

M42 Junction 6 Improvement Scheme Number TR010027 Volume 6 6.3 Environmental Statement Appendix 9.14 Water Vole Survey Report

Regulation 5(2)(a)

Planning Act 2008

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

January 2019



Infrastructure Planning

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009

M42 Junction 6 Improvement

Development Consent Order 202[]

6.3 Environmental Statement Appendix 9.14 Water Vole Survey Report

Regulation Number	Regulation 5(2)(a)
Planning Inspectorate Scheme	TR010027
Reference	
Application Document Reference	6.3
Author	M42 Junction 6 Improvement Project Team and
	Highways England

Version	Date	Status of Version
1	January 2019	DCO Application

HIGHWAYS ENGLAND

M42 JUNCTION 6 IMPROVEMENT WATER VOLE SURVEY REPORT

MAY 05, 2017 CONFIDENTIAL







M42 JUNCTION 6 IMPROVEMENT WATER VOLE SURVEY REPORT

FINAL CONFIDENTIAL

PROJECT NO.: 62241010 DATE: MAY 2017

WSP
THREE WHITE ROSE OFFICE PARK
MILLSHAW PARK LANE
LEEDS

PHONE: +44 (0)113 305 6623 WSP.COM

QUALITY MANAGEMENT

ISSUE/REVISION	FIRST ISSUE	REVISION 1	REVISION 2	REVISION 3
Remarks				
Date	05.05.17			
Prepared by	David Lovett			
Signature				
Checked by	Lucy Elliott			
Signature				
Authorised by	Andy Bascombe			
Signature				
Project number	62241010			
Report number				
File reference				

SIGNATURES

PREPARED BY



David Lovett, MBiolSci GradCIEEM Consultant Ecologist

REVIEWED BY



Lucy Elliott, BSc (Hons) MSc MCIEEM Senior Ecologist

This report was prepared by WSP for the account of Highways England, in accordance with the professional services agreement. The disclosure of any information contained in this report is the sole responsibility of the intended recipient. The material in it reflects WSP's best judgement in light of the information available to it at the time of preparation. Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it, are the responsibility of such third parties. WSP accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by any third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this report. This limitations statement is considered part of this report.

The original of the technology-based document sent herewith has been authenticated and will be retained by WSP for a minimum of ten years. Since the file transmitted is now out of WSP's control and its integrity can no longer be ensured, no guarantee may be given to by any modifications to be made to this document.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION 1
1.1	Background1
1.2	Scheme Location
1.3	Study Area1
1.4	Study Aims and Objectives1
2	METHODOLOGY 2
2.1	Desk Study
2.2	Field Survey
2.3	Limitations2
3	RESULTS 3
3.1	Desk Study
3.2	Field Survey3
4	EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 4
4.1	Water Vole4
5	FIGURES 5
5.1	Figure 1: Watercourse Map5

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

WSP (formerly Mouchel) was commissioned by Highways England to undertake ecological surveys to inform the proposed M42 Junction 6 Improvement Scheme. An extended Phase 1 habitat survey was undertaken by Mouchel in February 2017. During this survey, habitats within and adjacent to the proposed scheme were assessed for their suitability to support protected species. Three watercourses were identified as being suitable for water vole *Arvicola amphibius*.

Water vole surveys were undertaken in May 2017, the aim of which was to confirm the presence or likely absence of water vole and assess likely impacts of the proposed scheme on this species, if present. This report presents the results of the survey work undertaken.

1.2 SCHEME LOCATION

At the time of writing, three possible route options (Options 1, 2 and 3) are being considered. All three options are predominantly located to the south west of Junction 6 close to the village of Bickenhill, although all route options also include improvements to the junction itself. The land within the proposed scheme is predominantly used for agriculture and pasture grazing, although the scheme is also close to the National Exhibition Centre (NEC), Birmingham International Railway Station and Birmingham Airport as well as proposed developments including High Speed 2 (HS2) route and terminal, a Motorway Service Area (MSA) and UK Central development.

1.3 STUDY AREA

A study area extending up to 1km from the proposed route was defined, with field surveys focusing on three watercourses present within the footprint of the scheme (see Figure 1): Hollywell Brook, which passes beneath the M42 at SP192809 and an unnamed watercourse, which passes beneath the motorway at SP194821.

1.4 STUDY AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The study sought to determine whether water vole are present within suitable habitats within the study area and if so, to determine likely impacts of the proposed scheme on this species. To achieve this, a review of records of protected species obtained from environmental bodies was undertaken, along with field surveys to search for evidence of water vole within suitable habitats within the study area.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 DESK STUDY

Warwickshire Biological Records Centre, the local biological records centre, and the ENVIS database kept by Highways England was consulted to collate historical ecological records from within the study area.

2.2 FIELD SURVEY

A survey was undertaken in May 2017 to search for evidence of water vole. Surveys were undertaken in line with guidance set out in the Water Vole Mitigation Guidelines¹. The extent of the watercourses surveyed is shown in Figure 1. Where accessible, the banks of the watercourses were surveyed from within the channel. Surveyors systematically searched along each bank and any evidence of water vole, including burrows, latrines, droppings, feeding remains and runs within the vegetation was recorded when found. Where surveyors were unable to access the watercourse channel, evidence was searched for from the top of the banks, using binoculars as required.

2.3 LIMITATIONS

There were no limitations to the survey work undertaken.

_

¹ Dean, M., Strachan, R., Gow, D. and Andrews, R. (2016) The Water Vole Mitigation Handbook (The Mammal Society Mitigation Guidance Series). Eds Fiona Mathews and Paul Chanin. The Mammal Society, London.

3 RESULTS

3.1 DESK STUDY

No records of water vole from within the study area were returned from the desk study.

3.2 FIELD SURVEY

No evidence of water vole was found during the field surveys undertaken in May 2017.

The habitats were generally found to be unsuitable for water vole. Both Shadow Brook and the unnamed watercourse were largely dry along their lengths and the section of Hollywell Brook to the west of the M42 is set within a concrete channel. To the east of the M42, Hollywell Brook is set within steep earth banks, although heavy shading means that vegetation on the banks is limited. Several areas were also poached by livestock. Therefore, a second survey visit was not undertaken on the basis that the habitats are of low suitability for water vole.

4 EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 WATER VOLE

No evidence of water vole was found within the survey area and the habitats are considered to be of low suitability for water vole. As such, no further surveys or mitigation in respect of water vole are recommended.

5 FIGURES

5.1 FIGURE 1: WATERCOURSE MAP









