**From:** Dominic Woodfield [<mailto:dominicwoodfield@bioscanuk.com>]   
**Sent:** 02 May 2017 17:10  
**To:** Matthew Parry; Planning  
**Cc:** Haidrun Breith; Nick Bowles; David Lowe; Adrian Colwell; Charlotte Frizzell; David Peckford; Caroline Bulman; Matthew Jackson; Nigel Bourn; Neil Clennell; Euesden, Olivia (NE); Charlotte Watkins  
**Subject:** Gavray Drive West - 15/00837/OUT

Dear Matthew

I have today noted that some of my several recent submissions on the matter of biodiversity offsetting calculations and the need for management of the LWS have been uploaded, but not all.

I therefore attach again my calculation for this application (Gavray West), as was attached to my e-mail of 20th April  and which draws attention to the applicant's failure to factor in any indirect impacts on the LWS from the proposed development on adjacent land at Gavray West.

We have since communicated about this further, and the latest position you provided to me was that "We do not consider that we would have sufficiently strong grounds to demonstrate that the proposed development would materially harm the LWS".  
  
I and others have provided evidence that suggests that the grounds for such a conclusion are actually very strong indeed. What may have also escaped attention however is that **the applicants themselves provide clear evidence of an anticipated significant residual negative effect on the LWS from the proposed development at Gavray West**.   
  
For example, the following statement is taken from the ES (para 9.5.17)  
  
"It is considered that during the post-completion stage of the Proposed Development Gavray Drive Meadows LWS is at risk of potential adverse effect as a result of increased recreational pressure resulting from increased housing provision. Increased recreational pressure has the potential to damage and degrade valuable ground flora and trees through trampling and littering, and disturb associated fauna occurring within the LWS including birds, great crested newts and reptiles. The effects of increased recreational pressure as discussed above are considered to have been partially inherently mitigated through the open space provision shown on the submitted Parameter Plan. The resulting effect is considered to be minor adverse (permanent) and of significance at the local level"

I repeat the point that this significant negative residual net effect would not comply with Policy Bicester 13. It also corroborates the conclusion indicated by the attached calculator output I provided to you on 20th April, and further underlines the lack of weight that can be attached to the BIA submissions from EDP which can now be seen to contradict the conclusions they themselves reached in the ES.

I hope that, reminded of this information, you would agree that officers are now in possession of plenty of evidence of a likely significant net negative effect on the LWS and biodiversity, which provides ample grounds to require the applicant to deliver the Ecological Management Plan as required by the policy.

Best regards

Dominic Woodfield
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