A27 Arundel Bypass Environmental Assessment Report – Biodiversity Technical Appendices Errata

PCF Stage 2 – Further Consultation

February 2020

Environmental Assessment Report Errata (Biodiversity Technical Appendices), February 2020

A27 Arundel Bypass

PCF Stage 2 – Further Consultation

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this note is to summarise a set of corrections to the PCF Stage 2 Environmental Assessment Report (EAR) Biodiversity Technical Appendices (Appendices 8-1 to 8-25) dated September 2019 which formed part of the package of material available at the 2019 Further Consultation for the A27 Arundel Bypass scheme.

In each case, this note sets out the existing text in the biodiversity technical appendix requiring correction (labelled as 'Existing Text') and below it, the corrected text (labelled as 'Amended Text'). All changes required to be made in the Amended Text are shown in red text. Text that is to be removed from the Existing Text is struck-out.

The errata presented herein are intended to be read in conjunction with the published consultation documents provided on Highways England's A27 Arundel Bypass website (https://highwaysengland.co.uk/projects/a27-arundel-improvement/).

The corrections presented in this note do not affect the assessments undertaken for the purposes of the PCF Stage 2 EAR as the vast majority are relatively minor technical corrections. As such, it is unlikely that the validity of any comments made as part of the consultation would be materially impacted.

Eight attachments are included in this note:

- Attachment A: Corrected version of Technical Appendix 8-6: Bat Radio Tracking Baseline Survey
- Attachment B: Technical Appendix 8-8 Bat Activity Baseline Survey Report Defra Study – corrected Appendix A, Table 4
- Attachment C: Technical Appendix 8-10 Breeding Bird Baseline Survey – corrected map to insert in Appendix F Breeding Bird Transect Maps
- Attachment D: Corrected version of Technical Appendix 8-13 Amphibian Baseline Survey
- Attachment E: Technical Appendix 8-20 Phase 1 Habitat Survey Baseline Survey – Corrected Figure 1 Vegetation Sample Location Map
- Attachment F: Technical Appendix 8-23 Preliminary Ecological Appraisal – corrected Target Note Appendix C
- Attachment G: Technical Appendix 8-23 Preliminary Ecological Appraisal – corrected Appendix B, Desk Study Data
- Attachment H: Corrected version of Technical Appendix 8-25: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

2. CORRECTIONS

2.1. EAR Technical Appendix 8-4: Barn Owl

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
Appendix B	Table B-1 Field Survey Findings	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

Obs_No	Occupancy	Description	S2_Date	S2_Result	S3_Date	S3_Result	Lead Surveyor	Comments	Easting	Northing
BO-01	None	Other	01/09/17	TRS	-	-	P Cannings	Hunting perch, fence post on corner of woodland pit, splashing.	499188	108153
BO-02	Medium	Common Ash	01/09/17	PNS	25/06/18	PNS	P Cannings	Three cavities, suitable, old pellets no recent signs	499205	108125
BO-03	Medium	Pedunculate oak	01/09/17	PNS	25/06/18	PNS	P Cannings	3 cavities, 2 old pellets, no recent signs or signs of nesting	499227	107684

Amended Text

Obs_No	Occupancy	Description	S2_Date	S2_Result	S3_Date	S3_Result	Lead Surveyor	Comments	Easting	Northing
BO-01	None	Other	~~01/09/17~~ 18-28/09/2017	TRS	-	-	P Cannings	Hunting perch, fence post on corner of woodland pit, splashing.	499188	108153
BO-02	Medium	Common Ash	~~01/09/17~~ 18-28/09/2017	PNS	25/06/18	PNS	P Cannings	Three cavities, suitable, old pellets no recent signs	499205	108125
BO-03	Medium	Pedunculate oak	~~01/09/17~~ 18-28/09/2017	PNS	25/06/18	PNS	P Cannings	3 cavities, 2 old pellets, no recent signs or signs of nesting	499227	107684

Explanation

This erratum applies to all dates in column 3 (S2_Date) with a date ending in 2017. A number of exemplar rows are shown to demonstrate the required correction but the whole table is not re-produced. The date 01/09/2017 was originally stated. However, this was a typographic error. Surveys were actually undertaken between 18 September 2017 and 28 September 2017, across a period of time, not in a single day. Correction of the dates of survey activity does not alter the correct baseline information which was fed into the assessment presented in the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity.

2.2. EAR Technical Appendix 8-6: Bat Radiotracking Baseline Survey

Errata

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
Various	Various	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text / Amended Text		
Corrected text is provided in Attachment A which is appended to this errata document.		
Explanation		
Several errors were identified in Technical Appendix 8-6. Each of these errors relate to transcription errors between raw bat count data collected in the field and data reported in in the main body of the report. For example, the trapping location reference was stated incorrectly in several places and the number of individual bats caught on a particular trapping evening was transcribed erroneously. The correct raw baseline data was fed into the baseline of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity and therefore the conclusions summarised in Section 8.9.3 remain unchanged. For ease of reference, a corrected copy of Technical Appendix 8-6 with each of these issues corrected is provided as Attachment A of this document.		

2.3. EAR Technical Appendix 8-7: Bat Structures Baseline Survey Report

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.1.1	Table 3-1 Bats recorded or likely to be present within the Desk Study Area	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

Flight strategy	Species	Relative UK Distribution and Conservation Status	Local Distribution and Status
Open Habitat Adapted Species	Noctule	Widespread, relatively common	Widespread, uncommon

Amended Text

Flight strategy	Species	Relative UK Distribution and Conservation Status	Local Distribution and Status
Open Habitat Adapted Species	Noctule	Widespread, relatively common	Widespread, uncommon
	Leisler's bat	Widespread, uncommon	Widespread, uncommon

Explanation

Transcription error. Leisler's bat was omitted from the desk study section of the report in error. Elsewhere in the same report this species is considered accurately (Table 3-3 of Technical Appendix 8-7 confirms that foraging by Leisler's bat or noctule was detected in the Field Survey Area). The presence of Leisler's bat is accounted for in

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.1.1	Table 3-1 Bats recorded or likely to be present within the Desk Study Area	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
baseline of the Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Assessment Report. This erratum does not alter the conclusions in relation to bats which are presented in Chapter 8 as summarised in Section 8.9.3.		

Erratum 2

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.2	Paragraph 3.2.2.2	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		
3.2.2.1 In 2017, 18 structures identified within the 2017 Field Survey Area were subject to survey and eight were found to contain potential roost features. 3.2.2.2 In 2018, a further 57 structures identified within the 2018 Field Survey Area were subject to external preliminary roost assessment and 30 were found to contain potential roost features. Ten of these structures were subject to internal inspection.		
Amended Text		
3.2.2.1 In 2017, 18 structures ~~identified~~ within the 2017 Field Survey Area were subject to survey (the 19th structure was inaccessible). ~~and~~ ~~E~~ight were found to contain potential roost features. 3.2.2.2 In 2018, a further 57 structures ~~identified~~ within the 2018 Field Survey Area were subject to external preliminary roost assessment (the remaining 30 were inaccessible) and ~~30~~ 22 were found to contain potential roost features. Ten of these structures were subject to internal inspection.		
Explanation		
Transcription error between paragraph 3.2.2 and raw data summary tables in the same report where the correct information is presented. The total number of structures found to contain potential bat roost features in 2018 is 22 and not 30 as stated. This erratum does not affect the conclusions drawn in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Assessment Report which were based on accurate baseline information presented in the tables of Technical Appendix 8-7. The assessment which is summarised in Section 8.9.3 of the Environmental Assessment Report is unaffected.		

Erratum 3

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
Appendix B	Bat Structures Appendix B Survey Results (Figure)	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text / Amended Text		
Revised version of Structure 35 on the figure.		
Explanation		
Structure 35 is classed as a "low-confirmed" roost in the figure key. However, it is not a confirmed roost. The symbology should be changed from a green triangle to a green circle (low unconfirmed roost) to reflect this. This		

erratum does not affect the conclusions drawn in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Assessment Report as this error was confined to map symbology alone. The correct status of the roost was taken into consideration in the baseline of the Environmental Assessment Report and the conclusions summarised in Section 8.9.3.

