

EUROPEAN PROTECTED SPECIES

LICENSING CONSULTATION DECISION ON THE FAVOURABLE CONSERVATION STATUS (FCS) TEST

GREAT CRESTED NEWTS (*Triturus cristatus*)

NATURAL
ENGLAND

Applicant and company / organisation:	Mr Jim McMahon (Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council)		
Ecologist and consultancy:	Dr Paul Joyce (Mouchel)		
Site name:	Styal Golf Ltd, Cheshire		
Case reference number:	EPSM: TRM/2014/7152A; EPSA: -; EPSI: -		
Grid reference for site:	SJ 3842 3845		
Date application received by Adviser:	17/02/2014	Natural England's response deadline:	27/03/2014
Date re-submission received by Adviser:	-	Natural England's response deadline:	-
Date modification received by Adviser:	-	Natural England's response deadline:	-

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended)

The appropriate authority shall not grant a licence under regulation 53(9)(b) unless they are satisfied that actions authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range.

It should be noted that the comments provided on this form do not provide an exhaustive list of concerns that need to be addressed. The onus is on the applicant/ecologist to provide all details required for a full assessment. The method statement should be carefully checked to ensure that it follows the recommendations provided in the Great Crested Newt Mitigation Guidelines (2001). Deviations from the recommendations should be fully explained within the method statement. Please ensure the method statement, with accompanying documents, is re-submitted in its entirety.

Please see the following documents for further advice:

- http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/wmlg04_tcm6-4112.pdf
- http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/wlmsfaqs_tcm6-3859.pdf
- http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/wmlg05_tcm6-4115.pdf
- http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/WML-G11_tcm6-9930.pdf

1. Experience

Is the experience written in the application form and attached written references adequate for the proposed work?

Yes No

- Experience will usually be taken as adequate if the ecologist has held or been named on a licence in the past three years for the same species and in relation to a project of a similar scale, methodology and mitigation:
 - A licence to carry out survey work is not considered to be a similar licence.
 - A new consultant ecologist, or one who had not held or been named on a similar licence in the last 3 years, must provide a description of their work experience with great crested newts and include two written references, both of which must contain specific detail of the referees own experience with great crested newts (including

licence numbers) and their knowledge of relevant work carried out by the consultant ecologist. Please refer to document WMLG05 – link provided above.

- At least one of the written references must be from a person who held or been named on a licence in the past three years for the same species and in relation to a project of a similar scale, methodology and mitigation. Details of this licence must be provided.

If 'NO' please address the following:

N/A

2. Survey

Has an adequate and appropriate survey of the site been carried out in relation to the proposed objectives?

Yes No

An adequate survey will include:

- Details of the area and habitat that was surveyed;
- An appropriate scaled map(s) of:
 - i) The area where the great crested newts will be affected by the proposed work,
 - ii) The proposed area where mitigation will occur (if applicable), and
 - iii) Adjoining sites if part of a phased or multi-plot development or other great crested newt mitigation licences are held in those areas;
- The survey methods used;
- The name/s of the surveyor/s who undertook the work;
- Dates and weather conditions when the surveys were carried out; and
- Clearly presented survey results (for each method used) cross-referenced to areas on the map(s).

If 'NO' please address the following:

Natural England has concerns over the adequacy of the survey data submitted to support this application. A number of ponds to be lost were found not to support GCN; therefore adequate survey data are essential to inform the mitigation that will be required. The survey section requires significant revision as detailed below to enable a better understanding of the population/s on site and the impacts as a result of the proposed works covered by this application (and all future applications). Please therefore ensure that each point is addressed in turn before re-submitting.

As the population on site is large (please see further comments below), Natural England is prepared to accept those data for the golf course application as long as the justifications requested below are addressed. However please ensure you update the survey data for the proposed A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road (A6MARR) in 2014 if you intend to apply for a licence in 2015.

C3.2 -

Railway lines and minor roads (such as Station road) are not considered significant barrier to newt dispersal. Therefore please revise this section and provide a robust justification for not including those ponds in your survey.

(Hint: as the impacts within the golf course appear to be concentrated on the three areas shown on Figure D, you could consider distance from these areas and not from the golf site boundary. However please also consider all comments below regarding adequacy of survey data).

C3.3 -

HSI alone cannot be used to discount ponds from further surveys. Therefore, please ensure you provide a justification for not including ponds in survey. A rationale for each pond not surveyed will need to be provided in individual licence applications. It is not sufficient to state that a pond is totally unsuitable for GCN, you need to justify why.

