

Land West of Worthing Road, Southwater

Phase 4

Ecological Assessment - Addendum

May 2025



T: 0118 989 10 86
E: info@derekfinnie.com
W: www.derekfinnie.com

20 Soames Place, Mulberry Grove
Wokingham, Berkshire RG40 5AT



COMMISSIONED BY
Berkeley Homes (Southern) Limited
Berkeley House
Bay Tree Avenue
Leatherhead
Surrey
KT22 7UE

Land West of Worthing Road, Southwater Phase 4

Ecological Assessment - Addendum

May 2025

Report Ref: DFA24062V2a

Derek Finnie Associates Ltd
20 Soames Place
Wokingham
Berkshire
RG40 5AT

info@derekfinnie.com



CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Background.....	1
2	METHODOLOGY.....	2
2.1	Reptile survey	2
2.2	Bat Survey.....	3
2.3	Survey Constraints.....	3
3	SITE DESCRIPTION	4
3.1	Desk Study	4
4	EVALUATION	5
4.1	Site Evaluation	5
	REFERENCES.....	6

TABLES

Table 1.	Reptile Survey Dates and Conditions.....	2
Table 2.	Bat Activity Survey Dates	3
Table 3.	Static Detector Deployment Dates and Weather	3
Table 4.	Summary of Bat Registrations	4
Table 5.	Summary of Bat Registrations per Night	4

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 Derek Finnie Associates was commissioned by Berkeley Homes (Southern) Ltd (BHS) to provide ecological advice in relation to an area of land to the south of Church Lane and east of Shaw Lane in Southwater, herein referred to the 'Site'. The Site had previously formed Phase 4 of BHS's wider *Land West of Southwater* development which received outline planning permission for residential development (Ref: DC/14/0590). An Ecological Assessment was submitted in support of a Section 73 Minor Material Amendment application to the approved Reserved Matters application associated to Phases 3.2 and 4 of the development known as Broadacres, Southwater (Report Ref DFA24062V2).
- 1.1.2 However, due to the time constraints, not all surveys were complete at the time the report was submitted; reptile and bat surveys were still ongoing. The following Addendum, therefore, presents the results of the final reptile and bat surveys completed throughout the summer of 2024.
- 1.1.3 The methodologies are the same as those present in the submitted Ecological Assessment, but are repeated here for ease. Where any significant difference in the evaluation of the ecological receptors has been identified as a result of the update surveys, this is also discussed.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Reptile survey

- 2.1.1 A previous survey undertaken in 2013 did not identify any reptiles within the Phase 4 area of the wider site. However, surveys undertaken in 2019 within the adjoining Phase 5 land did identify small populations of common lizard, slow worm and grass snake. As there is some direct habitat connectivity between Phases 4 and 5, albeit sub-optimal, a reptile re-survey of the Phase 4 land was deemed to be warranted.
- 2.1.2 A total of 60 refugia, consisting of heavy-duty roofing felt approximately 0.5m², were placed across the Site in line with best practice survey guidance. To maximise the efficiency of the survey the refugia were concentrated in areas which appeared to be more likely to support reptiles. The refugia were placed across the 5.2ha site at the density recommended by Froglife (1999) of 10ha⁻¹.
- 2.1.3 The refugia generally heat up quicker than the surrounding environment, which makes them attractive to reptiles which need to attain a certain body temperature to hunt effectively. Thus, careful inspection of the refugia results in a more effective way to locate these often-elusive animals.
- 2.1.4 The refugia were placed on Site on the 19th May 2024 and allowed to 'bed in' for at 10 days before the survey proper began. The refugia will be checked on seven occasions throughout the survey period, on suitable days, which are classified as sunny, or partially sunny days, with little or no wind and an air temperature between 8°C and 19°C. Within the previous submitted Ecological Assessment, the result of surveys undertaken on 29th May, 6th June and the 12th June 2024 were present. This Addendum presents the results of a further four surveys, undertaken on the dates presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Reptile Survey Dates and Conditions

Visit No.	Date	Weather
4	12/07/24	16°C, sunny, 4/8 cloud
5	21/07/24	13°C, sunny, 2/8cloud
6	06/08/24	14°C, sunny, no cloud
7	02/09/24	17°C, sunny, 1/8 cloud

- 2.1.5 In addition to checking the artificial refugia, other suitable natural basking areas around the Site were carefully inspected from a short distance using Leica 10x32 BGA binoculars, expanding the search area to cover parts of the Site where refugia could not be placed.