2.4. EAR Technical Appendix 8-8: Bat Activity Baseline Survey Report: Defra Study

Erratum 1

Section	**Paragraph / Table**	**Location**
2.3.2	Paragraph 2.3.2.2	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		
The survey was undertaken as per specifications of the 2015 Defra research report WC106018, between June and September 2017 and 2018 inclusive in appropriate weather conditions, with a total of 33 locations selected for survey (Appendix A, Figure 2).		
Amended Text		
The survey was undertaken as per specifications of the 2015 Defra research report WC106018, between June and September 2017 and 2018 inclusive in appropriate weather conditions, with a total of 33 locations selected for survey (~~Appendix A~~ Section 5, Figure 2).		
Explanation		
Typographic error. Section 5 was mislabelled Appendix A. Correct information provided in Section 5, Figure 2 was fed into the baseline of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 – Biodiversity, and thus the conclusions relating to bats summarised in Section 8.9.3 are unchanged.		

Erratum 2

Section	**Paragraph / Table**	**Location**
2.4.4	Appendix A, Table 4	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text / Amended Text		
The corrected table is provided in Attachment B which is appended to this errata document.		
Explanation		
Appendix A, Table 4 was not compiled with the published document. Table 4 provides a list of surveys that could not be completed due to land access or health and safety constraints. This data is required to provide an audit trail for cancelled surveys. This data is now included as Attachment B along with this errata document. This erratum does not affect the outcome of Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR as correct information fed into the baseline reported therein and the conclusions made in relation to bats, summarised in Section 8.9.3, remain unchanged.		

Erratum 3

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.1	Paragraph 3.2.1.4	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

A total of 4,961 visual observations of bats passing were made compared to 6,835 passes which were recorded by the detector.

Amended Text

A total of ~~4,961~~ 4,768 visual observations of bats passing were made compared to 6,835 passes which were recorded by the detector.

Explanation

A transcription error resulted in the incorrect number being stated in paragraph 3.2.1.4 whilst the correct number was stated in Table 3-3. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis and does not influence the conclusion of Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR as the correct information was accounted for in the baseline reported in the EAR and fed into the assessment which is summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 4

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.2	Paragraph 3.2.2.1 / Table 3-6	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

3.2.2.1 A total of 158 bat passes were observed, of which; 22 (13.9%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 135 (85.4%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-6 - Survey results for Crossing Point 1

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	158	22	13.9	135	85.4
Common pipistrelle	102	16	15.6	85	83.3
Soprano pipistrelle	21	4	19.0	17	80.9
Myotis species	34	2	5.8	32	94.1
Noctule-Leisler's-Serotine (NSL)	1	0	0	1	100.0

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.2	Paragraph 3.2.2.1 / Table 3-6	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Amended Text

3.2.2.1 A total of ~~158~~ 157 bat passes were observed, of which; 22 (~~13.9~~ 14.0%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 135 (~~85.4~~ 86.0%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-6 - Survey results for Crossing Point 1

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	~~158~~ 157	22	~~13.9~~ 14.0	135	~~85.4~~ 86.0
Common pipistrelle	~~102~~ 101	16	15.~~6~~ 8	85	~~83.3~~ 84.2
Soprano pipistrelle	21	4	19.0	17	~~80.9~~ 81.0
Myotis species	34	2	5.~~8~~ 9	32	94.1
Noctule-Leisler's-Serotine (NSL)	1	0	0	1	100.0

Explanation

A transcription and summing error resulted in incorrect numbers being stated in Table 3-6 and paragraph 3.2.2.1. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data presented in the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity in relation to bats, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 5

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.3	Paragraph 3.2.3.1 / Table 3-7 Survey results for Crossing Point 2	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

3.2.3.1 A total of 74 bat passes were observed, of which; four (5.41%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with 70 (94.49%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-7 - Survey results for Crossing Point 2

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.3	Paragraph 3.2.3.1 / Table 3-7 Survey results for Crossing Point 2	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Common pipistrelle	49	7	14.3	42	85.7
Soprano pipistrelle	6	0	0	6	100
Pipistrelle species	4	0	0	4	100
Myotis species	7	1	14.3	7	85.7
Noctule-Leisler's-Serotine (NSL)	1	0	0	1	100
Leisler's bat	2	1	50	1	50
Serotine	1	0	0	1	100
Bat species	4	0	0	4	100

Amended Text

3.2.3.1 A total of ~~74~~ 75 bat passes were observed, of which; ~~four~~ nine (~~5.41~~ 12.0%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with ~~70~~ 66 (~~94.49~~ 88.0%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-7 - Survey results for Crossing Point 2

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
Common pipistrelle	49	7	14.3	42	85.7
Soprano pipistrelle	6	0	0	6	100
Pipistrelle species	4	0	0	4	100
Myotis species	~~7~~ 8	1	~~14.3~~ 12.5	7	~~85.7~~ 87.5
Noctule-Leisler's-Serotine (NSL)	1	0	0	1	100
Leisler's bat	2	1	50	1	50
Serotine	1	0	0	1	100
Bat species	4	0	0	4	100

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.3	Paragraph 3.2.3.1 / Table 3-7 Survey results for Crossing Point 2	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Explanation

A transcription and summing error led to incorrect figures being stated in Table 3-7 to paragraph 3.2.3.1. The correct number of bats safely using the feature at this location informed the baseline of Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the Environmental Assessment Report and thus the conclusion summarised in Section 8.9.3 is unaffected.

Erratum 6

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.6	Paragraph 3.2.6.1 / Table 3-10 - Survey results for Crossing Point 5	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

3.2.6.1 A total of 127 bat passes were observed, of which; 19 (14.9%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 108 (85%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-10 - Survey results for Crossing Point 5

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	127	19	14.9	108	85.0
Common pipistrelle	52	8	15.4	44	84.6
Soprano pipistrelle	38	6	15.8	32	84.2
Myotis species	32	5	32	15.6	84.6
Barbastelle	3	0	0	3	100
Plecotus species	2	0	0	2	100

Amended Text

3.2.6.1 A total of 127 bat passes were observed, of which; 19 (~~14.9~~ 15.0%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 108 (85%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.6	Paragraph 3.2.6.1 / Table 3-10 - Survey results for Crossing Point 5	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Table 3-10- Survey results for Crossing Point 5

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	127	19	~~14.9~~ 15.0	108	85.0
Common pipistrelle	52	8	15.4	44	84.6
Soprano pipistrelle	38	6	15.8	32	84.2
Myotis species	32	5	~~32~~ 15.6	~~15.6~~ 27	~~84.6~~ 84.4
Barbastelle	3	0	0	3	100
Plecotus species	2	0	0	2	100

Explanation

A summing error resulted in incorrect numbers being stated in paragraph 3.2.6.1 and Table 3-10. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data presented in the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity in relation to bats, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 7

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.7	Paragraph 3.2.7.1 / Table 3-11 Survey results for Crossing Point 6	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

3.2.7.1 A total of 125 bat passes were observed, of which; 16 (12.8%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 108 (86.4%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-11 - Survey results for Crossing Point 6

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	125	16	12.8	108	86.4

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.7	Paragraph 3.2.7.1 / Table 3-11 Survey results for Crossing Point 6	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Common pipistrelle	37	4	10.8	33	89.2
Soprano pipistrelle	55	8	14.5	47	85.4
Myotis species	24	4	16.6	20	83.3
Noctule-Leisler's-Serotine (NSL)	1	0	0	0	0
Plecotus species	7	0	0	7	100

Amended Text

3.2.7.1 A total of ~~125~~ 123 bat passes were observed, of which; 16 (~~12.8~~ 13.0%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with ~~108~~ 107 (~~86.4~~ 87.0%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-11 - Survey results for Crossing Point 6

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	~~125~~ 123	16	~~12.8~~ 13.0	10~~8~~ 7	~~86.4~~ 87.0
Common pipistrelle	37	4	10.8	33	89.2
Soprano pipistrelle	55	8	14.5	47	85.~~4~~ 5
Myotis species	24	4	16.~~6~~ 7	20	83.3
Noctule-Leisler's-Serotine (NSL)	~~1~~ 0	0	0	0	0
Plecotus species	7	0	0	7	100

Explanation

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.7	Paragraph 3.2.7.1 / Table 3-11 Survey results for Crossing Point 6	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
A transcription and summing error resulted in incorrect numbers being stated in Table 3-11 and paragraph 3.2.7.1. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data presented in the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity in relation to bats, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.		

