation of the Wildlife & Countryside Act (as amended) with respect to nesting birds applies. This legislation makes an offence:

- Intentional killing, injuring or taking;
- Taking, damaging or destroying nests in use or being built;
- Taking or destroying eggs;
- Possessing or having control of (with certain exceptions but including live or dead birds, parts or derivatives);
- Setting or permitting certain traps, weapons, decoys or poisons
- Selling, offering or exposing for sale, possessing or transporting for sale any live wild bird*, egg or part of an egg or advertising any of these for sale, or dead wild bird* including parts or derivatives are also prohibited

*Except woodpigeon (at all times); capercaillie, common snipe, coot, golden plover, mallard, pintail, pochard, shoveler, teal, wigeon and woodcock (between 1 September and 28 February).

BADGERS

Badgers and their setts are protected under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992. The Protection of Badgers Act 1992 is based primarily on the need to protect badgers from baiting and deliberate harm or injury, badgers are not protected for conservation reasons. The following are criminal offences:

- To intentionally or recklessly interfere with a sett. Sett interference includes disturbing badgers whilst they are occupying a sett, as well as damaging or destroying a sett or obstructing access to it.

- To wilfully kill, injure, take, possess or cruelly ill-treat a badger, or to attempt to do so.

A badger sett is defined in the legislation as:

- *'Any structure or place that displays signs indicating current use by a badger'.*

'Current use' is not synonymous with current occupation and a sett is defined as such (and thus protected) as long as signs of current usage are present. Therefore, a sett is protected until such a time as the field signs deteriorate to such an extent that they no longer indicate 'current usage'.

Badger setts can be disturbed inadvertently by a multitude of operations including excavation and coring, even if there is no direct interference or damage to the sett. Any intentional or reckless work that disturbs badgers is illegal without a licence from Natural England (NE).

BATS

Bats and the places they use for shelter or protection (i.e. roosts) receive European protection under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, as amended (Habitats Regulations 2010, as amended). They receive further legal protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (WCA) 1981, as amended. This protection means that bats, and the places they use for shelter or protection, are capable of being a material consideration in the planning process.

Regulation 41 of the Habitats Regulations 2010 (as amended), states that a person commits an offence if they:

- deliberately capture, injure or kill a bat;
- deliberately disturb bats; or
- damage or destroy a bat roost (breeding site or resting place).

Disturbance of animals includes in particular any disturbance which is likely to impair their ability to survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young, or in the case of animals of a hibernating or migratory species, to hibernate or migrate; or to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong.

It is an offence under the Habitats Regulations 2010 (as amended) for any person to have in his possession or control, to transport, to sell or exchange or to offer for sale, any live or dead bats, part of a bat or anything derived from bats, which has been unlawfully taken from the wild.

Whilst broadly similar to the above legislation, the WCA 1981 (as amended) differs in the following ways:

- Section 9(1) of the WCA makes it an offence to *intentionally* (rather than deliberately) kill, injure or take any protected species.
- Section 9(4)(a) of the WCA makes it an offence to *intentionally or recklessly** damage or destroy, or *obstruct access to*, any structure or place which a protected species uses for shelter or protection.
- Section 9(4)(b) of the WCA makes it an offence to *intentionally or recklessly** disturb any protected species *while it is occupying a structure or place which it uses for shelter or protection*.

*Reckless offences were added by the Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act 2000.

As bats re-use the same roosts (breeding site or resting place) after periods of vacancy, legal opinion is that roosts are protected whether or not bats are present.

DRAFT

APPENDIX 2

ECOLOGICAL PERMIT TO WORK (Sample)		
CONTRACT NAME: Land at Burndell Road	CONTRACT NO: 113678	PERMIT NO: 01
RECEPIENT:		
ZONE/AREA:		
PROPOSED NATURE OF WORKS:	Vegetation clearance	
ECOLOGICAL ISSUES:	Dense scrub, long grassland and tall ruderal vegetation present – nesting birds within the nesting bird season	
ECOLOGICAL CONTROL LEVEL:	Amber	
ECOLOGICAL CONTROL MEASURES	Pre-start site inspection and direct search of all remaining vegetation.	
METHOD STATEMENT APPROVAL	NO: N/A	AUTHOR: N/A
	SIGNED (ECW):	DATE:
NOTES/ISSUES	Permit valid until the end of April 2013 Pre-start inspection carried out 16.03.13. No issues.	
ECOLOGICAL MANAGER	David Smith	07885 865520
ECOLOGICAL CLERK OF WORKS	Charlotte Lea	07738 488356
ENVIRONMENT AGENCY CONTACT	N/A	

NATURAL ENGLAND CONTACT	N/A	
Notes:		
1. Ecological control levels	Red = Full time ECW supervision	
	Amber = Part-time ECW supervision	
	Green = Visiting ECW role	
Permit Valid Dates	From:	To:
Review dates	(One month max)	SIGNED (ECW): SIGNED (contractor)
Document No: 01	Document date: 15.01.09	Revision No: 01

ECOLOGY CERTIFICATE 1 (SAMPLE)

Form of Certificate to be used by the Environmental Manager for certifying that the relevant Works have been completed.

1. We certify that we have used reasonable professional skill and care in examining the Works carried out listed below and that in our opinion all such Works have been completed in all respects in accordance with the Contract, so as to accord with the Ecological Design to which there has been no objection under the Review and Certification Procedure and so as to satisfy the Employer's Requirements and the Contractor's Proposals as amended by the following Contractor's Changes and Employer's Changes.

[DETAILS OF ECOLOGICAL WORKS]

Signed

Environmental Manager (Partner or Director)

Name

Title

Date

Signed

Project Manager (Principal)

Name

Title

Date

Where the Environmental Manager is not a specialist in this area

2. This certificate is
 - i accepted*
 - ii accepted with comments:*
 - iii returned unaccepted with comments:*

*delete as appropriate

Signed

Employer's Agent

Name

Date

Site Memo

Barking Riverside

	
Ref: 102361	
Date: 29.1.09	Author: CL/DS
Issue to: Barking Riverside Ltd	

ISSUE		Memo No: 001	
Date Raised:		Support docs:	E-mail and supporting docs
By Whom:			
RESPONSE			
Date Responded:		Support docs:	Drawing:
By Whom:	David Smith		

MIDDLEMARCH ENVIRONMENTAL LTD
QUALITY ASSURANCE

TITLE: ECOLOGICAL PROTECTION PLAN

LAND AT BURNDELL ROAD,
YAPTON

A Report to Persimmon Homes

Contract Number: C113678

Report Number: RT-MME-113678-02

Revision Number: 00

Description: Draft

Date: March 2013

Checked by:

David Smith
Ecology & Landscape Director

Approved by:

Dr. Philip Fermor
Managing Director