C3.4 -

Please provide areas in ha. It might be an oversight but you have indicated XX ha for each habitat type described. Please ensure habitat description is written for the development site. Therefore if you decide to reduce the development site to those impacted areas (see previous comment in C3.2), please ensure this is reflected here and only habitats within the development site are described and quantified. Please also include a brief description of adjacent habitat.

C4.2 -

Please remove survey sheets for ponds which were not surveyed.
Please indicate the total number of ponds surveyed on the first survey sheet.
Please indicate the surveyor names on the first survey sheet.

Survey sheets have been incorrectly completed. It is not clear if three methods have been used at each pond. If nil data are recorded, it should be indicated as such on each survey result sheet. When no GCN is recorded, "0" should be indicated otherwise it indicates that no survey was done and/ or that the method was not used. Therefore please ensure this is completed adequately at resubmission. It is difficult at this stage to provide a full assessment of the survey data.

Additionally it appears that the surveys started mid-March 2013 when the weather was exceptionally cold – the first 2 and sometimes 3 visits were carried out when temperatures were below 5 degrees. Bottle trapping should not have been used for welfare reasons and as the data show, no GCN were recorded during those visits as they might still have been in hibernation. Therefore it is highly likely that the results are not a current representation of the GCN population at the site. It appears that you have used between 1-10 traps for all the surveyed ponds. This does not represent a sufficient survey effort for most of the ponds. Please explain.

Air temperature represented a major constraint during the surveys and turbidity was sometimes 4 or 5. Please describe constraints for each pond where applicable and in C5 provide some justification as why you believe the results are an accurate reflection of the GCN population on site.

C5 -

Please revise your assessment arguing there are two distinct metapopulation on site. Habitat within the golf course is highly suitable for dispersal and GCN were identified in at least 12 ponds, all of which are within a maximum distance of 200m from each other. Therefore it is highly likely that dispersal occur and that the GCN population at Styal Golf Course should be considered large as indicated by the peak count of 138. Additionally considering the constraints observed during the surveys, it is likely that the population size in several ponds has been underestimated. Please revise your assessment and provide some justification as to why you believe your survey data are an accurate representation of the GCN population on site and consider any implications this may have on your mitigation proposal. Please ensure that all detectability warnings are justified.

3. Impacts

Are the impacts of the development on the population fully described?

Yes No

Impacts of the development on the great crested newt population should be described as if taking place in the absence of mitigation:

- *Details of the areas and habitat types that will be lost to the development should be included;*
- *For phased or multi-plot developments impacts for all phases should be detailed in a separate master plan provided as a separate document, please refer to and follow WML-G11, link above. Each individual method statement should contain details on the impacts from that development proposal; and*

- *The population must be considered in context of the local or regional population of great crested newts.*

If 'NO' please address the following:

D1/ D2 –

Please provide a break-down of the different habitat types (e.g. grassland, woodland, tall ruderals) to be temporarily damaged and make sure each are quantified.

Please refer to comments provided in section E4 and ensure the impact assessment is revised accordingly.

Figure D –

Please indicate all GCN breeding ponds within the survey area on this figure.

Please ensure 50/250m and 500m radii from GCN ponds are shown.

Please indicate pond references.

Please expand this map on the impacted areas to show more details.

D4 –

Following our telephone conversation on 21/03/2014 your proposal needs to be revised to ensure that GCN trapped for this application will not be trapped again for the proposed A6MARR. Therefore in this section please address the risk of double-handling due to future proposals. This should describe the impacts of double-handling in the absence of mitigation.

D5.1 –

Please revise the table in line with previous comment regarding impact on the golf metapopulation.

4. Methodology

Is the proposed methodology of the work programme suitable to meet the stated objectives in the application form?

Yes No

Suitable methodology will include:

- *A clear description of the licensable operations e.g. capture and exclusion, translocation;*
- *Details of the proposed methods and techniques; and*
- *A detailed timetable of the proposed works pertaining to all licensable activities and mitigation, including disturbance /destruction of great crested newt habitat. **This should be realistic and updated for any re-submission.***

The above must correspond with the details contained within the application form.

If 'NO' please address the following:

E4 –

Based on the submitted survey data, the capture effort proposed is largely inadequate. It is anticipated that a 90 days trapping programme will be required. Please revise your proposal.

It is not clear why you are intending to trap out 5 ponds when only one will be damaged. Please consider whether the work could be undertaken at a time when the newts are not in the ponds (i.e. in the autumn) and when only (or minimal) aquatic trapping will be required. Natural England would prefer work to be scheduled in the winter or late in the season in order to avoid the need for extended capture period in the most sensitive period of GCN lifecycle.