Erratum 8

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.8	Paragraph 3.2.8.1 / Table 3-12 Survey results for Crossing Point 7	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

3.2.8.1 A total of 231 bat passes were observed, of which; 57 (24.24%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with 175 (75.76%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-12 - Survey results for Crossing Point 7

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
Common pipistrelle	136	36	26.5	110	73.5
Soprano pipistrelle	37	6	16.2	31	83.8
Pipistrelle species	3	2	66.7	1	33.3
Myotis species	14	3	21.4	11	78.6
Barbastelle	1	0	0	1	100
Leisler's bat	4	0	0	4	100
Noctule	2	2	50	2	50
Plecotus species	6	3	50	3	50
Serotine	1	1	100	0	0
Bat species	24	7	29.2	17	70.8

Amended Text

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.8	Paragraph 3.2.8.1 / Table 3-12 Survey results for Crossing Point 7	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

3.2.8.1 A total of ~~231~~ 240 bat passes were observed, of which; ~~57~~ 60 (~~24.24~~ 25.0%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with ~~175~~ 180 (~~75.76~~ 75.0%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-12 - Survey results for Crossing Point 7

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
Common pipistrelle	~~136~~ 146	36	~~26.5~~ 24.7	110	~~73.5~~ 75.3
Soprano pipistrelle	37	6	16.2	31	83.8
Pipistrelle species	3	2	66.7	1	33.3
Myotis species	14	3	21.4	11	78.6
Barbastelle	1	0	0	1	100
Leisler's bat	4	0	0	4	100
Noctule	~~2~~ 4	2	50	2	50
Plecotus species	6	3	50	3	50
Serotine	1	1	100	0	0
Bat species	24	7	29.2	17	70.8

Explanation

A transcription and summing error resulted in incorrect numbers being stated in paragraph 3.2.8.1 and Table 3-12. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 9

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.9	Paragraph 3.2.9.1 / Table 3-13 - Survey results for Crossing Point 8	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.9	Paragraph 3.2.9.1 / Table 3-13 - Survey results for Crossing Point 8	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

3.2.9.1 A total of 187 bat passes were observed, of which; 20 (10.7%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 167 (89.3%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-13 - Survey results for Crossing Point 8

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	187	20	10.7	167	89.3
Common pipistrelle	118	12	10.2	106	89.8
Soprano pipistrelle	33	2	6.1	31	93.9
Myotis species	30	4	13.3	36	86.7
Barbastelle	2	0	0	2	100
Noctule-Leisler's bat-Serotine (NSL)	3	2	66.7	1	33.3

Amended Text

3.2.9.1 A total of ~~187~~ 196 bat passes were observed, of which; 20 (10.~~7~~ 2%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with ~~167~~ 176 (~~89.3~~ 89.8%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-13 - Survey results for Crossing Point 8

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	~~187~~ 196	20	10.~~7~~ 2	~~167~~ 176	~~89.3~~ 89.8
Common pipistrelle	118	12	10.2	106	89.8
Soprano pipistrelle	33	2	6.1	31	93.9
Myotis species	~~30~~ 40	4	~~13.3~~ 10.0	36	~~86.7~~ 90.0
Barbastelle	2	0	0	2	100
Noctule-Leisler's bat-Serotine (NSL)	3	2	66.7	1	33.3

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.9	Paragraph 3.2.9.1 / Table 3-13 - Survey results for Crossing Point 8	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Explanation

A transcription/count error resulted in incorrect numbers being stated in paragraph 3.2.9.1 and Table 3-13. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 10

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.10	Paragraph 3.2.10.1 / Table 3-14 - Survey results for Crossing Point 9	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

3.2.10.1 A total of 130 bat passes were observed, of which; 11 (8.5%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 117 (90%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-14 - Survey results for Crossing Point 9

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	130	11	8.5	117	90
Common pipistrelle	59	5	8.5	54	91.5
Soprano pipistrelle	49	2	4.1	46	93.9
Myotis species	14	2	14.3	12	85.7
Serotine	4	[1]	25	2	50
Noctule-Leisler's-Serotine (NSL)	1	1	100	0	0
Plecotus species	3	0	0	3	100

Amended Text

3.2.10.1 A total of ~~130~~ 128 bat passes were observed, of which; 11 (8.~~5~~ 6%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 117 (~~90~~ 91.4%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.10	Paragraph 3.2.10.1 / Table 3-14 - Survey results for Crossing Point 9	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Table 3-14 - Survey results for Crossing Point 9

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	~~130~~ 128	11	8.~~5~~ 6	117	~~90~~ 91.4
Common pipistrelle	59	5	8.5	54	91.5
Soprano pipistrelle	~~49~~ 48	2	4.~~1~~ 2	46	~~93.9~~ 95.8
Myotis species	14	2	14.3	12	85.7
Serotine	~~4~~ 3	1	~~25~~ 33.3	2	~~50~~ 66.7
Noctule-Leisler's-Serotine (NSL)	1	1	100	0	0
Plecotus species	3	0	0	3	100

Explanation

A transcription/count error resulted in incorrect numbers being stated in paragraph 3.2.10.1 and Table 3-14. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 11

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.11	Paragraph 3.2.11.1 / Table 3-15 Survey results for Crossing Point 10	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

3.2.11.1 A total of 108 bat passes were observed, of which; nine (8.3%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 94 (87%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-15 - Survey results for Crossing Point 10

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	108	9	8.3	94	87.0
Common pipistrelle	73	5	6.8	64	87.6
Soprano pipistrelle	22	4	18.2	18	81.8
Myotis species	9	0	0	9	100
Noctule	2	0	0	1	50
Serotine	1	0	0	1	100

Amended Text

3.2.11.1 A total of ~~108~~ 102 bat passes were observed, of which; nine (~~8.3~~ 8.8%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with ~~94~~ 93 (~~87~~ 91.2%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-15 - Survey results for Crossing Point 10

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	~~108~~ 102	9	~~8.3~~ 8.8	~~94~~ 93	~~87.0~~ 91.2
Common pipistrelle	~~73~~ 69	5	~~6.8~~ 7.2	64	~~87.6~~ 92.8
Soprano pipistrelle	22	4	18.2	18	81.8
Myotis species	9	0	0	9	100

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.11	Paragraph 3.2.11.1 / Table 3-15 Survey results for Crossing Point 10	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Noctule	~~2~~ 1	0	0	1	~~50~~ 100
Serotine	1	0	0	1	100

Explanation

A typographic/transcription error resulted in the incorrect number being stated in paragraph 3.2.11.1 and Table 3-15. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 12

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.12	Paragraph 3.2.12.1	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

A total of 355 bat passes were observed, of which; 65 (18.31%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with 290 (81.69%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Amended Text

A total of 355 bat passes were observed, of which; ~~65~~ 68 (~~18.31~~ 19.15%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with ~~290~~ 287 (~~81.69~~ 80.84%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Explanation

A transcription error resulted in the incorrect number being stated in paragraph 3.2.12.1 whilst the correct number was stated in Table 3-16. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 13

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.13	Paragraph 3.2.13.1 / Table 3-17 - Survey results for Crossing Point 12	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

3.2.13.1 A total of 83 bat passes were observed, of which; 58 (69.8%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 24 (28.9%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-17 - Survey results for Crossing Point 12

