



Fosse Green Energy

Preliminary Environmental Information Report

VOLUME

3

**Appendix 8-F: Reptiles and
Common Toad**

October 2024



Prepared for:

Fosse Green Energy Limited

Prepared by:

AECOM Limited

© 2024 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited ("AECOM") for sole use of our client (the "Client") in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	Background	1
1.2	Site Description	1
1.3	Scope of the Report.....	1
2.	Relevant Legislation and Policy	3
2.1	Legislation	3
2.2	Priority Species.....	3
2.3	Local Biodiversity Action Plan.....	4
3.	Methods	5
3.1	Characterising the Baseline.....	5
3.2	Desk Study	5
3.3	Field Survey.....	5
3.4	Population Assessment	9
3.5	Biodiversity Importance	10
3.6	Assumptions and Limitations	10
4.	Results	12
4.1	Desk Study	12
4.2	Field Survey.....	12
5.	Evaluation	14
5.1	Summary of Results	14
5.2	Population Assessment	14
6.	Conclusions	16
7.	References.....	17
	Annex A Figures	19

Tables

Table 1: Habitat suitability assessment.....	6
Table 2: Number of artificial refugia placed within each discrete Survey Area.....	7
Table 3: Survey dates and weather conditions of Survey Area 1 to 4.....	8
Table 4: Survey dates and weather conditions of Survey Area 5.....	9
Table 5: Population estimates of reptiles (taken from Froglife, 1999 (Ref 11))	9
Table 6: Reptiles and Common Toad recorded within the Survey Area	12

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

- 1.1.1 This report forms a technical appendix to the Preliminary Ecological Information (PEI) Report, specifically to accompany **PEI Report Volume 1, Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation**. The report provides information on the presence and distribution of reptiles and Common Toad (*Bufo bufo*), relevant to Fosse Green Energy (hereafter referred to as the Proposed Development), including the results of surveys undertaken within the Site.
- 1.1.2 Further information on the Proposed Development is included within **PEI Report Volume 1, Chapter 3: The Proposed Development**.

1.2 Site Description

- 1.2.1 The Proposed Development is located 89km to the south and south west of Lincoln City Centre, Lincolnshire and lies within the administrative district of North Kesteven.
- 1.2.2 The Proposed Development comprises two distinct parcels:
- a. the Principal Site, which is where ground mounted solar PV panels, electrical sub-stations and Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) will be installed; and
 - b. the Cable Corridor, which comprises the underground electrical infrastructure required to connect the Solar and Energy Storage Park to the National Grid.
- 1.2.3 The location of the Proposed Development is centred at Ordnance Survey (OS) Grid Reference SK 90388 62514 and is presented in **PEI Report Volume 2, Figure 1-1**.
- 1.2.4 The Site covers an area of approximately 1,426 hectares (ha) and is dominated by arable fields (approximately 90% of the Site) with smaller areas of improved and semi-improved grassland, hedgerows and woodland.

1.3 Scope of the Report

- 1.3.1 The aim of this report is to determine the presence or likely absence of reptiles and Common Toad within the Survey Area (see Section 3.1).
- 1.3.2 The objectives, therefore, are to:
- a. review existing ecological data to identify any records of reptiles and Common Toad within the Study Area (see Section 3.1); and



- b. identify the presence of reptiles and Common Toad within the Site (see Section 3.1).

1.3.3 Combined, this will be used to:

- a. determine the biodiversity importance of the Site for reptiles and Common Toad; and
- b. determine the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on reptiles and Common Toad, along with any required mitigation and the identification of opportunities to enhance the herpetofauna of the Site and its environs.