If you are intending to trap ponds in the breeding season, we would expect capture effort to be in line with population size, therefore a minimum of 90 days bottle trapping will be required.

Also please consider excluding Ponds 57, 60 and 81 from the work area to avoid having to trap them at all.

Your scheme should be designed to have the lesser impact as possible on GCN – if you can do as suggested, the only impact will be on Pond 52. Also please consider to remodel Pond 58 instead of Pond 52 as GCN were absent from Pond 58 (bearing in mind comments on survey data). This combined with an autumn trapping would reduce significantly the trapping impacts.

Additionally, in order to avoid any future double-handling of GCN due to the future construction of the proposed A6MARR, please consider trapping the footprint of the proposed A6MARR (and the golf course area due to be lost) under this licence and installing fencing in such a way that GCN will not be able to recolonize this area until the road is built.

Please detail how you will proceed with pond draining: pumping with grid, sediment searches etc.

Figure 4a –

This figure does not clearly show the fencing layout. This figure should show the location of all exclusion fencing including drift fencing (if any) and ring fencing around ponds. The location of traps should also be indicated (on the inside or the outside of the fence or both for the ring fencing).

E6A –

Please revise the work schedule and address the following:

- please indicate site name and address at the top of the form
- please indicate the submission date
- please revise the schedule of work in line with the above comments. When you propose different trapping effort in different areas, it needs to be clear on the figures and in the work schedule which area you are referring to (although in this instance we would expect a higher trapping effort in all areas)
- please differentiate timing for pond draining and pond damage/ remodeling or specify that pond remodeling will be undertaken immediately after pond draining if applicable
- hand search has been proposed so timing needs indicating
- drift fence removal is mentioned and no reference is made to drift fencing in E4: please ensure drift fencing is shown on Figure E4a and mentioned in section E4 of the Method Statement
- you have allowed a number of activities to take place in March when the decision on this application was not due before the end of March. Please make sure you take this into account in your resubmission and allow for the time of assessment of your application.

Regarding the fencing that will have to be installed to avoid any future double-handling, please allow for two options:

- 1/ if the proposed A6MARR is not built;
- 2/ if the proposed A6MARR is built.

E.g. fencing removal will be carried out after completion of the work on the golf course at the earliest or following completion of the dual carriageway/ installation of new tunnels at the latest (month and year should be indicated).

5. Mitigation

Is the mitigation proposed adequate with respect to the habitat which will be lost?

Yes No

Adequate mitigation will include details of:

- *Habitat creation, modification and/or restoration (including areas and habitat types);*
- *Post-development habitat management;*
- *Post-development habitat maintenance;*
- *Post-development population monitoring; and*
- *Details of any mechanism in place for ensuring delivery (e.g. a Section 106 agreement).*

It will also include scaled drawings, plans and/or maps and photographs, as appropriate.

If 'NO' please address the following:

E1 –

Semi-improved grassland, tall ruderal and woodland will be damaged and will be replaced by short amenity grassland. Therefore please provide some justification as to why your proposals are adequate to compensate for what is being lost. In Section D, you have only considered habitats to be damaged. If suitability for GCN is greatly reduced, you might have to consider that some of those suitable

habitats will be lost. Please revise the impact section D accordingly.
You might want to include in your proposal any additional terrestrial habitat creation which is proposed surrounding the two ponds to be created.

E2 –

In line with previous comments, please revise this entire section to reflect that a large GCN population is present within the golf course.

E2.2 –

You mention here survey reports appended as H3(a) and H3(b); however these appendices were not submitted. Please ensure you submit these documents at resubmission.

E2.3 –

The proposed receptor site is a patch of rough grassland and scrub within the centre of the golf course. Your proposals include trapping GCN in their aquatic phases. Therefore you will need to select a terrestrial receptor site and potentially several aquatic receptor sites (as your proposal includes the trapping out of five GCN ponds). Please revise your proposal accordingly. You will need to indicate where GCN trapped will be released.

Figure E2: please revise this figure in line with the above comments.

Please make sure all GCN ponds identified are shown on this figure with their unique reference.

E3.1b –

Please provide dimensions for the two new ponds to be created and for the remodeled Pond 52.

Figure E3.1 –

Please clearly distinguish grassland re-seeding and scrub planting on this figure.

Please expand this figure on the area of interest to show more details.

