

8.0 SCHEDULE OF MITIGATION AND RESIDUAL EFFECTS

Introduction

- 8.1 This chapter summarises the mitigation measures and residual effects identified in each of the technical assessments included in the ES.
- 8.2 The Development has been subject to an iterative design process informed by technical constraints as discussed in Chapter 4. As this process progressed measures have been incorporated into the development in order to avoid, reduce or offset significant environmental effects. Where this has not been possible, further mitigation measures have been proposed and are set out in Table 17.1. Effects that do not require mitigation, or where mitigation is not proposed are not included here, however they are summarised in the summary table of each technical ES chapter. Mitigation is not required for either the construction phase or operational phase for some technical disciplines. The table therefore only includes the relevant phase(s) for which mitigation is proposed.
- 8.3 Compliance with the submitted CEMP is key to mitigating the majority of effects identified in the ES. As discussed earlier in this ES, a detailed CEMP is included at Appendix 3.2 for approval. This includes detailed construction methodology and mitigation measures including the responsibilities for delivery and methods by which results of monitoring will be communicated to stakeholders including GBC, statutory consultees and local residents, as required.
- 8.4 Where the mitigation proposed would also serve to mitigate effects that are the responsibility of the Applicant in the cumulative scenario, measures are not listed twice. The provision of SANG associated with the Proposed Wisley New Settlement is not included here as a planning application has not yet been prepared, submitted or approved, but it is acknowledged in the cumulative assessment section of Chapter 6 Biodiversity that a forthcoming planning application for the Proposed Wisley New Settlement would seek permission for land use change to SANG and the necessary approvals sought to mitigate the effects of recreational pressure in the cumulative scenario.

Table 8.1: Schedule of Mitigation

Stage	Effect	Mitigation	How the Mitigation will be Secured, Implemented and Monitored (if required)	Residual Significance
Landscape and Views				
Completed Development	Open Views from PRow crossing the Site	Arable converted to managed meadow by seeding the ground with wildflower meadow (Emorsgate mix EM2 or similar)	The seeding principles are included in the Habitat Creation and Management Plan submitted for approval with the planning application and included at Appendix 6.6. The Applicant is responsible for ensuring compliance with the Plan. Monitoring would be through an annual walkover in summer by a suitably qualified ecologist to check that the habitat is as expected and recommend changes to the management regime, if required.	Negligible
	Open upper storey views from limited properties at Elm Corner	As above	As above	Negligible
	Open groundfloor/garden views from limited properties at Elm Corner	As above	As above	Negligible
	Open views from limited properties at Hatchford End	As above	As above	Negligible
	Single upperstorey view from Ockham End	As above	As above	Negligible
	Limited framed views from Old Farm	As above	As above	Negligible
	Glimpsed/filtered views from Old Lane	As above	As above	Negligible
	Landscape Character and Value	As above	As above	Negligible
Biodiversity				
Construction	TBH SPA, Ockham and Wisley Commons SSSI and Ockham & Wisley LNR, Elm Corner Woods SNCI, Hunts Copse SNCI – damage to interest features	Ecological buffer zone; implementation of CEMP	Buffer zone inherent to the Development design. Approval of submitted plans will secure this. The Applicant is responsible for compliance with the submitted/approved drawings. CEMP submitted with the planning application for approval (included at Appendix 3.2). The Applicant is responsible for ensuring that the mitigation and monitoring measures defined within the CEMP are	Not significant

