

GN40: BREEAM and HQM Ecology Assessment Issues Reporting Template

Applicability of this Guidance Note (GN) to the BREEAM Family of Schemes (BREEAM and HQM)

This guidance is primarily aimed at the Home Quality Mark (HQM) and BREEAM UK New Construction 2018. Please refer to the most up to date version of the relevant technical manual being assessed against to ensure that this guidance note can be used. Where the term 'Assessor' is used in this document this refers to the BREEAM or HQM Assessor as appropriate.

Purpose and Scope of this Guidance Note

The purpose of this guidance note is to help Assessors relate the information generated during the project, to the BREEAM or HQM ecology assessment issues in the scheme being used for assessment. The guidance in this document has been produced to support the assessment of these issues and should not be interpreted as criteria. This GN should be read alongside the corresponding technical manual being assessed against to ensure all criteria are met and the methodology section has been followed.

Use of this document as a template is optional. If the Assessor chooses to use the template provided within this guidance note as evidence, all relevant sections must be completed.

The completed document can be used by the Assessor along with all relevant project documentation to demonstrate compliance with the BREEAM or HQM criteria.

Evidence Used to Demonstrate Compliance

Evidence does not need to be prepared specifically for the purpose of the BREEAM or HQM assessment. Wherever possible the Assessor should source readily available project information to demonstrate compliance. For this reason, BREEAM is generally not prescriptive on the type of evidence required, although some issues do require specific documents to be provided.

The Assessor and project team will find that many assessment issues require more than one piece or type of information to demonstrate compliance with one criterion. However, in some instances, a single piece of information may be enough to demonstrate compliance with multiple criteria.

To help project teams and the Assessor understand how the different types of building information documentation they collate can be used as evidence at each stage of assessment, the evidence types are grouped broadly into three categories:

1. General evidence type
2. Specific evidence type
3. Other evidence type.

For some assessment issues, the Assessor will require a mix of general and specific evidence types. For more guidance see the Evidence sections of the relevant technical manual.

Sections in this Document

Section A: Scheme, Assessment Route and Contact Details (both assessment routes)

- Section A1: Identifies the BREEAM family scheme the project has been assessed under.
- Section A2: Contact details for the assessment
- Section A3: Prerequisite: Statutory obligations
- Section A4: Identifies the assessment route that has been used for the project.

Section B: Foundation Route/Route 1 Assessments Only

- Section B1: Requests a list of the organisations/experts which were consulted in support of the assessment of the ecology assessment issues.
- Section B2: Collects information and summarises evidence to support the assessment of the ecology issues.
- Section B3: Signature of Validation

Section C: Comprehensive Route/Route 2 Assessments Only

- Section C1: Determines whether the appointed ecologist is 'suitably qualified' as defined by BREEAM
- Section C2: Collects information and summarises evidence to support the assessment of the ecology issues
- Section C3: Signature of Validation

Supporting Notes:

- 1) There are four core assessment issues which relate to ecology (exact titles may vary according to scheme):
 - Ecological risks and opportunities
 - Managing impacts on ecology
 - Ecological change and enhancement
 - Long term ecology management and maintenance
- 2) Only the appointed qualified and licensed Assessor can confirm if a credit, or equivalent, is met for a BREEAM or HQM assessment.
- 3) If the Assessor assists in the completion of this document, the project team member (for Foundation route) or the ecologist (for Comprehensive route) must complete and sign the Signature of Validation to confirm the contents are accurate.
- 4) In some instances, this guidance note refers to actions that have already been taken. However, for design stage assessments, some of these actions may not have been taken yet (e.g. mitigation measures before construction has started). Where this is the case, answers should reflect what will happen based on commitments and plans in place, with evidence submitted to support this as referred to in the Evidence sections of the relevant technical manual being assessed against.