E5.2 -

A large population has been identified therefore a population size class assessment will be required. Impacts from your proposal is considered to be medium as a GCN pond will be temporarily damaged, therefore a minimum of 6 years monitoring is expected. Please revise your proposal accordingly

Figure E5.2 -

Please clarify whether you intend to monitor the two ponds to be created.

Some of the ponds identified on this figure will be lost to the proposed A6MARR – please identify these ponds and make clear on the figure and in the text how much monitoring these ponds will be subject to prior to being destroyed.

F –

Please provide a brief summary of the development and the mitigation strategy you have set out to ensure it meets the Favourable Conservation Status.

Figure F-

This figure is currently not very clear

Please ensure all ponds are clearly shown and referenced (including the proposed new ponds).

Please also show the hibernacula and a legend of the habitat compensation / replacement proposed.

Please distinguish retained habitats, those created under this licence and any others that will be created.

6. Additional Comments and Advice

Method Statement:

B1.8/ Section J:

Section J in relation to E3.1 and E3.2 should also be ticked as aquatic and terrestrial habitat

compensation will be created outside the applicant's ownership.

Figure B1.8 –

Please ensure that receptor sites for each phase are clearly indicated on this figure.

B2.1 –

Damage/ destruction of resting place has not been ticked. Figure D shows that impacted habitats include tall ruderals, semi-improved grassland and woodland; therefore it is highly likely that these habitats offer resting place for GCN. Please make sure this is ticked at resubmission.

H – References -

Please ensure missing Appendix H3a and b are submitted and indicated here at resubmission

The points raised above must be addressed in a revised Method Statement. Please read the comments carefully and address all of the issues raised. The resubmission should be presented in its entirety to include all maps, appendices, reports etc. Please ensure to modify maps (where necessary) and to allow sufficient time in the Work schedule (30 working days) for the resubmission to be assessed. All changes from the previously submitted documents must be clearly highlighted.

The comments below are for information/advice only and do not need to be addressed for the re-submission. They should however be taken into account when preparing future licence applications.

Application Form:

Section 5d should also indicate areas to be restored.

Method Statement:

C4.2 –

Other amphibian species recorded should be indicated in the separate table and box below survey sheet used to comment on any constraints. Please bear this in mind for future application. Please ensure egg searches are not continued once GCN eggs are identified in a pond. This increases their risk of predation and is likely to be detrimental.

Additional comments in relation to the future licence application for the proposed construction of the A6MARR (please ensure those are taken into account for any future licence applications, especially in relation to aquatic habitat creation in advance of the work taking place)

As mentioned in our telephone conversation dated 21/03/2014, Natural England suggests that this licence application is considered an independent phase from the construction of the proposed A6MARR. It is also suggested that the work planned for the Bramhall Oil Terminal Accommodation Works is combined with the proposed A6MARR as it is on the same footprint and will not have any additional impacts on GCN. Therefore as the only in-combination effect is any potential double-handling at the golf course and not a typical multi-phased development, we would suggest submitting independent applications as long as the double-handling issue is addressed as per comments in sections D4 and E4.

The comments below are therefore additional as a masterplan is no longer required and should be taken into account for future licence applications.

Fragmentation

The A6MARR scheme will have a significant fragmentation impact on GCN populations along the scheme. Therefore please ensure that fragmentation impacts are detailed in the absence of mitigation (in Section D) in relation to the different metapopulations identified and how these impacts will be mitigated for in Section E. You mention the installation of wildlife underpasses; however you will need to ensure these are fit for newt crossing.

Natural England is cautious about the use of tunnels/underpasses as these systems are largely unproven. They should therefore be considered only as a last resort when all other options have been exhausted. Where the use of tunnels/underpasses cannot be avoided Natural England expects large

box culverts or tunnels, at least 1m in width to be installed (standard ACO amphibian tunnels/underpasses are not acceptable unless the fragmentation effect is minimal – this is not the case for this development where fragmentation is potentially a major issue). In all schemes where tunnels/underpasses are installed the following must be provided:

- Clear plans to show the location of tunnels and fencing (to guide newts to the tunnels)
- Tunnel/underpass and guide fencing design
- A monitoring and maintenance plan and a commitment to undertake them

Typically tunnels/underpasses should be installed under all highway barriers to newt dispersal. Guide fencing should be installed to a distance of about 100m either side to the tunnel/underpass which should be designed to remain damp without flooding.