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	83	58	69.8	24	28.9
Common pipistrelle	61	45	73.7	15	24.5
Soprano pipistrelle	14	8	57.1	6	42.8
Myotis species	5	2	40	3	60
Barbastelle	1	1	100	0	0
Serotine	1	1	100	0	0
Plecotus species	1	1	100	0	0

Amended Text

3.2.13.1 A total of ~~83~~ 82 bat passes were observed, of which; 58 (~~69.8~~ 70.7%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 24 (~~28.9~~ 29.3%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-17 - Survey results for Crossing Point 12

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	~~83~~ 82	58	~~69.8~~ 70.7	24	~~28.9~~ 29.3
Common pipistrelle	~~61~~ 60	45	~~73.7~~ 75.0	15	~~24.5~~ 25.0
Soprano pipistrelle	14	8	57.1	6	42.~~8~~ 9

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.13	Paragraph 3.2.13.1 / Table 3-17 - Survey results for Crossing Point 12	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Myotis species	5	2	40	3	60
Barbastelle	1	1	100	0	0
Serotine	1	1	100	0	0
Plecotus species	1	1	100	0	0

Explanation

A typographic error resulted in the incorrect number being stated in paragraph 3.2.13.1 and Table 3-17. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 14

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.14	Paragraph 3.2.14.1 / Table 3-18 - Survey results for Crossing Point 13	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

3.2.14.1 A total of 51 bat passes were observed, of which; two (3.9%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 46 (90.2%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-18 - Survey results for Crossing Point 13

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	51	2	3.9	46	90.2
Common pipistrelle	26	2	7.69	21	80.76
Soprano pipistrelle	1	0	0	1	100
Myotis species	24	0	0	24	100

Amended Text

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.14	Paragraph 3.2.14.1 / Table 3-18 - Survey results for Crossing Point 13	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

3.2.14.1 A total of ~~51~~ 48 bat passes were observed, of which; two (~~3.9~~ 4.2%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 46 (~~90.2~~ 95.8%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-18 - Survey results for Crossing Point 13

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	~~51~~ 48	2	~~3.9~~ 4.2	46	~~90.2~~ 95.8
Common pipistrelle	~~26~~ 23	2	~~7.69~~ 8.7	21	~~80.76~~ 91.3
Soprano pipistrelle	1	0	0	1	100
Myotis species	24	0	0	24	100

Explanation

A typographic error resulted in the incorrect number being stated in paragraph 3.2.14.1 and Table 3-18. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 15

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.15	Paragraph 3.2.15.1 / Table 3-19 - Survey results for Crossing Point 14	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

3.2.15.1 A total of 309 bat passes were observed, of which; 259 (83.8%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 43 (13.9%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-19 - Survey results for Crossing Point 14

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	309	259	83.8	43	13.9

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.15	Paragraph 3.2.15.1 / Table 3-19 - Survey results for Crossing Point 14	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Common pipistrelle	205	174	84.9	27	13.2
Soprano pipistrelle	57	50	87.7	6	10.5
Myotis species	18	11	61.1	5	38.9
Serotine	29	24	82.8	5	17.2

Amended Text

3.2.15.1 A total of ~~309~~ 302 bat passes were observed, of which; 259 (~~83.8~~ 85.8%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 43 (~~13.9~~ 14.2%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-19 - Survey results for Crossing Point 14

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	~~309~~ 302	259	~~83.8~~ 85.8	43	~~13.9~~ 14.2
Common pipistrelle	~~205~~ 201	174	~~84.9~~ 86.6	27	~~13.2~~ 13.4
Soprano pipistrelle	~~57~~ 56	50	~~87.7~~ 89.3	6	~~10.5~~ 10.7
Myotis species	~~18~~ 16	11	~~61.1~~ 68.8	5	~~38.9~~ 31.3
Serotine	29	24	82.8	5	17.2

Explanation

A typographic error resulted in the incorrect number being stated in paragraph 3.2.15.1 and Table 3-19. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 16

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.16	Paragraph 3.2.16.1 / Table 3-20 - Survey results for Crossing Point 15	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

3.2.16.1 A total of 148 bat passes were observed, of which; 124 (83.7%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 22 (14.8%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-20 - Survey results for Crossing Point 15

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	148	124	83.7	22	14.8
Common pipistrelle	113	93	82.3	18	15.9
Soprano pipistrelle	13	10	76.9	3	14.8
Myotis species	10	10	100	0	0
Barbastelle	4	4	100	0	0
Serotine	7	6	85.7	1	14.28
Plecotus species	1	1	100	0	0

Amended Text

3.2.16.1 A total of ~~148~~ 146 bat passes were observed, of which; 124 (~~83.7~~ 84.9%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe crossing height, with 22 (~~14.8~~ 15.1%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-20 - Survey results for Crossing Point 15

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
All bat species	~~148~~ 146	124	~~83.7~~ 84.9	22	~~14.8~~ 15.1
Common pipistrelle	~~113~~ 111	93	~~82.3~~ 83.8	18	~~15.9~~ 16.2
Soprano pipistrelle	13	10	76.9	3	~~14.8~~ 23.1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.16	Paragraph 3.2.16.1 / Table 3-20 - Survey results for Crossing Point 15	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Myotis species	10	10	100	0	0
Barbastelle	4	4	100	0	0
Serotine	7	6	85.7	1	14.28
Plecotus species	1	1	100	0	0

Explanation

A typographic error resulted in the incorrect number being stated in paragraph 3.2.16.1 and Table 3-20. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 17

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.17	Paragraph 3.2.17.1	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

A total of 214 bat passes were observed, of which; 66 (30.8%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with 147 (68.7%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Amended Text

A total of 214 bat passes were observed, of which; 66 (30.8%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with ~~147 (68.7%)~~ 148 (69.1%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Explanation

A transcription error resulted in the incorrect number being stated in paragraph 3.2.23.1 whilst the correct figure was stated in Table 3-21. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR, Chapter 8 - Biodiversity, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 18

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.18	Paragraph 3.2.18.1 / Table 3-22 - Survey results for Crossing Point 21	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

3.2.18.1 A total of 197 bat passes were observed, of which; two (1.0%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with 195 (99.0%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-22 - Survey results for Crossing Point 21

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
Common pipistrelle	51	1	2	50	98
Soprano pipistrelle	141	1	0.5	140	99.5
Leisler's	1	1	50	1	50
Noctule	2	1	50	1	50
Noctule-Leisler's-Serotine (NSL)	1	0	0	1	100
Bat species	1	0	0	1	100

Amended Text

3.2.18.1 A total of ~~197~~ 198 bat passes were observed, of which; ~~two (1.0%)~~ four (2.0%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with ~~195 (99.0%)~~ 194 (98.0%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-22 - Survey results for Crossing Point 21

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
Common pipistrelle	51	1	2	50	98
Soprano pipistrelle	141	1	~~0.5~~ 0.7	140	~~99.5~~ 99.3
Leisler's	~~1~~ 2	1	50	1	50
Noctule	2	1	50	1	50

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.18	Paragraph 3.2.18.1 / Table 3-22 - Survey results for Crossing Point 21	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Noctule-Leisler's-Serotine (NSL)	1	0	0	1	100
Bat species	1	0	0	1	100

Explanation

A transcription/typographic error resulted in the incorrect numbers being stated in paragraph 3.2.18.1 and Table 3-22. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 – Biodiversity, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 19

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.20	Paragraph 3.2.20.1 / Table 3-24 - Survey results for Crossing Point 23	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

3.2.20.1 A total of 40 bat passes were observed, of which; eight (20.0%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with 32 (80.0%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-24 - Survey results for Crossing Point 23

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
Common pipistrelle	6	2	25	4	75

Amended Text

3.2.20.1 A total of 40 bat passes were observed, of which; ~~eight~~ 11 (~~20.0~~ 27.5%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with ~~32~~ 29 (~~80.0~~ 72.5%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-24 - Survey results for Crossing Point 23

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
Common pipistrelle	6	2	~~25~~ 33.3	4	~~75~~ 66.7