Section A: Scheme, Assessment Route and Contact Details

Section A1: Information About the BREEAM Family Scheme the Development/Project has Been Assessed Under

1. Please enter the full name of the scheme including version, revision number and year (e.g. BREEAM UK New Construction 2018, V3.0) being assessed against:

BREEAM UK New Construction 2018, V3.0

2. Please add the project details:

BRE project reference number (if known):

Development name: Greyfriars Church

Development address: Greyfriars Church, Friar St, Reading, RG1 1EH

Section A2: Contact Details

Project team member (Foundation route) or Ecologist (Comprehensive route) details

Company name: JBKS Architects,

Company address: Suite 1, Parkwood Stud, London Road, Aston Rowant, Oxfordshire, OX49 5SP

Contact name: Katie Duggan

Project team member or ecology report reference (where applicable):

Developer/Client details

Company name: Greyfriars Church

Company address: Friar St, Rading, RG1 1EH

Contact name:

Section A3: Prerequisite: Statutory Obligations

To proceed with the assessment please ensure the client or designated representative (e.g. contractor) has confirmed that compliance is being monitored against all relevant UK and EU or international legislation relating to the ecology of the site?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, please provide details on all relevant current UK and EU legislation that relates to the site:

Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) - general protection afforded to nesting birds and certain animals such as bats.

If no, the points below are not applicable as none of the assessment issues referred to in GN40 can be achieved.

Section A4: Assessment Route Used for the Development/Project

3. Which assessment route is being used for the project?

- ☐ Foundation route (Route 1 – Project team member) – GO TO SECTION B
- ☒ Comprehensive route (Route 2 – Ecologist) – GO TO SECTION C

Section B – Foundation/Route 1 Assessments

Section B1: Recognised Local Ecological Expertise

Please list the names and websites of the organisations who provided recommendations, specialist input or guidance which supported the assessment of the site:

Section B2: Criteria Checklist – Foundation Route

This section asks for information to support the assessment of the Ecology Issues using the Foundation route (Project team member).

Assessment Issue: Ecological Risks and Opportunities

HQM: Issue 2.1
New Construction: LE 02

Survey and Evaluation

1. Has the BREEAM, HQM Ecology Risk Evaluation Checklist ([GN34](#)) been completed?

Guidance Note 34

Yes ☐ No ☐

Determining the Ecological Outcomes for the site

2. Have the survey and evaluation criteria been achieved?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Note: If no, the points below are not applicable, and the assessment issue cannot be achieved.

3. During Concept Design, did the project team liaise and collaborate with representative stakeholders to identify and consider ecological outcomes (appropriate to the scale and type of development) for the project?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

4. Was the Survey and evaluation of the site carried out prior to the project preparation and brief, allowing time for the outcome to influence the planning of the project/site ensuring maximum ecological outcomes specified in the relevant technical manual?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

Guidance Note: GN40

V0.1 June 2020

5. Was this done in accordance with the following hierarchy of actions for those applicable for the foundation route?

5a. Avoidance 5b. Protection

Yes ☐ No ☐

Please provide a brief statement for each action explaining how this was done/each point in the hierarchy was achieved:

Hierarchy of actions	How was this done?
Avoid	
Protect	

Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Wider Site Sustainability

*HQM: Only available for Comprehensive route
New Construction: Exemplary level criteria*

6. Where the assessor has determined that the related set of criteria is applicable, were the wider site sustainability-related activities and the potential for ecosystem service-related benefits also considered when determining the ecological outcomes for the site?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

--

Guidance Note: GN40

V0.1 June 2020

Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Evidence Submission

Evidence is required to support the above statements and confirm compliance with this assessment issue. See the beginning of this GN for guidance about evidence types acceptable to submit.

Please record the project specific information relevant for demonstrating compliance with this assessment issue. Include an appropriate reference, such as ID number or document title, for each document:

Description	Reference or Title

Assessment Issue: Managing Impacts on Ecology

HQM: Issue 2.2
New Construction: LE03

Prerequisite – Ecological Risks and Opportunities

1. Have the relevant criteria (see respective technical manual) in the Ecological Risks and Opportunities assessment issue been met?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Note: If no, the points below are not applicable, and the assessment issue cannot be achieved.