2.2 Bat Survey

Activity Surveys

- 2.2.1 A total of six activity surveys and six static surveys were undertaken across the 2024 survey season; the results of the initial two activity surveys were presented in the submitted ecological assessment. A further four activity surveys were undertaken on the dates listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Bat Activity Survey Dates

Date	Sunset	Start time	Temperature	Weather
14/07/24	21:09	20:55	14 °C	1/8 cloud, light wind
06/08/24	20:44	20:30	17 °C	2/8 cloud, light wind
14/08/24	20:24	20:20	16°C	3/8 cloud, light wind
11/09/24	19:11	18:50	14°C	No cloud, light wind

Static Surveys

- 2.2.2 In addition to the activity surveys, two Anabat Swift static detectors were placed within the branches of a suitable trees on four additional occasions as summarised in Table 3.

Table 3. Static Detector Deployment Dates and Weather

Dates	Min/Max overnight temp	Other comments
11/07 – 16/07/24	12°C /17°C	
04/08 – 09/08/24	12°C /16°C	Light precipitation overnight on 06/08
14/08 – 18/08/24	12°C /16°C	
11/09 – 16/09/24	10°C /12°C	Light precipitation overnight on 12/09

- 2.2.3 A 2m microphone extension lead was used to ensure the microphone was located within the optimum presumed flight path of any foraging bats.
- 2.2.4 The data from the detectors were analysed using Anabat Insight with *BatClassify UK AutoID*, with the ID Tag Certainty Threshold set at 80%. For the commoner species (common pipistrelle and soprano pipistrelle) one in every ten recordings was checked manually, with recordings being compared to those presented by Russ (2012); for the more uncommon species, every recording was checked manually.

2.3 Survey Constraints

- 2.3.1 No significant constraints to the surveys were encountered.
- 2.3.2 The survey was undertaken in line with the latest sectoral guidance from the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) and BS 42020: 2013 *Biodiversity – Code of Practice for Planning and Development*.

3 SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 Desk Study

Reptiles

- 3.1.1 No reptiles have been encountered within the Site during the remaining survey undertaken in 2024.

Bats

Activity Surveys

- 3.1.2 The level of bat activity encountered within the Site to date in 2024, and the composite species, is similar to that recorded during previous surveys in 2013/2014, although the surveys are still ongoing. Again, a total of five species have been recorded throughout the survey period, with common pipistrelle being the most frequently encountered species, as summarised in Table 2.

Table 4. Summary of Bat Registrations

Species	12/07/24	21/07/24	06/08/24	02/09/24
Common pipistrelle	21	13	25	16
Soprano pipistrelle	3	9	7	11
Noctule	2	2	4	3
Serotine	0	0	1	1
<i>Myotis</i> sp	1	0	1	0

- 3.1.3 Again, the majority of the registrations were associated with the mature tree belts, particularly along the eastern boundary of the Site.

Static Surveys.

- 3.1.4 The result of the static surveys mirror those of the activity, although *Myotis* sp. were also record at slighter high numbers. The static detector results are summarised in Table 5.

Table 5. Summary of Bat Registrations per Night

Species	21/05 – 25/08/24	14/06 – 18/06/24	11/07 – 16/07/24	04/08 – 09/08/24	14/08 – 18/08/24	11/09 – 16/09/24
Common pipistrelle	148	181	269	158	211	189
Soprano pipistrelle	15	32	16	21	31	17
Noctule	12	17	19	21	17	15
Brown Long eared bat	2	-	3	5	1	-
<i>Myotis</i> sp	6	12	11	7	11	7

4 EVALUATION

4.1 Site Evaluation

- 4.1.1 No change to the overall assessment of the ecological value has occurred based on the results of the updated surveys. The bat assemblage within the Site comprises the most common and widespread species, although the distribution of serotine bat is restricted to the south east, which raises the value of the Site for bats slightly. Nevertheless, it would still be classified as being of **Local** value only (Wray *et al* 2010).
- 4.1.2 Reptiles are still considered to be absent.

REFERENCES

BCT 2016. *Bat Surveys – Good Practice Guidelines, 3rd Edition*. Bat Conservation Trust, London.

Charter Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) 2018. *Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the United Kingdom and Ireland Third Edition*. CIEEM, Winchester.

Wray, S., Wells, D., Long, E. & Mitchell-Jones, T. 2010. Valuing Bats in Ecological Impact Assessment. *In Practice* 70: 23 – 25.