Explanation
A typographic error resulted in the incorrect number being stated in paragraph 3.2.20.1 and Table 3-24. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 20

Section	**Paragraph / Table**	**Location**
3.2.21	Paragraph 3.2.21.1 / Table 3-25 - Survey results for Crossing Point 24	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

3.2.21.1 A total of 143 bat passes were observed, of which; 19 (13.3%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with 124 (86.7%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-25 - Survey results for Crossing Point 24

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
Bat species	2	1	15	1	50

Amended Text

3.2.21.1 A total of 143 bat passes were observed, of which; ~~19 (13.3%)~~ 18 (12.5%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with ~~124 (86.7%)~~ 125 (87.4%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-25 - Survey results for Crossing Point 24

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
Bat species	2	1	~~15~~ 50	1	50

Explanation
A typographic error resulted in the incorrect number stated in paragraph 3.2.21.1 and Table 3-25. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity in relation to bats, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 21

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.22	Table 3-26 - Survey results for Crossing Point 25	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

Table 3-26 - Survey results for Crossing Point 25

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
Common pipistrelle	6	0	0	7	100
Soprano pipistrelle	12	0	0	1	100
Noctule	1	0	0	6	100
Bat species	7	0	0	12	100

Amended Text

Table 3-26 - Survey results for Crossing Point 25

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
Common pipistrelle	6	0	0	~~7~~ 6	100
Soprano pipistrelle	12	0	0	~~1~~ 12	100
Noctule	1	0	0	~~6~~ 1	100
Bat species	7	0	0	~~12~~ 7	100

Explanation

A transcription error resulted in the misalignment of data in column five of Table 3-26. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR, Chapter 8 - Biodiversity, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 22

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.23	Paragraph 3.2.23.1	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		
A total of 114 bat passes were observed, of which; 21 (18.4%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with 93 (81.6%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.		
Amended Text		
A total of ~~114~~ 113 bat passes were observed, of which; ~~21 (18.4%)~~ 17 (15.0%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with ~~93 (81.6%)~~ 96 (85.0%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.		
Explanation		
A transcription error resulted in the incorrect number stated in paragraph 3.2.23.1 whilst the correct number was stated in Table 3-27. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity , as set out in Section 8.9.3.		

Erratum 23

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.24	Paragraph 3.2.24.1 / Table 3-28 - Survey results for Crossing Point 28	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		

3.2.24.1 A total of 1,142 bat passes were observed, of which; 37 (3.2%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with 1105 (96.8%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-28 - Survey results for Crossing Point 28

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
Common pipistrelle	649	9	1.4	640	98.6
Soprano pipistrelle	477	25	5.2	472	94.8
Plecotus species	1	0	0	1	100
Noctule	5	2	40	3	60
Myotis species	1	0	0	1	100
Bat species	7	5	71.4	2	28.6

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.24	Paragraph 3.2.24.1 / Table 3-28 - Survey results for Crossing Point 28	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Amended Text

3.2.24.1 A total of ~~1,142~~ 1,160 bat passes were observed, of which; ~~37 (3.2%)~~ 41 (3.5%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with ~~1105 (96.8%)~~ 1,119 (96.5%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Table 3-28 - Survey results for Crossing Point 28

Species	No. of passes observed	No. of passes observed using the feature safely	% passing at a safe height	No. of passes observed crossing - unsafe height	% passing at an unsafe height
Common pipistrelle	649	9	1.4	640	98.6
Soprano pipistrelle	~~477~~ 497	25	~~5.2~~ 5.0	472	~~94.8~~ 95.0
Plecotus species	1	0	0	1	100
Noctule	5	2	40	3	60
Myotis species	1	0	0	1	100
Bat species	7	5	71.4	2	28.6

Explanation

A transcription error resulted in incorrect numbers stated in paragraph 3.2.24.1 and Table 3-28. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity, as set out in Section 8.9.3.

Erratum 24

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.25	Paragraph 3.2.25.1 / Table 3-29	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

A total of 15 bat passes were observed, of which; two (13.3%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with observed to 13 (86.7%) be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.

Amended Text

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.25	Paragraph 3.2.25.1 / Table 3-29	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
A total of ~~15~~ 18 bat passes were observed, of which; ~~two (13.3%)~~ three (16.7%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with ~~13 (86.7%)~~ 15 (83.3%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.		
Explanation		
A transcription error resulted in the incorrect number stated in paragraph 3.2.25.1 whilst the correct number was stated in Table 3-29. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR, as set out in Section 8.9.3.		

Erratum 25

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.26	Paragraph 3.2.26.1	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		
A total of 167 bat passes were observed, of which; 22 (13.2%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with 145 (86.8%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.		
Amended Text		
A total of 167 bat passes were observed, of which; ~~22 (13.2%)~~ 27 (16.2%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with ~~145 (86.8%)~~ 140 (83.8%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.		
Explanation		
A transcription error resulted in the incorrect number stated in paragraph 3.2.26.1 whilst the correct number was stated in Table 3-30. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.		

Erratum 26

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.27	Paragraph 3.2.27.1	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		
A total of 237 bat passes were observed, of which; 14 (5.9%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with 223 (94.1%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.		
Amended Text		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.27	Paragraph 3.2.27.1	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
A total of ~~237~~ 463 bat passes were observed, of which; 14 ~~(5.9%)~~ (3.0%) were considered to be using the feature at a safe height, with ~~223 (94.1%)~~ 449 (97.0%) observed to be crossing at an unsafe height and within the collision zone of potential traffic.		
Explanation		
A transcription error resulted in the incorrect number stated in paragraph 3.2.27.1, however, the correct number was stated in Table 3-31. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis as the correct figures were accounted for in the baseline data and therefore the assessment undertaken. As such, this correction does not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity, as summarised in Section 8.9.3.		

2.5. EAR Technical Appendix 8-9: Bat Habitat and Tree Roost Interim- Baseline Survey

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
Executive Summary	First paragraph	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		
WSP was commissioned by Highways England to undertake preliminary bat roost assessments and emergence / re-entry surveys on structures within a Field Survey Area extending to 100 metres from the Scheme options in 2017 and to 100 metres from the preferred route, Option 5A, for the A27 Arundel Bypass Scheme to establish whether bat roosts are present.		
Amended Text		
WSP was commissioned by Highways England to undertake preliminary bat roost assessments and emergence / re-entry surveys on ~~structures~~ trees within a Field Survey Area extending to 100 metres from the Scheme options in 2017 and to 100 metres from the preferred route, Option 5A, for the A27 Arundel Bypass Scheme to establish whether bat roosts are present.		
Explanation		
A typographic error is corrected, Technical Appendix 8-9 relates to trees not structures. It is clear that all other information presented in this report relates to trees. This erratum does not affect the outcome of data analysis and does not influence the conclusion of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity.		

Erratum 2

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location

3.1.1	Paragraph 3.1.1.1	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		
The desk study generated 564 bat records within the Desk Study Area, 162 of which were roost records. All records are provided in Figure 1. A total of 56 records of roosting bats were from structures (referred to in the WSP bat structures report [36]).		
Amended Text		
The desk study generated 564 bat records within the Desk Study Area, 162 of which were roost records. All records are provided in ~~Figure 1~~ Map 3 in Appendix A. A total of 56 records of roosting bats were from structures (referred to in the WSP bat structures report [36]).		
Explanation		
This correction is the result of a typographical error. Map 3 in Appendix A is the correct reference for this information. Correct information from Map 3 was fed through into the baseline of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 – Biodiversity and thus the conclusions drawn summarised in Section 8.9.3 are unchanged.		

2.6. EAR Technical Appendix 8-10: Breeding Bird Interim Baseline Survey

Erratum 1

Section	**Paragraph / Table**	**Location**
Appendix F	Paragraphs 2.1.1.1, 2.3.1.3, 2.4.1.1 and Appendix F	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text / Amended Text		
An additional map is provided in Attachment C which is appended to this errata document..		
Explanation		
Due to a document compilation error, the breeding bird transect map was omitted from Appendix F. This map is provided in Attachment C of this document. This erratum does not affect the conclusions drawn in the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity as this data was taken into account in the baseline data and assessments, the conclusions summarised in Section 8.9.3 relating to birds are unchanged.		