2. Relevant Legislation and Policy

2.1 Legislation

- 2.1.1 The four reptile species that could be found within or in the vicinity of the Proposed Development (based on habitat and, or geographical range) are Adder (*Vipera berus*), Grass Snake (*Natrix helvetica*), Common Lizard (*Zootoca vivipara*) and Slow Worm (*Anguis fragilis*). All four species are declining in distribution both nationally and locally (Ref 1) and are afforded partial protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) (WCA) (Ref 2), which makes it an offence to intentionally kill or injure a reptile and also to sell, offer or expose for sale such species.
- 2.1.2 In accordance with the WCA, care must be taken to ensure that reptiles are not killed or injured as a result of the Proposed Development. Additionally, Sand Lizard (*Lacerta agilis*) and Smooth Snake (*Coronella austriaca*) are both fully protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (Habitats Regulations) (Ref 3). However, neither of these species has been, or is likely to be recorded at or near to the Site due to their restricted ranges in the UK. Three species of amphibian, Great Crested Newt, Pool Frog (*Pelophylax lessonae*) and Natterjack Toad (*Epidalea calamita*) are also protected under the WCA (Ref 2) and the Habitats Regulations from intentional killing and injury, which also extends to protection of their habitats (including ponds and key foraging areas). With the exception of Great Crested Newt, neither Pool Frog or Natterjack Toad have been, or are likely to be recorded at or near to the Site due to restricted ranges in the UK.
- 2.1.3 There are no licensing provisions within the WCA (Ref 2) for development activities affecting herpetofauna. However, developers are expected to take adequate precautions to avoid breaches of the legislation, including undertaking adequate surveys, using suitably qualified ecologists, and adopting appropriate mitigation to avoid or minimise the risk of killing or injuring reptiles.

2.2 Priority Species

- 2.2.1 In addition to the above legislation, a number of species of herpetofauna are listed as being Species of Principal Importance (SPI) for conservation in England under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 (Ref 4). These species are of material consideration during the planning process and include Common Lizard, Grass Snake, Slow Worm, Adder and Common Toad.
- 2.2.2 The NERC list of SPI (Ref 4) is used to guide decision-makers such as public bodies, including local and regional authorities, in implementing their duty under Section 40 of the NERC Act (in this context, the Secretary of State). Under Section 40, every public authority (e.g., a local authority or local planning authority) must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far

as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity, including restoring or enhancing a population or a habitat.

- 2.2.3 The UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UKBAP) (Ref 5) was launched in 1994 and established a framework and criteria for identifying species (and habitat types) of conservation concern. From this list, action plans for Priority Species of conservation concern were published. The UKBAP was subsequently succeeded by the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework (July 2012) (Ref 6), and then again by the UK Biodiversity Framework 2024 (Ref 7). This latest Framework has been published in response to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (Ref 8), which was agreed at the Fifteen Conference of the Parties (COP15) in December 2022, which is relevant in the context of Section 40 of the NERC Act. These species are identified as those of conservation concern, due to their rarity or a declining population trend.

2.3 Local Biodiversity Action Plan

- 2.3.1 The Proposed Development is located within the county of Lincolnshire. Formerly, the Lincolnshire Biodiversity Action Plan (3rd edition) (Lincolnshire BAP) (Ref 9) provided context to inform identification of threatened or uncommon species of local relevance, alongside priorities for conservation and enhancement targeted at a local level. However, under the Environment Act 2021 (Ref 10), BAPs are being replaced by Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRs), which are a system of spatial strategies for nature which will support delivery of biodiversity net gain (BNG) and provide more focussed action for nature recovery. Whilst this is still being developed for Lincolnshire and with no specific habitat or species plans currently in place, this report references those species formerly included on the Lincolnshire BAP.
- 2.3.2 Of the herpetofauna likely to occur within or near to the Site, Common Lizard, Grass Snake, Slow Worm, Adder and Common Toad are listed on the Lincolnshire BAP (Ref 9), but with no specific action plans for conserving these species within the county.

3. Methods

3.1 Characterising the Baseline

- 3.1.1 Within this report, the following terminology is used when referring to the geographic areas within which assessments were made:
- Study Area – the area within the Site and a 2 km radius which was subject to collection of background information e.g., collation of desk study records to supplement the findings of the survey work;
 - Zone of Influence (Zol) – the area over which reptiles or Common Toad may be affected by the Proposed Development which, using professional judgement is typically no more than 2 km around the Site. Through review of likely impacts of the Proposed Development and results of the desk study, the Zol was used to define the scope of field surveys; and
 - Survey Area – the area within which survey work was undertaken and is synonymous with the Site.

3.2 Desk Study

- 3.2.1 A desk study was undertaken as part of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) in 2023 (see **PEI Report Volume 3, Appendix 8-B**). This desk study obtained records of reptiles and Common Toad within the Study Area from Lincolnshire Environmental Records Centre (LERC) and this was sufficient in determining the presence or likely absence of reptiles and Common Toad occurring within the Zol.
- 3.2.2 Only records of reptiles and Common Toad up to ten years from the data request date were considered within the assessment, as any records older than ten years are unlikely to be still representative of presence in the local area.