Specification of the tunnels will need to be provided in the future licence application as well as location of tunnels. Monitoring will also need to be included. If you intend to install other types of wildlife crossing, please ensure they are clearly distinguished from the newt tunnels.

Mitigation/ Compensation

- Terrestrial habitat compensation proposed (addressing connectivity, dispersal and habitat quality issues) – the aim should be to replace qualitatively what is being lost. At present the compensation proposed would appear to be largely inadequate e.g. 38h of habitat will be lost/damaged and 2ha of compensatory habitats is proposed. Receptor sites and other terrestrial compensation should be of equivalent size to the habitat due to be lost unless it can be clearly demonstrated that receptor sites will be of higher quality. You will also need to provide more details on terrestrial habitat compensation: what habitat will be provided and this should be clearly shown on the overall masterplan figure.
- Aquatic habitat compensation proposed for each phase - In accordance with the Great crested newt mitigation guidelines (2001), **Natural England requires that new ponds are created a *minimum* of 6 months prior to when any translocated GCN will need to use them – ideally ponds should be in place 1 or more years in advance.** This is to enable the ponds to establish a suitable diversity and quantity of invertebrate prey, ensure water levels are stable and appropriate, and to enable time for some aquatic vegetation to develop (both for egg-laying and to support invertebrate life) – please bear this in mind prior to preparing the licence application for the proposed A6MARR;
- Details on where displaced newts will be moved for each phase i.e. receptor site (for example, for the proposed Bramhall Oil Terminal Accommodation Works, two receptor sites are indicated either side of the new road without any indication of how connectivity will be addressed (again this should consider the metapopulation impacted), the size of the area and habitat types within it and if newts are to be retained in an enclosed receptor area, indicate how long for.
- Assurance of long-term security of the GCN population and confirmation that any proposals are not left as open-ended options before the application is submitted. Ideally this should be secured by a legal agreement or planning obligation;
- Guarantees that proposed receptor sites will be safeguarded and free from future development pressure
- Proposed post-development monitoring in line with the Great Crested Newt Mitigation Guidelines (GCNMG, 2001) – please ensure your monitoring include the newt tunnel monitoring. Additionally, monitoring is necessary to record GCN movement across tunnels/underpasses to assess their effectiveness. For example, photographs of the belly patterns of GCN captured during ongoing aquatic monitoring surveys unique belly patterns can be compared between surveys each year to assess if any movement between waterbodies has occurred. Surveys could also employ a combination of refugia checks and torching.

Below are some comments on the submitted masterplan drawings. You do not need to resubmit any of those; however you might find the comments useful when preparing the licence application for the proposed A6MARR.

Map1.2: Scheme Phasing Plan:

- please ensure this plan also demonstrate how the proposed compensation will provide

connectivity across the scheme, and linking to the surrounding area, post-development

Map 3.3:

- Phase 1 Impacts and Mitigation: please show all identified ponds in the survey area (and whether or not they contain GCN)
- Please indicate 50/250 radii from GCN ponds
- Please indicate pond references

Map 4.3: Phase 2 Impacts and Mitigation:

- please show all identified ponds in the survey area (and whether or not they contain GCN)
- Please indicate 50/250 radii from GCN ponds
- Please indicate pond references
- Please indicate footprint of pipeline and associate infrastructures
- Please distinguish lost/ damaged habitat
- Please clearly mark all receptor sites
- Please expand map(s) to clearly show all the above in the area of interest

Habitat Maintenance and Management Plan (HMMP):

As a masterplan is no longer required, you will only need to provide a HMMP if

- a/ population size class is large and impacts are moderate-high;
- b/ regionally important population and impacts are moderate-high;
- c/ losses of > 2 breeding waterbodies on site supporting medium size class population

From the information previously provided in the masterplan, it is believed that a HMMP will be required for the proposed A6MARR.

The HMMP will need to clearly detail what actions will be undertaken and when they will be undertaken to maintain the habitats created/ enhanced suitable for GCN. Natural England needs assurance that the habitats will remain suitable for GCN.

Also please ensure you address the following:

- Please detail the management prescription for all terrestrial and aquatic habitats.
- Please provide a time schedule for the implementation of the management and maintenance activities. A summary table at the end would also need to be included.
- Please include who will be responsible for each aspect of the plan.
- The management plan should include, as a minimum, details for all the habitat management and site maintenance operations listed in E5.1 of the Method Statement including checking for fish presence, and removal through appropriate methods, checking for pond condition and remedial action as required, checking for and removal of dumped rubbish, reinstatement following fire, acute pollution, maintenance of newts tunnels. Check all activities and ensure all applicable are described in your management plan.
- The tunnel/underpass monitoring and maintenance programme should be detailed within the HMMP which should also detail what remedial actions will be undertaken if the tunnels/underpasses fail to achieve an acceptable level of connectivity e.g. habitat enhancement around tunnel entrances.