Erratum 2

Section	**Paragraph / Table**	**Location**
3.1.1	Paragraph 3.1.1.6	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		
The following four sites are not included in Table 3-1 as these are not designated for their value to birds: Fairmile Bottom (LNR); Warningcamp		
Amended Text		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.1.1	Paragraph 3.1.1.6	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
The following three sites are not included in Table 3-1~~; as these are not designated for their value to birds: Fairmile Bottom (LNR);~~ Warningcamp Hill and New Down LWS, Polling Copse LWS and Avisford Notable Road Verge as these are not designated for their value to birds.		
Explanation		
The names of the three LWS's which are not of value to birds were omitted from this paragraph. They are now added. This erratum does not affect the conclusions drawn in the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity as the confirmation of sites which are not of importance for birds is a procedural requirement for a desk study and has no material bearing on the assessment of potential effects on birds. Effects on designated sites are separately assessed in the EAR and the conclusions summarised in 8.9.3 are unaffected.		

2.7. EAR Technical Appendix 8-11: Wintering Birds Baseline Report

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.1.1	Paragraph 3.1.1.9	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		
The Desk Study identified one non-statutory site of value to wintering birds: Arun Valley, Watersfield to Arundel and Arundel Park Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA).		
Amended Text		
The Desk Study identified one non-statutory site of value to wintering birds: Arun Valley, Watersfield to Arundel Local Wildlife Site ~~and Arundel Park Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA)~~.		
Explanation		
This correction is the result of a typographical error. Arundel Park BOA is not a non-statutory designation, it is a policy/opportunity map targeting suitable locations to undertake habitat creation and other nature conservation activities. This erratum does not affect the conclusion of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity. Accurate baseline information for the BOA is provided in Table 8-2 and effects on non-statutory sites are summarised in Section 8.9.3 and they remain unchanged.		

Erratum 2

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.3	Paragraphs 3.2.3.1 and 3.2.3.2	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		
3.2.3.1 Fifty-five species were recorded in total through vantage point surveys. Table 3-3 shows the species observed whilst carrying out the vantage point survey at the River Arun, excluding passerines as these		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.3	Paragraphs 3.2.3.1 and 3.2.3.2	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
birds that are not at risk of collision with structures that might be built across the River Arun. The full dataset is located in Appendix E, Table E-1. 3.2.3.2 Thirty-six species of non-passerines were recorded as follows, as detailed in Table 3-3:		
Amended Text		
3.2.3.1 Fifty ~~five~~ nine species were recorded in total through vantage point surveys. Table 3-3 shows the species observed whilst carrying out the vantage point survey at the River Arun, excluding passerines as these birds that are not at risk of collision with structures that might be built across the River Arun. The full dataset is located in Appendix E, Table E-1. 3.2.3.2 Thirty-six species of notable non-passerines were recorded as follows, as detailed in Table 3-3:		
Explanation		
This correction is the result of a typographical error. Paragraph 3.2.3.1 should sum as fifty nine (= 36 non-passerines stated in paragraph 3.2.3.2 + 14 notable passerine species stated in paragraph 3.2.3.3 + 9 non-notable passerines listed in paragraph 3.2.3.4). In addition, an error in paragraph 3.2.3.2 is corrected (the word 'notable' should be inserted). These corrections do not alter the conclusions of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity. The bird baseline was accurately summarised in paragraph 8.6.4.128 onward of the EAR and was fed through into the assessment, the conclusions of which are summarised in Section 8.9.3. The conclusions remain unchanged.		

2.8. EAR Technical Appendix 8-13: Amphibian 2019 Update Survey Report

Errata

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.1.4	Paragraph 3.1.4.1	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text / Amended Text		
The corrected Technical Appendix 8-13 is provided in Attachment D which is appended to this errata document.		
Explanation		
Several errors were identified in Technical Appendix 8-13. Each of these errata relate to transcription errors between raw great crested newt count data collected in the field and data reported in in the main body of the report. The correct raw baseline data was fed into the baseline of the PCF Stage 2 EAR Chapter 8 - Biodiversity and therefore the conclusions summarised in Section 8.9.3 remain unchanged. For ease of reference, a corrected copy of Technical Appendix 8-13 with each of these issues corrected is provided as Attachment D of this document.		

2.9. EAR Technical Appendix 8-19: Otter and Water vole Baseline Survey Report

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
Executive Summary	Executive Summary	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

Highways England is undertaking an Environmental Assessment of three Scheme options for the A27 Arundel Bypass to inform option selection.

WSP was commissioned by Highways England to undertake comprehensive surveys of habitat within and adjacent to the Scheme options to advise on legalisation and planning and biodiversity policy requirements applying to the habitats found.

Phase 1 Habitat surveys were undertaken 2017 and 2018 during optimum survey times using standard techniques. A desk study investigating habitats recorded by third party organisations was also completed. The results of the field surveys and desk study were used to create a Phase 1 Habitat Map for the Field Survey Area. The Phase 1 Habitat types present within areas that were unable to be accessed for survey were identified from aerial photography.

The following Phase 1 Habitat types were recorded within the Field Survey Area (from most to least frequent): broadleaved semi-natural woodland, arable, improved grassland, poor semi-improved grassland, mixed plantation woodland, semi-improved grassland, buildings, hard standing, amenity grassland, standing water, marsh/marshy grassland, broadleaved plantation woodland, dens/continuous scrub, tall ruderal, swamp, broadleaved scattered trees/parkland, mosaic, unimproved neutral grassland, scattered plants saltmarsh, mixed semi-natural woodland, introduced shrub, bracken, scattered scrub, ephemeral/sort perennial, intertidal mud/sand and inundation vegetation.

The following linear Phase 1 Habitat types were also recorded within the Field Survey Area (from most to least frequent): species-poor intact hedgerow, running water, ditch, species-poor hedgerow with trees, native species-rich hedgerow with trees, species-poor defunct hedge, native species-rich intact hedge and native species-rich defunct hedge.

Fourteen Habitats of Principal Importance (HPI) were identified within the Field Survey Area. Of these, Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh HPI and Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland HPI covered large parts of the Field Study Area. Other HPIs present included Arable Field Margin, Hedgerow, Reedbed, River, Lowland Heathland, Lowland Meadow, Pond, Saltmarsh, Wet Woodland and Wood Pasture and Parkland. Much of the woodland habitat is ancient woodland.

Amended Text

~~Highways England is undertaking an Environmental Assessment of three Scheme options for the A27 Arundel Bypass to inform option selection.~~

~~WSP was commissioned by Highways England to undertake comprehensive surveys of habitat within and adjacent to the Scheme options to advise on legalisation and planning and biodiversity policy requirements applying to the habitats found.~~

~~Phase 1 Habitat surveys were undertaken 2017 and 2018 during optimum survey times using standard techniques. A desk study investigating habitats recorded by third party organisations was also completed. The results of the field surveys and desk study were used to create a Phase 1 Habitat Map for the Field Survey Area. The Phase 1~~

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
Executive Summary	Executive Summary	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

~~Habitat types present within areas that were unable to be accessed for survey were identified from aerial photography.~~

~~The following Phase 1 Habitat types were recorded within the Field Survey Area (from most to least frequent): broadleaved semi-natural woodland, arable, improved grassland, poor semi-improved grassland, mixed plantation woodland, semi-improved grassland, buildings, hard standing, amenity grassland, standing water, marsh/marshy grassland, broadleaved plantation woodland, dens/continuous scrub, tall ruderal, swamp, broadleaved scattered trees/parkland, mosaic, unimproved neutral grassland, scattered plants saltmarsh, mixed semi-natural woodland, introduced shrub, bracken, scattered scrub, ephemeral/sort perennial, intertidal mud/sand and inundation vegetation.~~

~~The following linear Phase 1 Habitat types were also recorded within the Field Survey Area (from most to least frequent): species-poor intact hedgerow, running water, ditch, species-poor hedgerow with trees, native species-rich hedgerow with trees, species-poor defunct hedge, native species-rich intact hedge and native species-rich defunct hedge.~~

~~Fourteen Habitats of Principal Importance (HPI) were identified within the Field Survey Area. Of these, Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh HPI and Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland HPI covered large parts of the Field Study Area. Other HPIs present included Arable Field Margin, Hedgerow, Reedbed, River, Lowland Heathland, Lowland Meadow, Pond, Saltmarsh, Wet Woodland and Wood Pasture and Parkland. Much of the woodland habitat is ancient woodland.~~

This report sets out interim baseline survey results for otter and water vole in the vicinity of the A27 Arundel Bypass Scheme.