3.3 Field Survey

Habitat Suitability Assessment

- 3.3.1 A Habitat Suitability Assessment (HSA) was undertaken using desk-based study data, which included a review of the Phase 1 Habitat map and aerial imagery to determine the habitats most likely to support herpetofauna. This information was used to refine the Survey Area, which was defined using the following characteristics for assessing the potential suitability of habitat for reptiles and Common Toad:
- location in relation to species range (taken from desk study data);
 - vegetation structure;
 - insolation (sun exposure) for reptiles;
 - aspect;

- e. topography;
 - f. connectivity to nearby good quality habitat;
 - g. refuge opportunity;
 - h. hibernation potential;
 - i. disturbance; and
 - j. egg-laying site potential (Grass Snake and Common Toad).
- 3.3.2 Using the Phase 1 Habitat map and aerial imagery, each broad habitat type or discrete area was graded (poor, good or exceptional) for its potential to support reptiles and Common Toad, based on the above characteristics and these, alongside a description of these definitions, are presented in Error! Reference source not found..

Table 1: Habitat suitability assessment

Habitat Grading	Description
Poor	Habitat which is unfavourable, based on most of the habitat assessment characters listed above or is limited in size and highly isolated from other areas of suitable habitat.
Good	Habitat which is favourable or sub-optimal for many of the habitat assessment characters listed above or is sub-optimal for some of the characters and has good connectivity with areas of more suitable habitat.
Exceptional	Habitat which is favourable, based on most of the habitat assessment characters listed above.

Survey Area

- 3.3.3 Using the HSA, the Survey Area that was subject to refugia surveys (see below) included any suitable terrestrial habitat, graded as good or exceptional, for reptiles or Common Toad within the Site, e.g., ephemeral / short perennial vegetation, woodland edges and semi-improved grassland.
- 3.3.4 Five discrete areas, collectively referred to as the Survey Areas, were identified within the Site during the HSA as being 'good' terrestrial habitat for reptiles and were subject to further survey. There were no exceptional areas of habitat anywhere within the Site and areas of poor habitat were excluded from the survey.
- 3.3.5 The locations of the five Survey Areas within the Proposed Development are presented in **Figure 8-F-1: Reptile and Common Toad Survey Locations & Desk Study Records**.

Determining Presence / Absence

- 3.3.6 The field surveys utilised the following survey methods within the Survey Areas to record the presence or absence of reptiles and Common Toad:
- aquatic habitat surveys – visual observations of amphibians in water bodies, including tadpoles or spawn;
 - terrestrial habitat surveys – refugia surveys (see from Section 3.3.9); and
 - visual observation of banks and, or other suitable terrestrial habitat – basking locations and habitat with foraging potential.

Aquatic Habitat Surveys

- 3.3.7 Within aquatic habitats found within the Site, any observations of Common Toad were made alongside undertaking surveys for Great Crested Newt, which were completed between April and June 2023 by suitably experienced AECOM ecologists. Surveys took place from the edge of each surveyed water body, without entering the water, and involved walking steadily along the edge of the water body to make observations of Common Toad in the water or signs of Common Toad presence (such as tadpoles or spawn).

Terrestrial Habitat Surveys

- 3.3.8 Surveys of terrestrial habitats within the Site, identified using the HSA (see Section 3.3.1) were undertaken in May, August and September 2023 in Survey Areas 1 to 4 and May to June 2024 in Survey Area 5 by suitably experienced AECOM ecologists. All surveys were undertaken using artificial refugia and in accordance with Froglife's Advice Sheet 10 for Reptile Surveys (Ref 11) and Natural England's Standing Advice Sheet for Reptiles (Ref 12). This method is also useful in detecting Common Toad, which often use refugia sheets for shelter.
- 3.3.9 Artificial refugia, in the form of sheets of bitumen roofing felt and corrugated tin measuring approximately 0.5 by 0.5 m, were placed in likely basking spots for reptiles within the Survey Areas. Such spots included unshaded patches of vegetation next to cover, grassland and areas adjacent to potential hibernation sites such as piles of rubble, logs, rabbit burrows and near vegetation waste such as arisings from grass cuttings and wood chips.
- 3.3.10 A total of 94 refugia sheets were distributed across the Survey Areas. The numbers of refugia sheets placed in each Survey Area are presented in **Table 2**.