Planning and Measures On-Site/Liaison, Implementation and Data

2. Were roles and responsibilities clearly defined, allocated and implemented to support successful delivery of project outcomes at an early enough stage to the ecological outcomes on the site by influencing the project brief and concept design stages?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

--

Guidance Note: GN40

V0.1 June 2020

3. Were site preparation and construction works planned for and implemented at an early project stage to optimise benefits and outputs?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

4. Did the project team liaise and collaborate with representative stakeholders, taking into consideration data collated and shared, to implement actions and selected measures, during site preparation and construction works?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining how this was achieved:

Managing Negative Impacts

5. Were negative impacts from site preparation and construction works managed according to the hierarchy set out within the methodology for the relevant assessment scheme via one of the following?

Avoidance of negative impacts on habitats and features of ecological value on the site.

Yes ☐ No ☐

Or

Avoidance of negative impacts, protection of habitats and features of ecological value from damage in accordance with best practice guidelines during development works.

Yes ☐ No ☐

For the option selected, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Guidance Note: GN40

V0.1 June 2020

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Evidence Submission

Evidence is required to support the above statements and confirm compliance with this assessment issue. See the beginning of this GN for guidance about evidence types acceptable to submit.

Please record the project specific information relevant for demonstrating compliance with this assessment issue. Include an appropriate reference, such as ID number or document title, for each document:

Description	Reference or Title

Assessment Issue: Ecological Change and Enhancement

HQM: Issue 2.3
New Construction: LE 04

Project/Site Overview

1. Please provide a brief description of the site being developed making clear features of the site which can be classified as linear (foliage and watercourse) and area-based habitats:

--

Prerequisite – Managing Impacts on Ecology

2. Have the relevant criteria (see respective technical manual) in the managing impacts on ecology site assessment issue been met?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Note: If no, the points below are not applicable, and the assessment issue cannot be achieved.

Change and Enhancement of Ecology/Liaison, Implementation and Data

3. Did the project team, liaising and collaborating with representative stakeholders and taking into consideration data collated and shared, implement locally relevant measures/actions to enhance the site?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Were the measures/actions adopted based on recommendations from recognised 'local' ecological expertise and specialist input and guidance?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Please briefly summarise the recommendations made and measures/actions implemented:

--

Evidence Submission

Evidence is required to support the above statements and confirm compliance with this assessment issue. See the beginning of this GN for guidance about evidence types acceptable to submit.

Please record the project specific information relevant for demonstrating compliance with this assessment issue. Include an appropriate reference, such as ID number or document title, for each document:

Description	Reference or Title

Assessment Issue: Long Term Ecology Management and Maintenance

HQM: Issue 2.4
New Construction: LE 05

The layout of assessment content varies depending on the scheme therefore this part of the GN captures the key issues assessed and supports the inclusion of information relevant to demonstrate compliance against this issue.

Prerequisite – Planning and Site Implementation

1. Have the relevant criteria (see respective technical manual) in the Change and Enhancement of Ecological Value assessment issue been met?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Note: If no, the points below are not applicable, and the assessment issue cannot be achieved.

Management and Maintenance Throughout the Project

2. Did the project team liaise and collaborate with representative stakeholders, taking into consideration data collated and shared, with respect to the measures and actions implemented to:
 - 2a. monitor and review implementation and the effectiveness
 - 2b. develop and review management and maintenance actions or measures.

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining how this was achieved:

3. Taking into consideration the assessment criteria in the scheme technical manual which the project is being assessed against please:
 - 3a. summarise the monitoring and reporting arrangements/actions in place for the project/site (e.g. monitoring mitigation and enhancement measures taken during site clearance and construction)
 - 3b. show how these demonstrate compliance against the criteria
 - 3c. include justifications about why these were deemed appropriate to the nature and scale of the project

4. As part of the tenant or building owner information supplied, has a section been included on Ecology and Biodiversity to inform the owner or occupant of local ecological features, value and biodiversity on or near the site and any related management requirements?