A desk study and field survey were undertaken. No evidence of otter was found within the Field Survey Area, which extended 0.25 km from the outer boundary of the Scheme Options footprint, and it is concluded that this species is absent from the area. However, large parts of the Field Survey Area provide suitable habitat to support this species and it is likely that otter will colonise the River Arun catchment in the future given that it is present in neighbouring Hampshire.

It is recommended that the Scheme Options should be designed to ensure undisturbed habitats are available for future foraging and holt construction and that otter is able to pass through the Scheme area unhindered by road infrastructure.

Extensive evidence of water vole was identified, principally concentrated on the River Arun floodplain (both east and west of the River Arun).

It is recommended that the scheme should be designed such that undisturbed habitats are available for water vole foraging and burrow construction and that the effects of severance of water vole habitat is minimised by appropriately designed mitigation that allows animals to move unhindered through the landscape.

Explanation

The correct executive summary is given for the otter and water vole report, replacing a document compilation error which caused the Phase 1 habitat survey executive summary to be reported instead of the otter/water vole survey executive summary. The contents of the otter/water vole report are otherwise correct and this baseline fed into Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR and thus the conclusions drawn in relation to otter and water vole as summarised in Section 8.9.3 are unchanged.

Erratum 2

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
2.4.1	Paragraph 2.4.1.1	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		
In these locations, approximately 50% of each watercourses and ponds surveyed could be fully inspected for signs of otter and water vole.		
Amended Text		
In these locations, approximately 50% of the shoreline of each watercourse and pond ~~of each watercourses and ponds surveyed~~ could be fully inspected for signs of otter and water vole.		
Explanation		
This is a correction to the original text suggesting that there was a lack of access to 50% of waterbodies. The replacement text makes clear it was in fact simply 50% of the shoreline of the waterbodies. The correct baseline fed into the Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR and thus the conclusions drawn in relation to otter and water vole summarised in Section 8.9.3 remain unchanged.		

2.10. EAR Technical Appendix 8-20: Phase 1 Habitat Baseline Survey Report

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
5	Figure 4: Phase 1 Habitat Vegetation Sample Locations	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text / Amended Text		
The corrected Figure 4 is provided in Attachment E which is appended to this errata document		
Explanation		
A page showing the west part of the Field Survey Area in Figure 4 was omitted due to a technical error. The missing map sheet is provided as Attachment E of this document. All data, including that from the west of the Field Survey Area, was used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR and thus the conclusions drawn in relation to habitats as summarised in Section 8.9.3 are unchanged.		

Erratum 2

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.17	Paragraph 3.2.17.2	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		
Thirty-five waterbodies were identified within the Field Survey Area. These are described in the great crested newt interim report[40]. The Mid-Arun Valley Environmental Survey recorded seasonally wet ponds within the woodlands and fields as well as large permanent ponds described as having a good diversity of species. The ponds surveyed		

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.17	Paragraph 3.2.17.2	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
by the Mid-Arun Valley Environmental Survey around Binsted village supported various species including Nationally Scarce and Sussex Scarce water soldier at Sandy Hole Pond, and bogbean (Menyanthes trifoliata) at Madonna Pond. The latter is considered by the Mid-Arun Valley Environmental Survey to be relatively uncommon in Sussex.		
Amended Text		
~~Thirty-five waterbodies~~ Sixty four ponds and 100 waterbodies and were identified within the Field Survey Area. These are described in the great crested newt interim report[40]. The Mid-Arun Valley Environmental Survey recorded seasonally wet ponds within the woodlands and fields as well as large permanent ponds described as having a good diversity of species. The ponds surveyed by the Mid-Arun Valley Environmental Survey around Binsted village supported various species including Nationally Scarce and Sussex Scarce water soldier at Sandy Hole Pond, and bogbean (Menyanthes trifoliata) at Madonna Pond. The latter is considered by the Mid-Arun Valley Environmental Survey to be relatively uncommon in Sussex.		
Explanation		
A typographical error lead to an incorrect number of waterbodies and ponds being stated which are in the Field Survey Area of all six scheme options combined. However, the correct number of waterbodies was incorporated into the baseline within Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR and thus informed the conclusions drawn in relation to habitats as summarised in Section 8.9.3.		

Erratum 3

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.25	Paragraph 3.2.25.1	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		
Hedgerows are widespread across the entire Field Survey Area. 47 hedgerows were recorded during field surveys. The hedgerows are shown in Figure 5 and detailed survey data is summarised in Appendix D.		
Amended Text		
Hedgerows are widespread across the entire Field Survey Area. ~~47~~ 49 hedgerows were recorded during field surveys. The hedgerows are shown in Figure 5 and detailed survey data is summarised in Appendix D.		
Explanation		
Typographic error caused by a duplication of two of the hedgerow codes in the table presented in Appendix D (the labels for 36 and 19 are duplicated in the table, however, the data presented relates to four unique hedges). All raw data presented in Appendix D is accurate and was used to inform the baseline of Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR, and thus the conclusions drawn in relation to habitats as summarised in Section 8.9.3 remain unchanged.		

2.11. EAR Technical Appendix 8-21: Reptile Baseline Survey Report

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
2.3.3	Table 2-5 Population categories for each reptile species depending on maximum number of adults seen in one day	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

Table 2-5 - Population categories for each reptile species depending on maximum number of adults seen in one day

	Low Population *Score 1*	Good Population *Score 2*	Exceptional Population *Score 3*
Adder	< 5	5 – 10	> 10
Grass snake	< 5	5 - 10	> 10
Common lizard	< 5	5 - 10	> 10
Slow-worm	< 5	5 - 10	> 10

Amended Text

Table 2-5 - Population categories for each reptile species depending on maximum number of adults seen in one day

	Low Population *Score 1*	Good Population *Score 2*	Exceptional Population *Score 3*
Adder	< 5	5 – 10	> 10
Grass snake	< 5	5 - 10	> 10
Common lizard	< 5	5 – ~~10~~ 20	> ~~10~~ 20
Slow-worm	< 5	5 – ~~10~~ 20	> ~~10~~ 20

Explanation

Typographical error; good population score for common lizard and slow-worm should read 10-20 and an exceptional population score should be shown as >20. This error is confined to the method only. Correct baseline information was used to inform the baseline presented in Chapter 8: Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR and thus conclusions drawn in relation to reptiles, summarised in Section 8.9.3, remain unchanged.