Table 2: Number of artificial refugia placed within each discrete Survey Area

Survey Area (see Figure 8-F-1)	Survey Area (hectare)	Number of Artificial Refugia	Density of Refugia per hectare
Survey Area 1	0.34	15	44
Survey Area 2	0.38	13	34
Survey Area 3	0.11	10	90

Survey Area (see Figure 8-F-1)	Survey Area (hectare)	Number of Artificial Refugia	Density of Refugia per hectare
Survey Area 4	0.23	15	65
Survey Area 5	1.92	41	21

- 3.3.11 The density of the sheets was based on guidance from Froglife (Ref 11), which recommends between 5 and 10 sheets per hectare. More sheets were used per hectare than the recommended number from the guidance document to account for any sheets being lost or damaged due to unforeseen circumstances (e.g., unplanned mowing of a grassland which could destroy felt sheets).
- 3.3.12 Following placement of sheets in each Survey Area, the artificial refugia were left *in situ* for up to two weeks to settle in and were then checked by suitably qualified and experienced AECOM ecologists on seven separate occasions. They were removed from the Survey Areas on the seventh visit.
- 3.3.13 Reptile activity is greatly influenced by weather conditions, with reptiles most likely to use artificial refugia in temperatures of between 9 °C and 18 °C (Ref 11) and in hazy or intermittent sunshine with light winds (Ref 13). The optimal survey period for reptiles (as recommended in the Herpetofauna Worker's Manual (Ref 13)) is April, May and September. Reptiles are also active in June, July and August. However, they will need to spend less time basking so may be more difficult to find.
- 3.3.14 The dates of reptile surveys and weather conditions during surveys of Survey Areas 1 to 4 are presented in **Table 3**, each Survey Area being visited on each of the seven occasions.

Table 3: Survey dates and weather conditions of Survey Area 1 to 4

Survey Visit	Date / AM or PM	Temperature range	Cloud Cover (%)	Dry / wet	Ground Conditions
1	10/05/2023 PM	14°C - 12°C	60	Dry	Wet
2	11/05/2023 AM	13°C - 16°C	40	Dry	Dry
3	15/05/2023 PM	15°C - 13°C	40	Dry	Dry
4	22/05/2023 PM	18°C - 16°C	0	Dry	Dry
5	23/05/2023 AM	15°C - 18°C	40	Dry	Dry
6	23/08/2023 AM	16°C - 20°C	40	Dry	Dry
7	04/09/2023 PM	20°C - 17°C	0	Dry	Dry

- 3.3.15 Due to access restrictions, Survey Area 5 was surveyed in 2024. Four visits have been completed at the time of writing this report, with the final three

visits planned for September 2024. The dates of the four visits and weather conditions are presented in **Table 4**.

Table 4: Survey dates and weather conditions of Survey Area 5

Survey Visit	Date / AM or PM	Temperature range	Cloud Cover (%)	Dry / wet?	Ground Conditions
1	21/05/2024 AM	15°C - 16°C	40	Dry	Dry
2	30/05/2024 AM	14°C - 15°C	90	Dry	Wet
3	03/06/2024 AM	16°C - 17°C	80	Dry	Dry
4	04/06/2024 AM	15°C - 16°C	50	Dry	Dry

3.3.16 Where any reptiles were found, the age of each reptile was also recorded using the Amphibian and Reptile Conservation Trust (ARC) Reptile Identification Guide (Ref 14).

Visual Inspections

3.3.17 Whilst undertaking other ecological surveys across the Site, any incidental observations of reptiles were recorded and searches were made in order to 'spot' basking Common Lizards. This species will often sit on top of grass tussocks, debris and felts and will quickly move from sight upon disturbance. Consequently, spotting this species can be more effective than searching under artificial refugia. Common Lizards are often very territorial reusing favourite basking sites (Ref 15). Once these sites are known, spotting can become a relatively successful method of recording Common Lizard.

3.3.18 Any existing hibernation sites within a Survey Area, such as rubble piles or wood piles, were, where possible, also searched for herpetofauna during checks of artificial refugia.

3.4 Population Assessment

3.4.1 Where reptiles are present, estimating population sizes of reptiles can be undertaken using guidance within Froglife's advice sheet Number 10 (Ref 11). This advice sheet provides a simple means of evaluating a species population as 'low', 'good', or 'exceptional' on the basis of the maximum number of adult reptiles (of each species) recorded during a single visit (see **Table 5**).