Stage	Effect	Mitigation	How the Mitigation will be Secured, Implemented and Monitored (if required)	Residual Significance
			implemented and complied with.	
	Wisley Airfield SNCI – direct loss of interest features,	Targeted storage and translocation of topsoil, management of temporary 'arable plant reserves' to build up seed bank within wider FWA site	Habitat Creation and Management Plan submitted for approval with the planning application and included at Appendix 6.6. The areas not affected by earthworks would be managed to encourage the germination of annual arable plants and the Applicant's ecologist would monitor the Site monthly during the growing season for the appearance of species of conservation importance. This includes c. 6.5ha within the Site boundary but outside of the earthworks footprint and 5.9ha outside the Site boundary but within the Applicant's ownership. Monitoring would be through an annual walkover in summer by a suitably qualified ecologist to check that the habitat is as expected and recommend changes to the management regime, if required.	Not significant
	Wisley Airfield SNCI harm/disturbance to interest features – (disturbance to bats from construction activity)	Ecological buffer zone, implementation of CEMP	Buffer zone inherent to the Development design. Approval of submitted plans will secure this. CEMP submitted with the planning application for approval (included at Appendix 3.2). The Applicant is responsible for ensuring that the mitigation and monitoring measures defined within the CEMP are implemented and complied with.	Not significant
	Wisley Airfield SNCI harm/disturbance to interest features (breeding bird assemblage – direct harm, destruction of nests)	Pre-works nesting bird checks, implementation of CEMP	The Applicant's ecologist would undertake the nesting bird checks before commencement of works affecting vegetation. The Applicant is responsible for ensuring that the checks are undertaken. CEMP submitted with the planning application for approval (included at Appendix 3.2). The Applicant is responsible for ensuring that the mitigation and monitoring measures defined within the CEMP are implemented and complied with.	Not significant
	Wisley Airfield SNCI Harm/disturbance to interest features - reptile assemblage (disturbance from construction activity)	Ecological buffer zone, implementation of CEMP	Buffer zone inherent to the Development design. Approval of submitted plans will secure this. The Applicant is responsible for compliance with the submitted/approved drawings. CEMP submitted with the planning application for	Not significant

Stage	Effect	Mitigation	How the Mitigation will be Secured, Implemented and Monitored (if required)	Residual Significance
			approval (included at Appendix 3.2). The Applicant is responsible for ensuring that the mitigation and monitoring measures defined within the CEMP are implemented and complied with.	
	Great Crested Newts - Direct harm to individuals	Ecological buffer zone, exclusion fence and capture/ relocation along fence line under EPSML Toolbox Talk delivered by experienced ecologist to all construction personnel on the first day of works.	Buffer zone inherent to the Development design. Approval of submitted plans will secure this. The Applicant is responsible for compliance with the submitted/approved drawings. The Applicant's ecologist will deliver the Toolbox Talk. The Applicant is responsible for ensuring that this happens.	Not significant
	Great Crested Newts - Habitat loss and fragmentation (not significant but legal offence)	Exclusion fence implemented under EPSML Toolbox Talk delivered by experienced ecologist to all construction personnel on the first day of works.	Planning permission required for an EPSML to be secured. The Applicant is responsible for ensuring compliance with the licence. Any deviation from the methods or timings set out in the licence will first be agreed with Natural England through a licence amendment. The Applicant's ecologist would apply for the licence on behalf of the Applicant and the Applicant is responsible for ensuring that work is undertaken in compliance with it. The Applicant's ecologist will deliver the Toolbox Talk. The Applicant is responsible for ensuring that this happens.	Legal offence avoided
	Great Crested Newts – Disturbance from construction activity	Ecological buffer zone, exclusion fence under EPSML, implementation of CEMP. Toolbox Talk delivered by experienced ecologist to all construction personnel on the first day of works.	Buffer zone inherent to the Development design. Approval of submitted plans will secure this. The Applicant is responsible for compliance with the submitted/approved drawings. Planning permission required for an EPSML to be secured. The Applicant is responsible for ensuring compliance with the licence. Any deviation from the methods or timings set out in the licence will first be agreed with Natural England through a licence amendment. The Applicant's ecologist would apply for the licence and the Applicant is responsible for ensuring	Not significant

Stage	Effect	Mitigation	How the Mitigation will be Secured, Implemented and Monitored (if required)	Residual Significance
			<p>that work is undertaken in compliance with it.</p> <p>CEMP submitted with the planning application for approval (included at Appendix 3.2). The Applicant is responsible for ensuring that the mitigation and monitoring measures defined within the CEMP are implemented and complied with.</p> <p>The Applicant's ecologist will deliver the Toolbox Talk. The Applicant is responsible for ensuring that this happens.</p>	
	Reptiles – direct harm (not significant but potential legal offence)	Ecological buffer zone, exclusion fence, capture/relocation along fence line Toolbox Talk delivered by experienced ecologist to all construction personnel on the first day of works.	Buffer zone inherent to the Development design. Approval of submitted plans will secure this. The Applicant is responsible for compliance with the submitted/approved drawings.	Legal offence avoided
	Reptiles – disturbance from construction activity	Exclusion fence, implementation of CEMP	CEMP submitted with the planning application for approval (included at Appendix 3.2r ensuring that the mitigation and monitoring measures defined within the CEMP are implemented and complied with.	Not significant
	Wintering bird assemblage – loss of foraging habitat	Creation of temporary arable weed reserves	Habitat Creation and Management Plan submitted for approval with the planning application and included at Appendix 6.6. The Applicant is responsible for ensuring that the measures set out in the plan are delivered and the monitoring is undertaken. Monitoring would be through an annual walkover in summer by a suitably qualified ecologist to check that the habitat is as expected and recommend changes to the management regime, if required.	Neutral
Completed Development	Wisley Airfield SSCI, Arable Plant Assemblage,	Implementation of Habitat Creation and Management Plan	Habitat Creation and Management Plan submitted for approval with the planning application and included at Appendix 6.6.	Significant positive effect at local level