Landscape and Ecology Management Plan

5. Was the Landscape and ecology management plan, or similar, developed in accordance with BS 42020:2013 section 11.1 covering as a minimum the first five years after project completion?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Were any sections or items listed in the criteria or methodology relating to the scope and content of the plan deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Evidence Submission

Evidence is required to support the above statements and confirm compliance with this assessment issue. See the beginning of this GN for guidance about evidence types acceptable to submit.

Please record the project specific information relevant for demonstrating compliance with this assessment issue. Include an appropriate reference, such as ID number or document title, for each document:

Description	Reference or Title

Section B3: Signature of Validation

I confirm the information provided in this document is truthful and accurate at the time of completion.

Name of project team member: _____

Signature of project team member: _____

Date: _____

Guidance Note: GN40

V0.1 June 2020

3. Are you bound by a professional code of conduct and subject to peer review*?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, please provide details including which organisation you are a full member of:

Full member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM)
Chartered environmentalist (CEnv)

***Note:** a full member of one of the following organisations is bound by a professional code of conduct and subject to peer review: Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management (CIWEM); Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM); Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA); Landscape Institute (LI); Institute of Environmental Sciences (IES); Royal Society of Biology; Institute of Environmental Sciences.

Peer review is defined as the process employed by a professional body to demonstrate that potential or current full members maintain a standard of knowledge and experience required to ensure compliance with a code of conduct and professional ethics.

If 'no' has been answered for any question in this section (C1), the requirements for carrying out an assessment using the comprehensive route have not been met and no credits or points can be awarded for any ecology assessment issues under the comprehensive route. Please refer to Section B2 and follow the process for the foundation route (Route 1) if a suitably qualified ecologist has not been appointed.

Section C2: Criteria Checklist – Comprehensive Route

Assessment Issue: Ecological Risks and Opportunities

HQM: Issue 2.1
New Construction: LE 02

Survey and Evaluation

1. Was an appropriate individual(s) appointed at a project stage that ensured early involvement in site configuration and, where necessary, could influence strategic planning decisions?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, briefly describe the role and relevance of the individual(s) to the project and project stage in meeting the above point:

Matt Pickard of MPEcology was commissioned to survey the site for potential constraints to development and to provide information in support of BREEAM.

2. Was there an appropriate level of survey and evaluation carried out to determine the ecological baseline of site considering the zone of influence to establish:

2a. Current and potential ecological value and condition of the site, and related areas within the zone of influence.

2b. Direct and indirect risks to current ecological value

2c. Capacity and feasibility for enhancement of the ecological value of the site and, where relevant, areas within the zone of influence

Yes ☒ No ☐

Guidance Note: GN40

V0.1 June 2020

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

In October 2017 MPEcology were commissioned to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment of the buildings subject to the proposed development in order to identify constraints and inform planning. A visit in January 2019 was undertaken to provide a pre-assessment for BREEAM.

3. Was the Survey and evaluation of the site carried out early enough to influence the planning of the project/site ensuring maximum ecological outcomes specified in the relevant technical manual?

Yes, and before project preparation and brief ☒

Yes, but not before project preparation and brief ☐

No ☐

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

Surveys were carried out in advance of project commencement although the location and limitations of the site inhibited significant ecological enhancement proposals.

Note: if 'yes but not before project preparation and brief', please refer to the Knowledge base for further guidance: kb.breeam.com/

Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to point 3 above, deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate
The zone of influence and ecological value of the site were considered limited in addition to its capacity for enhancement. For instance trees associated with the site form an island with limited connectivity to other features.	Limitations in available land in a highly urbanised setting

4. Were data collated and shared with the project team to inform the site preparation, design or construction works?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

The survey work was commissioned by the project team to inform the design and subsequent construction works.