7. Conclusion in respect of regulation 53(9)(b)

Satisfied
Not satisfied

Assessed by Wildlife Adviser: Delphine Pouget
22/03/2014

Date:

The below is only to be completed once a satisfied decision has been reached on the FCS test and if the case has been through the Pre-submission Screening Service

Team Leader Counter Signature: N/A

Date:

8. Adviser's licence recommendations to Customer Services Wildlife Licensing (EPS) following a 'Satisfied' decision being reached on the FCS test:

WML-F14a (08/13) <http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/regulation/wildlife/default.aspx>

Number of great crested newts to be licensed	N/A
Licensing of taking/moving of eggs	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Licensable activities	<input type="checkbox"/> Capture <input type="checkbox"/> Transport <input type="checkbox"/> Disturb <input type="checkbox"/> Damage/destroy a resting place <input type="checkbox"/> Damage/destroy a breeding site
Licensable methods	<input type="checkbox"/> By hand <input type="checkbox"/> Hand search <input type="checkbox"/> Destructive search <input type="checkbox"/> Bottle trapping <input type="checkbox"/> Netting <input type="checkbox"/> Draining down pond/s <input type="checkbox"/> Night/torch searching <input type="checkbox"/> Pitfall trapping <input type="checkbox"/> Refugia <input type="checkbox"/> Exclusion by permanent amphibian fencing <input type="checkbox"/> Exclusion by permanent one-way amphibian fencing <input type="checkbox"/> Exclusion by temporary amphibian fencing <input type="checkbox"/> Exclusion by temporary one-way amphibian fencing <input type="checkbox"/> Drift fencing
Period of Licence	From: To:
Compliance visit recommended?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Type of check	<input type="checkbox"/> Telephone <input type="checkbox"/> Visit
When? E.g. time period or dates. <i>Explain significance/reason if necessary</i>	
Justification for visit and brief details of requirements <i>(please be specific and clear)</i>	
Adviser's opinion as to whether a high/medium/low risk case (as per complianceSOP)	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low
Adviser's opinion as to whether a high/medium/low impact case (as per GCNMG)	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low
Reason for risk and impact allocations (explain)	Risk: Impact:
If the case was discussed with the Topic lead, the EPS Specialist, Senior Specialist, Senior Adviser or manager please state and	

explain why	
-------------	--

9. ELIS Report Information for Customer Services Wildlife Licensing (EPS) (to be completed by the Wildlife Adviser following a satisfied response on the FCS test)

Population size	<input type="checkbox"/> Small <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Large <input type="checkbox"/> Presence only
Breeding confirmed/likely	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Expected number of 'breeding' water bodies damaged	
Expected number of 'breeding' water bodies destroyed	
Expected number of 'other' water bodies damaged	
Expected number of 'other' water bodies destroyed	
Connectivity severance (in the absence of mitigation)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Expected compensation measures	<input type="checkbox"/> Hedgerow planting; <input type="checkbox"/> Grassland re-seeding; <input type="checkbox"/> Grassland management; <input type="checkbox"/> Scrub planting; <input type="checkbox"/> Woodland planting; <input type="checkbox"/> Hibernacula; <input type="checkbox"/> Refugia; <input type="checkbox"/> Habitat reinstatement; <input type="checkbox"/> Bridge; <input type="checkbox"/> Tunnel/underpass/culvert; <input type="checkbox"/> Permanent amphibian fencing; <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretation boards; <input type="checkbox"/> Ponds/waterbodies; <input type="checkbox"/> Other - please state: (Is a receptor site specifically being created? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No). If yes, please provide an 8-figure grid reference:
Expected number of GCN waterbodies created	
Expected number of GCN waterbodies enhanced	
Expected waterbody area lost	m ²
Expected waterbody area gained	m ²
Expected terrestrial habitat area damaged	Ha
Expected terrestrial habitat area destroyed	Ha
Expected terrestrial habitat area created	Ha
Expected amount of terrestrial habitat enhanced	Ha
Number of years monitoring and years it will take place (e.g. 3 years in 2014, 2016,	

2018). (If not required please state N/A).	
Type of monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/> Presence / absence plus terrestrial habitat assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Population size class plus terrestrial habitat assessment Other: