6.4 APPENDIX TO CHAPTER 6 – Comparison Table (parent application EcIA (2019) vs amended EIAR Chapter 6 (2026))

Appendix 6-4 Comparison Table (parent application EcIA (2019) vs amended EIAR Chapter 6 (2026))

Receptor / Topic	Parent Application EcIA (2019 SHD / 2021 surveys)	Current EIAR Chapter (2025/2026)	Change in Impact Assessment	Change in Mitigation	Justification for Change / Continuity
Proposed Development (Overall Design)	Permitted SHD (ABP-303804-19): 291 units, 14 blocks (2–8 storeys), layout with defined building zones and open space structure	Amended LRD: 414 units (+123 units) Residential-led Mixed Use Development, revised building heights/massing (1–8 storeys), omission/reconfiguration of blocks (e.g. D1, E blocks), increased density, revised landscape plan and green infrastructure	No change in type of ecological effects (habitat loss, disturbance), but potential intensity of pressure slightly increased due to density; mitigated through improved design	Strengthened landscape-led design; enhanced habitat retention (woodland area), SuDS, bat-friendly lighting, habitat creation	Amendments increase built footprint locally but also enhance ecological infrastructure (planting, buffers, connectivity); therefore, impacts remain comparable in significance to parent scheme with improved mitigation outcomes
Survey Baseline	Baseline surveys undertaken 2018–2021 (Scott Cawley); limited bat activity; badger presence noted; urban bird assemblage	Updated surveys (2023–2026) incl. walkovers, breeding bird surveys, bat static, emergence, and transect surveys, camera traps for badger/mammals	Increased confidence in baseline; ecological conditions at the Site; confirmation of ongoing ecological use (e.g. badger activity; breeding gulls)	Additional targeted surveys (camera traps, updated bat work)	Required to reflect temporal updates and ensure compliance with CIEEM best practice; provides more robust baseline but does not fundamentally alter ecological value
Habitats (General)	Similar habitat mosaic; woodland, hedgerows, scrub retained in part	Habitats largely unchanged; some demolition of structures; refined layout	No material change in habitat value classification (still local importance higher for key habitats)	Continued retention of key habitats; enhanced planting strategy	Amendments do not significantly alter habitat baseline; continuity maintained; mitigation refined rather than replaced
Hedgerows & Treelines	Recognised as key commuting corridors; partial removal anticipated	Same ecological function confirmed; retained as primary green infrastructure	Impact remains slight negative locally (construction loss + disturbance)	Strengthened protection (root protection, retention, connectivity design)	Design iteration prioritises retention; mitigation carried forward and strengthened, not altered fundamentally
Broadleaved Woodland	Woodland retained; minor disturbance risk	Woodland retained; designated habitat preservation area introduced	Impact reduced from potential disturbance to controlled/limited effect	New Habitat Preservation Area (restricted access, buffers)	Design evolution reduces disturbance risk; mitigation improved to ensure long-term protection

Receptor / Topic	Parent Application EcIA (2019 SHD / 2021 surveys)	Current EIAR Chapter (2025/2026)	Change in Impact Assessment	Change in Mitigation	Justification for Change / Continuity
Bats	Low activity; no roosts recorded; moderate habitat suitability	Low–moderate activity confirmed; moderate roost potential retained (precautionary approach due to survey limitations)	Impact classification unchanged (moderate without mitigation)	Enhanced bat-friendly lighting strategy; habitat connectivity strengthened	Precautionary principle applied due to survey limitations in 2025, which were then confirmed and strengthened with 2026 bat survey effort; mitigation expanded rather than changed to ensure compliance
Birds	Urban assemblage; low suitability for SPA species	28 species recorded; confirmed breeding herring gull at St. Teresa's House; swift recorded foraging but not breeding on Site	Slight increase in sensitivity due to confirmed breeding herring gull	Inclusion of seasonal restrictions and consideration of breeding gulls (robust mitigation included to include pre construction, construction, and post-construction measures)	Updated survey confirms species presence; mitigation refined accordingly; no change to overall significance level
Badger	Sett present with limited activity; territory use identified	Camera traps confirm intermittent active use by ≥2 individuals	Increase in certainty of use; impact remains moderate without mitigation	Introduction of buffers (10–20 m), habitat preservation area, NPWS engagement provisions	New data refines understanding but does not change receptor value; mitigation enhanced to ensure legal compliance
Other Mammals (Hedgehog etc.)	Potential presence based on habitat	Same conclusion (likely presence, no direct records)	No change	Standard construction mitigation maintained (checks, escape routes)	No change required; baseline remains consistent
Reptiles (Common Lizard)	Not specifically emphasised	Potential presence identified based on habitat	Minor increase in receptor recognition	Inclusion of precautionary measures (timing, checks)	Reflects updated ecological guidance; precautionary update, not a design-driven change
Invasive Species	Presence identified (limited extent)	Same species recorded (Spanish bluebell, three-cornered garlic, etc.)	No change in impact (risk of spread)	Continued biosecurity and management measures	No substantive change; continuity maintained
Designated Sites / AA	AA concluded no significant effects on European sites	Updated AA/NIS confirms no adverse effect on integrity	No change	Continued reliance on CEMP, SuDS, pollution control embedded in project design and NIS	Consistent conclusions; updated assessment confirms previous findings remain valid
Hydrological Pathways	Potential pathway via Carysfort Stream identified	Same pathway confirmed; assessed via AA/NIS	No change (risk mitigated)	Continued robust drainage and CEMP measures	Design retains drainage controls; impact remains negligible

Receptor / Topic	Parent Application EcIA (2019 SHD / 2021 surveys)	Current EIAR Chapter (2025/2026)	Change in Impact Assessment	Change in Mitigation	Justification for Change / Continuity
Lighting	Standard mitigation for lighting proposed	Detailed bat-friendly lighting strategy introduced (hierarchy, lux control, temperature limits)	Operational impact reduced from moderate (unmitigated) to slight/negligible	Enhanced lighting design (directional, low lux, warm spectrum)	Reflects best practice (BCT/ILP guidance); mitigation significantly strengthened
Overall Habitat Loss	Partial habitat loss anticipated	Similar extent of loss under amended layout	No change (slight local negative)	Compensatory planting and enhanced green infrastructure	Design refinements offset loss through improved landscape/ecological integration
Cumulative Impacts	Considered; no significant effects identified	Updated review of planning applications; same conclusion	No change	No additional mitigation required	Consistent planning context; no new cumulative risks identified
Overall Conclusions	**No significant impacts with mitigation**	**Same conclusion maintained**	**No change in overall significance**	**Mitigation refined, expanded, but not fundamentally altered**	**Amendments do not materially change ecological conclusions; improvements provide stronger safeguards**