Determining the Ecological Outcomes

5. Have the survey and evaluation criteria been achieved?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Note: If no, the points below are not available, and the assessment issue cannot be achieved.

6. During Concept Design, did the project team liaise and collaborate with representative stakeholders to identify and consider ecological outcomes (appropriate to the scale and type of development) for the project?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

During the concept design stage and the planning stage of the project, landscape designs for the whole site have been developed.

7. Was the identification, appraisal and selection of specific actions/measures at a stage that allowed for the early influence of key project planning decisions?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Guidance Note: GN40

VO.1 June 2020

8. Was this done in accordance with the following hierarchy of actions:

8a. avoidance

8b. protection

8c. reduction or limitation of negative impacts

8d. on-site compensation and,

8e. enhancement, considering the capacity and feasibility within the site, or where viable, off-site.

Yes ☒ No ☐

Please provide a brief statement for each action explaining how this was done/each point in the hierarchy was achieved:

Hierarchy of actions	What was done?
Avoid	Trees were identified as key ecological features within a largely sterile site
Protect	Project design aimed to retain existing trees
Reduce/limit negative impacts	Existing planting beds / amenity grassland lost to the scheme were replaced
On-site compensation	Additional tree planting was designed into the scheme
Enhancement	Bird boxes have created nesting opportunities where previously absent

Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to point 9 above deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate
The 2019 BREEAM pre-assessment report suggested opportunities could include introduction of a water feature or green roof	The scale and location of the project was considered to limit opportunities for such features

9. Briefly describe the agreed ecological outcome for the site:

Planting beds and amenity grassland lost to the scheme were replaced and enhanced in the final design. The deployment of artificial nest boxes introduced opportunities where none previously existed.

Guidance Note: GN40

V0.1 June 2020

Wider Site Sustainability

*HQM: Only Available For Comprehensive Route
New Construction: Exemplary level criteria*

10. Where the assessor has determined that the related set of criteria is applicable, were the wider site sustainability-related activities and the potential for ecosystem service-related benefits also considered when determining the ecological outcome for the site?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

The retention of green space and introduction of opportunities to strengthen biodiversity resources within the wider landscape were a consideration. In particular, trees were considered important as carbon sinks in addition to their roles as biodiversity resources and affect on urban micro-climates.

Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate
Retention and enhancement of existing planting beds and amenity grassland was not possible.	Limitations in size of site

Evidence Submission

Evidence is required to support the above statements and confirm compliance with this assessment issue. See the beginning of this GN for guidance about evidence types acceptable to submit.

Please record the project specific information relevant for demonstrating compliance with this assessment issue. Include an appropriate reference, such as ID number or document title, for each document:

Description	Reference or Title
Identification of bird / bat constraints.	MPEcology (2017). Preliminary Roost Assessment, Greyfriars Church, Reading.
Phase 1 habitat survey and assessment	MPEcology (2019). Survey to inform BREEAM New Construction 2018 - Pre assessment of Greyfriars Church, Reading.

Assessment Issue: Managing Impacts on Ecology

HQM: Issue 2.2
New Construction: LE 03

Prerequisite: Ecological Risks and Opportunities

1. Have the relevant criteria (see respective technical manual) from the Identifying and understanding the risks and opportunities assessment issue been met for the project or site?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Note: If no, the points below are not applicable, and the assessment issue cannot be achieved.

Planning and Measures On-Site/Liaison, Implementation and Data

2. Were roles and responsibilities clearly defined, allocated and implemented to support successful delivery of project outcomes at an early enough stage to the ecological outcomes on the site by influencing the project brief and concept design stages?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

Planning to identify potential ecological risks was begun in 2017 when MPEcology were commissioned to undertake surveys for the project team.

3. Were site preparation and construction work planned for and implemented at an early project stage to optimise benefits and outputs?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

Surveys were commissioned to identify potential constraints and opportunities.