Table 5: Population estimates of reptiles (taken from Froglife, 1999 (Ref 11))

Species	Low Population	Good Population	Exceptional Population
Adder	<5	5-10	>10
Grass Snake	<5	5-10	>10
Common Lizard	<5	5-20	>20

Species	Low Population	Good Population	Exceptional Population
Slow Worm	<5	5-20	>20

- 3.4.2 This method of population size estimate (as presented in **Table 5**) uses the assumption of a reptile survey using a density of 10 reptile sheets per hectare. However, it can be difficult to determine a population size through interpretation of data using peak counts of reptiles and densities of sheets. Therefore, an average score across all survey visits was used to provide a more robust estimate of the population size of each reptile species present within suitable on-site habitat.
- 3.4.3 There is no published guidance on assessing the population of Common Toad within a site and therefore professional judgement has been used when evaluating the importance of the Site for this species.

3.5 Biodiversity Importance

- 3.5.1 An essential prerequisite step to allow ecological impact assessment of the Proposed Development is an evaluation of the relative biodiversity importance of the Survey Areas for reptiles and Common Toad. This is necessary to set the terms of reference for the subsequent ecological impact assessment.
- 3.5.2 The method of evaluation that was utilised has been developed with reference to the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) Guidelines (Ref 16). This gives guidance on scoping and carrying out environmental assessments and places appraisal in the context of relevant policies and at a geographical scale at which feature matters (i.e., international, national, regional, county, district, local or site). Data received through desk study and field-based surveys were used to identify the importance of the species addressed in this report. Professional judgement was also applied, where necessary. Relevant published national and local guidance and criteria has been used, where available, to inform the assessment of biodiversity importance and to assist consistency in evaluation.

3.6 Assumptions and Limitations

Desk Study

- 3.6.1 The aim of the desk study was to help characterise the baseline context of the Proposed Development and provide valuable background information that would not be captured by site surveys alone. Information obtained during the course of the desk study was dependent upon people and organisations having made and submitted records for the area of interest. As such, a lack of records for reptiles or Common Toad does not necessarily mean that the species does not occur in the study area. Likewise, the presence of records of species does not automatically mean that these still

occur within the area of interest or are relevant in the context of the Proposed Development.

- 3.6.2 Note that some desk study records have a low resolution and were given to the nearest 10km grid square, therefore it is uncertain as to whether they are within or outside the Site.

Field Survey

- 3.6.3 Sufficient information has been gathered to provide a representative sample of the presence of reptiles and Common Toad within the Site to inform the assessment within **PEI Report Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation**. Further surveys are being undertaken in 2024 to complete the remaining surveys in Survey Area 5, for which there was no access during the survey window in 2023. Any changes to the presence of reptiles and Common Toad as a result of any future surveys will be reported in an update of this report, and the assessment updated in the Environmental Statement (ES) submitted as part of the DCO application.

4. Results

4.1 Desk Study

- 4.1.1 Within the ten years prior to 2023, the desk study returned 144 records of reptiles within 2 km of the Site. Forty-nine were of Common Lizard, the closest of which was approximately 764m from the Site, with 22 records potentially within the Site or within 2km of the Site, but not possible to determine due to the low resolution of some records; 76 were of Grass Snake, the closest of which is approximately 205m from the Site, with 66 records are potentially within the Site or within 2km of the Site, but not possible to determine due to the low resolution of some records. Four records were of Slow Worm, all of which are of a low resolution so are potentially within the Site or within 2km of the Site but not possible to determine. The locations of those records of reptiles relevant to the Site, are presented in **Figure 8-F-1**. There were no records of Adder.
- 4.1.2 Additionally, there were 15 records of Common Toad, the closest of which is approximately 530m from the Site. The locations of records of Common Toad, relevant to the Site, are presented in **Figure 8-F-1**.

4.2 Field Survey

- 4.2.1 Four reptiles (all juvenile Grass Snake) were recorded during the refugia surveys undertaken in May and September 2023 and May and June 2024. Furthermore, one adult Grass Snake and one dead Grass Snake (see **Figure 8-F-1**) were recorded within the Site during other ecological surveys. The date, location, species and number of individuals of Grass Snake recorded during the refugia surveys are presented in **Table 6** and the locations of all Grass Snake recorded are presented in **Figure 8-F-1**. No other reptiles were recorded within the Site.
- 4.2.2 Five Common Toad were recorded during the refugia surveys carried out in between May and September 2023. The date, location, species and number of individuals recorded during the refugia surveys are presented in **Table 6** and the locations are presented in **Figure 8-F-1**. No Common Toads were recorded during any aquatic surveys undertaken at the time of writing this report.

Table 6: Reptiles and Common Toad recorded within the Survey Area

Species	Survey Area	Species	Number
10th of May 2023	Survey Area 2	Common Toad	1
	Survey Area 4	Grass Snake (juvenile)	1
11th of May 2023	Survey Area 1	Common Toad	1
	Survey Area 2	Common Toad	1
23rd of May 2023	Survey Area 1	Common Toad	1

Species	Survey Area	Species	Number
	Survey Area 2	Common Toad	1
4th of September 2023	Survey Area 2	Grass Snake (juvenile)	1
30th of May 2024	Survey Area 5	Grass Snake (juvenile)	1
3rd of June 2024	Survey Area 5	Grass Snake (juvenile)	1

5. Evaluation

5.1 Summary of Results

Reptiles

- 5.1.1 The desk study returned no records of reptiles within the Site and 162 records of three reptile species (Common Lizard, Grass Snake and Slow Worm) within 2 km of the Site.
- 5.1.2 Field surveys, undertaken in May and September 2023 and May and June 2024, identified single juvenile Grass Snakes in three areas of the Site. An adult Grass Snake was recorded in June 2023 and one dead Grass Snake was also recorded within the Site in October 2023, during other ecological surveys.

Common Toad

- 5.1.3 The desk study returned no records of Common Toad within the Site and 19 records of Common Toad within 2 km of the Site. Field surveys, undertaken in May and September 2023, and May and June 2024, identified in two areas of the Site, a single Common Toad on each occasion.

5.2 Population Assessment

- 5.2.1 The population size assessment of reptiles within the Site was measured using guidance presented in **Table 5** and was used to obtain a basic evaluation of the size and importance of the population of each reptile species within the Site. When determining the population size of reptiles on a site, consideration must be made for other factors that may influence the assessment such as habitat quality and species ecology.
- 5.2.2 Estimating the population size of reptiles on a site is difficult to achieve because each survey visit may only reveal a small sample of the population and the proportion of animals that may be detected during surveys will vary according to, for example, weather and migration patterns.
- 5.2.3 To allow for focussed estimations of the population size, relevant to the Proposed Development, only the maximum counts of each species on a single visit within the Proposed Development areas have been used.
- 5.2.4 Grass Snake was recorded within semi-improved grassland surrounding a waterbody in Survey Area 4 (see **Figure 8-F-1**), within poor semi-improved grassland in Survey Area 2 (see **Figure 8-F-1**) and within semi-improved neutral grassland along the banks of the river Witham in Survey Area 5 (see **Figure 8-F-1**).
- 5.2.5 The maximum count of Grass Snake on a single survey visit was one. The average score of Grass Snake across all survey visits amounted to 0.14 Grass Snakes per survey. Therefore, when the maximum count of one is

evaluated against the criteria in **Table 5** of this report, the population of Grass Snake is classified as low and of no more than local importance. Survey Areas 2, 4 and 5 are discrete areas and the likelihood is that the individual Grass Snakes recorded are different animals. If a precautionary approach was taken and three animals were evaluated, the population of Grass Snake would still be low and of no more than local importance.

- 5.2.6 Whilst there are no population assessment criteria for Common Toad, applying the same criteria as that used for reptiles would classify the population of Common Toad as being low and of no more than local importance.

6. Conclusions

- 6.1.1 The primary purpose of this report is to provide an assessment of the presence or absence of reptiles and Common Toad and their biodiversity importance within the Site to inform **Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation** of the **PEI Report Volume 1**. An assessment of potential impacts (considering embedded mitigation), any additional mitigation and residual effects on Grass Snake and Common Toad has been undertaken and is included within **Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation** of the **PEI Report Volume 1**. Where any changes in the distribution or abundance of these species are recorded during other ecological surveys undertaken for the Proposed Development, then this report will be updated accordingly to include with the ES chapter as part of the DCO application.
- 6.1.2 The desk study returned no records of reptiles or Common Toad within the Site.
- 6.1.3 The surveys undertaken in May, August and September 2023, and May and June 2024, identified the presence of low numbers of Grass Snake within the Site, which was restricted to habitats of poor semi-improved grassland and semi-improved neutral grassland, amounting to 2.98 ha of the Site (<1% of the total area). Adder, Slow Worm and Common Lizard were absent from the Site or very rare and undetected. Additionally, low numbers of Common Toad were recorded within two discrete areas of the Site.
- 6.1.4 Based on the results to date, the Proposed Development will be able to embed sufficient mitigation measures, formalised through a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), to ensure that reptiles and Common Toad occurring within the Site are not negatively impacted upon, in line with legislation, policy and guidance as described in Section 2 of this report.
- 6.1.5 The Proposed Development presents an opportunity to include habitat creation within the design that would enhance the populations of Grass Snake, Common Lizard, Slow Worm, Common Toad and other amphibians within the Site and its environs.

7. References

- Ref 1 Russell, L. and Foster, J. (2021). Establishing a baseline dataset for widespread reptiles in England to inform better management of development impacts. ARC report to Natural England. Amphibian and Reptile Conservation Trust, Bournemouth.
- Ref 2 Her Majesty's Stationery Office (HMSO). (1981). The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. HMSO, London. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1981/69>
- Ref 3 HMSO.. (2018). Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). HMSO, London. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2017/1012/contents/made>.
- Ref 4 HMSO. (2006). Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. HMSO, London. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/16/contents>.
- Ref 5 HMSO. (1994). Biodiversity The UK Action Plan. HMSO, London. Available at: <https://data.jncc.gov.uk/data/cb0ef1c9-2325-4d17-9f87-a5c84fe400bd/UKBAP-BiodiversityActionPlan-1994.pdf>
- Ref 6 Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) and Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra). (2012). UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework. Available at: http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/UK_Post2010_Bio-Fwork.pdf.
- Ref 7 JNCC (2023). UK Biodiversity Framework 2024. Available at <https://data.jncc.gov.uk/data/19a729f6-440e-4ac6-8894-cc72e84cc3bb/uk-biodiversity-framework.pdf>
- Ref 8 United Nations. (2022). Decision Adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. Available at: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-15/cop-15-dec-04-en.pdf>
- Ref 9 Lincolnshire Biodiversity Partnership. (2011). Lincolnshire Biodiversity Action Plan 2011-2020 (3rd edition). Available at: <https://www.nelincs.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/201110-LincolnshireBAP-3rd-edition.pdf>
- Ref 10 HMSO. (2021). The Environment Act 2021. HMSO, London. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2021/30/contents/enacted>.
- Ref 11 Froglife. (1999). Froglife Advice Sheet 10, Reptile Survey.
- Ref 12 Natural England. (2015). Reptiles: surveys and mitigation for development projects. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/reptiles-protection-surveys-and-licences>.
- Ref 13 Gent, T. and Gibson, S. (2003). Herpetofauna Workers' Manual. Joint Nature Conservation Committee.

- Ref 14 Amphibian and Reptile Conservation (ARC). (2016). Reptile Identification Guide. Amphibian and Reptile Conservation Trust. Available at: <https://www.arc-trust.org/Handlers/Download.ashx?IDMF=9493c965-0279-45d7-b271-015067ec87b5>
- Ref 15 Beebee, T. and Griffiths, R. (2000). Amphibians and Reptiles. New Naturalist Library, Book 87. Collins, London.
- Ref 16 Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM). (2018). Guidelines for Ecological Impact assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine. Available at: <https://cieem.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/ECIA-Guidelines-2018-Terrestrial-Freshwater-Coastal-and-Marine-V1.2-April-22-Compressed.pdf>

Annex A Figures

PEI Report Volume 3, Figure 8-F-1: Reptiles and Common Toad Survey Locations & Desk Study Records

Fosse Green Energy

Fosse Green Energy Ltd

AECOM Limited
Sunley House
4 Bedford Park
Surrey, CR0 2AP, UK
www.aecom.com

 Site Boundary
 2km Study Area
 Reptile Refugia

Reptile Presence

- Grass Snake
- Common Toad

Desk Study Records (source: Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership)

-  Common Toad
-  Slow-worm
-  Grass Snake
-  Common Lizard

Reproduced from Ordnance Survey digital map data © Crown copyright 2024. All rights reserved.
License number 0100031673.

PEI Report

60664324

Reptile Survey Locations & Desk Study
Records

Figure 8-F-1