Erratum 2

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.2	Table 3-2, Table 3-4	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

Table 3-2 - Total numbers of reptile species recorded during each survey visit in 2017

Survey visit	Adder		Grass Snake		Common Lizard		Slow worm	
	Adult count	Juvenile/sub-adult count	Adult count	Juvenile/sub-adult count	Adult count	Juvenile/sub-adult count	Adult count	Juvenile/sub-adult count
1	1	0	1	6	8	5	14	3
2	0	0	0	0	7	12	14	0
3	0	0	0	5	3	5	5	3
4	0	0	3	3	3	1	6	1
5	0	2	2	9	7	11	12	1
6	0	1	2	1	9	7	9	2
7	0	0	0	2	9	14	1	0
Maximum adult count	1		8		46		61	

Table 3-4 - Total numbers of reptile species recorded during each survey visit in 2018

Survey visit	Adder		Grass Snake		Common Lizard		Slow worm	
	Adult count	Juvenile/sub-adult count	Adult count	Juvenile/sub-adult count	Adult count	Juvenile/sub-adult count	Adult count	Juvenile/sub-adult count
1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	1
2	0	0	0	0	4	0	3	1
3	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	2
4	0	0	2	1	4	1	7	2
5	0	0	0	0	2	0	10	14

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.2	Table 3-2, Table 3-4	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

6	0	0	0	1	2	0	17	8
7	0	0	0	0	3	0	11	3
Maximum adult count	0		4		22		96	

Amended Text

Table 3-2 - Total numbers of reptile species recorded during each survey visit in 2017

Survey visit	Adder		Grass Snake		Common Lizard		Slow worm	
	Adult count	Juvenile/sub-adult count	Adult count	Juvenile/sub-adult count	Adult count	Juvenile/sub-adult count	Adult count	Juvenile/sub-adult count
1	1	0	1	6	8	5	14	3
2	0	0	0	0	7	12	14	0
3	0	0	0	5	3	5	5	3
4	0	0	3	3	3	1	6	1
5	0	2	2	9	7	11	12	1
6	0	1	2	1	9	7	9	2
7	0	0	0	2	9	14	1	0
Maximum adult count	1		~~8~~ 3		~~46~~ 9		~~61~~ 14	

Table 3-4 - Total numbers of reptile species recorded during each survey visit in 2018

Survey visit	Adder		Grass Snake		Common Lizard		Slow worm	
	Adult count	Juvenile/sub-adult count	Adult count	Juvenile/sub-adult count	Adult count	Juvenile/sub-adult count	Adult count	Juvenile/sub-adult count
1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.2.2	Table 3-2, Table 3-4	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

2	0	0	0	0	4	0	3	1
3	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	2
4	0	0	2	1	4	1	7	2
5	0	0	0	0	2	0	10	14
6	0	0	0	1	2	0	17	8
7	0	0	0	0	3	0	11	3
Maximum adult count	0		~~4~~ 2		~~22~~ 4		~~96~~ 17	

Explanation

This correction is the result of a typographical error. Table 3-2 and Table 3-4 should list the maximum adult count on any one occasion, not the summed count across all survey occasions. Correct baseline information was used to inform Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR, and thus the conclusions drawn in relation to reptiles (summarised in Section 8.9.3) remain unchanged.

2.12. EAR Technical Appendix 8-23: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal

Erratum 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
Appendix C	Appendix C: Target Notes	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text / Amended Text

The corrected Target Note data is provided in Attachment F which is appended to this errata document

Explanation

Target note data was provided in Appendix C and photos of each target note were provided in Appendix D. However, grid references for target notes were not supplied. For ease of reference these are now provided as Attachment F in this document. Correct baseline information was fed through into Chapter 8 – Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR and thus the conclusions summarised in Section 8.9.3 are unchanged.

Erratum 2

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.4.1	Paragraph 3.4.1.1 and Appendix B	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)

Existing Text

The potential for the Field Survey Area to support legally protected species and notable species has been assessed using the results of the desk study and observations made during the site survey of habitats within and immediately

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.4.1	Paragraph 3.4.1.1 and Appendix B	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
surrounding the Field Survey Area. A summary of desk study information is included within Appendix B. Habitats present within the Field Survey Area are suitable for the following species; further consideration is given below to the likelihood for these species to be present within the Field Survey Area:		
Amended Text		
No correction to text necessary.		
Explanation		
Owing to a technical error at the document compilation stage, Appendix B only contains invertebrate desk study information, rather than data relating to all species. Appendix B has been corrected and is provided with this document as Attachment G. All desk study data (both invertebrate and non-invertebrate data) was fully incorporated into the baseline of Chapter 8 - Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR and thus the conclusions summarised in Section 8.9.3 remain unchanged.		

Erratum 3

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
2.2.1	Paragraph 2.1.1.1	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		
▪ Field Survey Area – a zone of up to 0.25 kilometres from the outer boundary of the Scheme options footprint where Highways England Phase 1 habitat and protected and notable species surveys have not previously been undertaken. The Field Survey Area encompassed the entire Scheme option footprint, where surveys have not previously been undertaken, extending to 0.2 kilometres from the outer extent of the Scheme options to cover land that could be subject to indirect impacts from the Scheme.		
Amended Text		
▪ Field Survey Area – a zone of up to 0.25 kilometres from the outer boundary of the Scheme options footprint where Highways England Phase 1 habitat and protected and notable species surveys have not previously been undertaken. This ~~The~~ Field Survey Area ~~encompassed the entire Scheme option footprint, where surveys have not previously been undertaken, extending to 0.2 kilometres from the outer extent of the Scheme options to~~ covered land that could be subject to direct and indirect impacts from the Scheme.		
Explanation		
The correct Field Survey Area for Phase 1 habitat survey is 0.25 km. Superfluous text provided in error has been deleted. Accurate Phase 1 habitat survey information in a Field Survey Area extending 0.25 km from the scheme options was used to inform the assessment presented in Chapter 8 – Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR (and is mapped in Figure 8-7 of the EAR). Thus, the conclusions summarised in Section 8.9.3 remain unchanged.		

Erratum 4

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.4	Paragraph 3.4.5.4 Second bullet point	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		
▪ Two breeding Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 Schedule 1 species have been identified; Cetti's warbler (Cettia cetti) on the Arun floodplain and firecrest (Regulus ignicapilla) in Barn's Copse, Binsted Wood Complex LWS and Rewell Wood Complex.		
Amended Text		
▪ Four ~~Two~~ breeding Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 Schedule 1 species have been identified; Cetti's warbler (*Cettia cetti*) on the Arun floodplain, ~~and~~ firecrest (*Regulus ignicapilla*) in Barn's Copse, Binsted Wood Complex LWS and Rewell Wood Complex LWS, barn owl (*Tyto alba*) in various locations, and peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*);a fledgling was recorded at a single location.		
Explanation		
The correct number of Schedule 1 bird species is now stated in the text. Correct data was used to inform the baseline of Chapter 8 – Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR, and thus the conclusions summarised in Section 8.9.3 remain unchanged.		

Erratum 5

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
3.4.9	Paragraph 3.4.9.3	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text		
Water vole surveys undertaken by Highways England in 2017 and 2018 confirmed that the complex network of ditches associated with the floodplain on the west and east of the River Arun showed widespread evidence of water vole use[44]. Evidence recorded included multiple latrines, burrows, feeding remains, runs and a single record of water vole encountered dead. The majority of water vole evidence was concentrated in ditches in the River Arun floodplain, both to the east and west of the River Arun. Desk study records indicate water vole are present in this area but field surveys did not confirm this.		
Amended Text		
Water vole surveys undertaken by Highways England in 2017 and 2018 confirmed that the complex network of ditches associated with the floodplain on the west and east of the River Arun showed widespread evidence of water vole use[44]. Evidence recorded included multiple latrines, burrows, feeding remains, runs and a single record of water vole encountered dead. The majority of water vole evidence was concentrated in ditches in the River Arun floodplain, both to the east and west of the River Arun. ~~Desk study records indicate water vole are present in this area but field surveys did not confirm this.~~		

Explanation
Typographic error. The report makes clear in numerous locations that water vole field evidence was widespread as does the baseline of Chapter 8 – Biodiversity of the PCF Stage 2 EAR. Thus, the conclusions drawn in relation to water vole (summarised in Section 8.9.3) remain unchanged.

2.13. EAR Technical Appendix 8-25: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment

Errata 1

Section	Paragraph / Table	Location
Various	Various	All Scheme options (Baseline conditions)
Existing Text / Amended Text		
The corrected Technical Appendix 8-25 is provided in Attachment E which is appended to this errata document		
Explanation		
Several errata were identified owing to a table mis-referencing technical error which cascaded through numerous pages affecting the multiple table title captions. For ease of reference, the report is provided as Attachment H with all errors corrected.		