4. Did the project team liaise and collaborate with representative stakeholders, taking into consideration data collated and shared, implement measures/actions selected, during site preparation and construction works?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining how this was achieved:

During Design Team Meetings, the ecology of the site and landscaping were discussed with the wider Design Team.

Guidance Note: GN40

V0.1 June 2020

Managing Negative Impacts

5. Were negative impacts from site preparation and construction works managed according to the hierarchy set out within the methodology for the relevant assessment scheme via one of the following?

No overall loss of ecological value has occurred

Yes ☒ No ☐

Or

The loss of ecological value has been limited as far as possible

Yes ☐ No ☐

For the option selected, please provide a brief statement explaining how this was done:

Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate
Comprehensive planning to manage negative outcomes was not necessary given the limitations of the site. Namely: that negative impacts were avoided due to absence of significant features (with the exception of trees) and that ecological value could be maintained or minimised.	Apart from tree protection, negative impacts were so minimal that management was largely inappropriate. The larger trees associated with the site are located on council owned land and are covered by the Reading 2020 draft tree strategy which aims to safeguard the existing resource and plant an addition 3000 trees by 2030.

Evidence Submission

Evidence is required to support the above statements and confirm compliance with this assessment issue. See the beginning of this GN for guidance about evidence types acceptable to submit.

Please record the project specific information relevant for demonstrating compliance with this assessment issue. Include an appropriate reference, such as ID number or document title, for each document:

Description	Reference or Title
Phase 1 habitat survey and assessment	MPEcology (2019). Survey to inform BREEAM New Construction 2018 - Pre assessment of Greyfriars Church, Reading.

Assessment Issue: Ecological Change and Enhancement

HQM: Issue 2.3
New Construction: LE 04

Project/Site Overview

1. Please provide a brief description of the site being developed making clear features of the site which can be classified as linear (foliage and watercourse) and area-based habitats:

The site composed a church, hall and residential properties in a highly urbanised location within the centre of Reading. No linear or watercourse features were recorded (the closest significant feature being the River Thames 600m to the north).

2. Which change in ecological value methodology has been used for the site?

Full ☒ Simplified ☐

Where the simplified route was used please provide a brief explanation of why, including any assumptions made:

The Farm Environment Plan Manual (Natural England 2010) should generally be used to assess the condition of the habitats but this will not cover all habitat types and so will be inappropriate in some instances. If a different method has been used the SQE should explain why this has been selected and provide evidence to demonstrate its appropriateness for the site in question.

Prerequisite: Managing Impacts on Ecology

3. Have the relevant criteria (see respective technical manual) in 'The Managing the negative impacts on ecology site "assessment issue" been achieved?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Note: If no, the points below are not applicable, and the assessment issue cannot be achieved.

4. Where appropriate avoidance, mitigation and/or compensation measures have been agreed with the relevant statutory bodies for any potential impacts on legally protected species, SSSIs, ASSIs (Northern Ireland only), SACs, SPAs, Ramsar sites or irreplaceable habitats please briefly provide information about this:

N/A

Guidance Note: GN40

V0.1 June 2020

Ecological Enhancement

5. Did the project team, liaising and collaborating with representative stakeholders and taking into consideration data collated and shared, implement the measures/actions, selected in a way that enhances ecological value, in the following order:

4a. On site, and where this is not feasible,

4b. Off site within the zone of influence?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Please indicate what was pursued

On site enhancement ☒ Off-site enhancement ☐

6. Has relevant data been offered to the local environmental records centres nearest to, or relevant for, the site?

Yes ☐ No ☒ Not Applicable ☐

If not applicable, please explain why:

No protected or otherwise notable animal species were recorded. The few plant species recorded were common, widespread and unremarkable.

Change and Enhancement of Ecology/Liaison, Implementation, and Data

7. Where the calculation of the change in ecological value has been carried out in line with GN 36 – BREEAM, HQM Ecology Assessment Issues – Route 2, please confirm the BREEAM, HQM Change in Ecological Value tool has been completed and submitted as evidence.