Stage	Effect	Mitigation	How the Mitigation will be Secured, Implemented and Monitored (if required)	Residual Significance
	Bat, Breeding Bird, Great Crested Newt, Reptile, Wintering Bird Assemblages (significant positive effect)		The Applicant is responsible for ensuring that the measures set out in the plan are delivered and the monitoring is undertaken. Monitoring would be through an annual walkover in summer by a suitably qualified ecologist to check that the habitat is as expected and recommend changes to the management regime, if required.	
Water Resources & Flood Risk				
Construction	Pollution of water courses	Implementation of CEMP	CEMP submitted with the planning application for approval (included at Appendix 3.2). The Applicant is responsible for ensuring that the mitigation and monitoring measures defined within the CEMP are implemented and complied with.	Negligible
	Pollution of groundwater	Implementation of CEMP	CEMP submitted with the planning application for approval (included at Appendix 3.2). The Applicant is responsible for ensuring that the mitigation and monitoring measures defined within the CEMP are implemented and complied with.	Negligible

Interactive Effects

- 8.5 Paragraph 3 in Schedule 4 Part 1 of the EIA Regulations states that an ES must include a description of the aspects of the environment likely to be significantly affected by the development and the interrelationship between these effects. There is no published methodology for determining the significance of interactive or synergistic effects. Combining effects with respect to one environmental discipline with another on a single receptor or group of receptors is, necessarily, qualitative and based on judgment.
- 8.6 As demonstrated above, there are unlikely to be significant effects on the environment with the implementation of mitigation measures. Whilst scoped out of this ES, the main interactive effects are likely to be construction noise and dust from vehicles and plant on nearby residents and users of the PROW. As set out in Chapter 2, the measures to be implemented through the CEMP would reduce such effects as far as practicable such that they are not significant. They would also be temporary, lasting only for the construction phase.
- 8.7 There could be the potential for interactive effects on biodiversity/ecological receptors as a whole as a result of various construction phase activities. This could include, for example, pollution to watercourses and/or groundwater migrating off site potentially affecting the SNCI, SSSI and/or SPA, loss of foraging habitat, direct harm to species and floral assemblages and lighting impacts. However, the Development has been designed with these ecological sensitivities in mind and the mitigation measures committed to, including those set out in the CEMP, will ensure that such effects are not significant.
- 8.8 Given the nature of the Development, proposed mitigation measures and conclusions of the technical assessments presented in Chapters 5 – 7, no likely significant interactive effects are anticipated.
- 8.9 Cumulative effects (those that could result from the Development combined with other approved/reasonably foreseeable developments) have been assessed in each technical chapter. Chapter 2 sets out the developments considered in these assessments.

Summary

- 8.10 The Development has been subject to an iterative design process informed by technical constraints. As this process progressed measures have been incorporated into

the development in order to avoid, reduce or offset significant environmental effects. Where this has not been possible, further mitigation measures have been proposed.

- 8.11 Compliance with the submitted CEMP (Appendix 3.2) is key to mitigating the majority of effects identified in the ES.
- 8.12 The Development will result in the following beneficial residual effects:
- Significant positive effect through the implementation of a Habitat Creation and Management Plan, owing to the creation of extensive areas of wildflower grassland and arable plant reserves; and
 - Minor beneficial effect on the water quantity and quality in the Ockham and Wisley SSSI during the operational phase, owing to the introduction of new ponds which will help to reduce downstream flooding and regulate water quality.
- 8.13 The ES also considers the potential for interactive effects. These are where there could be multiple effects on a single receptor/environmental feature. No significant interactive effects are anticipated given the nature of the Development and mitigation proposed.
- 8.14 The ES has identified no residual adverse effects.