Yes ☒ No ☐

8. In addition to completion of the calculation tool please confirm the following:

Habitat losses and gains relating to legally protected species are included in the calculations and have been clearly identified.

Yes ☒ No ☐

Linear and area biodiversity units have been calculated separately and losses and gains calculated for the Pre-Development and Post-Development scenarios are reported separately, i.e. per habitat type.

Yes ☒ No ☐

All site survey information and the data associated with the calculations are included within evidence provided. This may include date stamped photographs and GIS layers containing data on the habitat types.

Yes ☒ No ☐

Were any sections or items listed in the methodology corresponding to this point deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

Yes ☐ No ☒

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate
Collaboration throughout the project	The limited footprint of planting schemes and small scale nature of enhancement measures (such as installation of bird boxes) has limited the availability of comprehensive plans and decision making communication trails.

Guidance Note: GN40

V0.1 June 2020

Evidence Submission

Evidence is required to support the above statements and confirm compliance with this assessment issue. See the beginning of this GN for guidance about evidence types acceptable to submit.

Please record the project specific information relevant for demonstrating compliance with this assessment issue. Include an appropriate reference, such as ID number or document title, for each document:

Description	Reference or Title
Phase 1 habitat survey and assessment	MPEcology (2019). Survey to inform BREEAM New Construction 2018 - Pre assessment of Greyfriars Church, Reading.
GN36 Appendix C calculation	Greyfriars App C_May 2021
GN36 Appendix C supporting image	Greyfriars App C_May 2021 image

Assessment Issue: Long Term Ecology Management and Maintenance

HQM: Issue 2.4
New Construction: LE 05

The layout of assessment content varies depending on the scheme therefore this part of the GN captures the key issues assessed and supports the inclusion of information relevant to demonstrate compliance against this issue.

Prerequisite: Planning and Site Implementation

1. Have the relevant criteria (see respective technical manual) in the change and enhancement of ecological value assessment criteria been achieved?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Note: If no, the points below are not applicable, and the assessment issue cannot be achieved.

Management and Maintenance Throughout the Project

2. Did the project team liaise and collaborate with representative stakeholders, taking into consideration data collated and shared, on measures/actions implemented to:

2a. monitor and review implementation and the effectiveness

2b. develop and review management and maintenance measures/actions.

Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining how this was achieved:

A full arboricultural report was undertaken and a method statement written to protect existing and retained trees on site.

A landscape management plan for the site will also be written.

Guidance Note: GN40

V0.1 June 2020

3. Taking into consideration the assessment criteria in the scheme technical manual which the project is being assessed against please:
- 3a. summarise the monitoring and reporting arrangements/actions in place for the project/site
- 3b. show how these demonstrate compliance against the criteria
- 3c. include justifications about why these were deemed appropriate to the nature and scale of the project

Landscape (and ecological) management plan will be undertaken.

4. As part of the tenant or building owner information being supplied, has a section been included on Ecology and Biodiversity to inform the owner or occupant of local ecological features, value and biodiversity on or near the site and any related management requirements?

Landscape and Ecology Management Plan

5. Was the Landscape and ecology management plan, or similar, developed in accordance with BS 42020:2013(206) covering as a minimum the first five years after project completion?

Yes ☐ No ☐

Were any sections or items listed in the criteria or methodology relating to the scope and content of the plan deemed not appropriate due to the nature and scale of the project?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please list these and provide a brief statement explaining why they were deemed not appropriate:

Which sections or items	Why not appropriate

Evidence Submission

Evidence is required to support the above statements and confirm compliance with this assessment issue. See the beginning of this GN for guidance about evidence types acceptable to submit.

Please record the project specific information relevant for demonstrating compliance with this assessment issue. Include an appropriate reference, such as ID number or document title, for each document:

Description	Reference or Title

Section C3: Signature of Validation

I confirm the information provided in this document is truthful and accurate at the time of completion.

Name of ecologist: _____

Signature of ecologist: _____

Date: _____