

BEDDINGTON CONSERVATION SCIENCE GROUP
Minutes of Meeting

Date : **Friday 5th May 2021; 09:30-14:15**

Place : Microsoft Teams

Present:

David Warburton [DW]	London Borough of Sutton (Chair)
Charlie Owens (CO)	London Borough of Sutton (Reserve Warden)
Adrian Frost [AF]	Viridor Waste Management
Marcus Kohler [MK]	MKA Ecology
Derek Coleman [DC]	Sutton Group of London Wildlife Trust
Roy Dennis [RD]	Beddington Farmland Bird Group
Simon Chalcraft [SC]	London Borough of Sutton (Planning Enforcement)
Jonathan Downs [JD]	Viridor Waste Management
Muriel Alix [MA]	Viridor Waste Management

[Action Tracker](#)

1) Apologies

Martin Boyle (Mitcham Common Conservators); Ian Crump (Thames Water)

A) Introduction of Muriel Alix

- i) MA introduces herself as the new addition to the Viridor team. MA has a PhD in Freshwater Ecology from Cardiff university and specialised in invasive species, riverine habitat restoration and habitat compliance. MA adds that she has been working with Viridor for the last four years and joined the Beddington Farmlands restoration team in October 2020. She is confident that her background in ecology should aid Viridor in understanding the development of the Acid Grassland area.
- ii) AF adds that Muriel works within the landfill sector of Viridor and comes from within the Compliance Teams, who will be morphed into the Aftercare Team. MA will be leading the closure plan for the Beddington landfill operations. To close the landfill operations, Viridor must surrender

its landfill license to the EA. MA will collate all of the monitoring information for the site into a closure report to be submitted to the EA, after which the site will officially move from an active site to a closed landfill. MA is leading this process.

- iii) DW asks how MA will sit within the Aftercare Team, presumably run by Pete Walker.
- iv) AF responds that the structure of this team is still in its infancy following the KKR takeover. MA is in landfill but will have a more central role within the aftercare team. AF adds that Jason Bean is the Aftercare Steward and MA will feed into JB's work.

2) Minutes of Last Meeting to be agreed and actions undertaken

DW asks if all are in agreement with the minutes from the previous meeting. Following no objections the minutes have been 'temporarily' agreed. Those missing from the meeting (MK (1st 15 minutes), MB & IC) need to be given a specific opportunity to make comments on those minutes prior to release.

3) CAMC update

DW asks if there are any comments, questions or concerns arising from the previous [CAMC](#).

No comments from any participants

4) Thames Water update

- A) Site Watering Report: There has been no progress at this date into securing funding / EA required data collection for recycling of final effluent through the historic lagoons.
- B) General Update: TW continue to support conservation activities and commitment to post-works management plan in partnership with Viridor / Sutton council.

5) Site Restoration Update

- A) Meadowlands
 - i) AF starts by saying that he met with MK, DW and RW back in April to discuss the conditions of the meadowlands and acid grasslands
 - ii) It was clear from this meeting and MKA's CSM that the meadowlands site lacks the positive indicators and a high proportion of negative/invasive/noxious weeds species are present.
 - iii) AF suggests that the best course of action would be to take a 'slash and burn' approach and in effect, start again with a blank sheet. This would tie in with the development of the Acid Grassland area (due to start this quarter). However, he acknowledges that this would cause a significant reduction in habitat.
 - iv) AF adds that this 'fresh start' approach would tie in with the proposed fencing works on the meadowlands. The old/unsuitable fence paddocks

would be removed as planned but AF would be keen to postpone installation of a new, stock appropriate, fence. With no fence installed, the entire area could be cultivated as one large scale operation.

- v) DW notes that due to the large scale elimination of invertebrate habitat under a 'scorched earth approach to meadowland resetting, it might be a better idea to work in a phased approach. I.e acid grassland this year and meadowlands in 2022. Should this be the case, the meadowlands weed burden would still require work this year to prevent colonization on fresh, disturbed soils on the Acid Grassland area.
- vi) AF agrees and says that some spot treatment should be considered this year
- vii) DW is concerned about the considerable amounts of negative indicator species shown in the CSM and NVC data. He adds that site indicator species are in the process of review given the site conditions. DW acknowledges that it would be difficult to work around the negative indicators without harming/reducing the positives. Furthermore, there is a requirement to deal with negative indicator species across the whole site as any left untreated presents an issue for any disturbed/restored/fresh soils.
- viii) AF says that the banks of the meadowlands have not been treated/managed in any way whatsoever and that he suspects much of the weed spp. seed stock originates from here. These areas were originally left for the benefit of avifauna. AF is keen to bring the banks into the meadowlands restoration area within this proposed larger scale restoration.
- ix) DW responds that this sounds sensible but we need to be cautious in relation to the bank scrub habitats which have benefits to resident and migratory passerines.
- x) MK adds that he is not aware/concerned about the scrub islands on the western bank but there may be within the bramble on the southern bank (particularly whitethroat). There is sufficient habitat and beneficial edge habitat close by for those passerine species but does add that interfaces [ecotones] are very important for many species.
- xi) MK says that he is not so certain that weed seed would come from here and suspects that much of the seed burden is from within the soils.
- xii) MK asks if the equipment Viridor has are suited to bank management due to the gradients.
- xiii) AF acknowledges that this is a management issue and that there will be some areas which machines will be unable to access.
- xiv) DW adds that CO has equipment within the Tools & Equipment list that are designed for bank management so that these areas can be managed. DW also asks CO if the banks have been included in the MLMP [MeadowLands Management Plan].
- xv) CO responds no, but that this can be easily fixed.

ACTION ⇒ CO to add meadowlands banks into the MLMP

- xvi) DW asks if members from the BFBG have any comments
- xvii) RD asks when the fencing will be removed
- xviii) AF replies that this work will take place post breeding season, mid-August at the earliest. This work may take place sooner but does not want to commit to a date.
- xix) DW adds that in previous CSG, AF had committed to fence removal by the end of July at the latest, as this would then allow time for other works to take place.
- xx) CO adds that if the banks are to have soil restoration operations this summer/autumn that there would still need to be a plan and approach to deal with the central meadowlands weed burden.
- xxi) MK agrees that this work would be valuable
- xxii) DW recommends that the sward be kept quite short and two to three cuts are likely to be necessary to preventing the weed seed burdens.
- xxiii) MK adds that the meadowlands have previously been a valuable habitat for skylark and that caution should be applied prior to work taking place.
- xxiv) JD noted one singing on the western flank by the north lake
ACTION ⇒ CO to monitor for skylark activity
- xxv) DW says that CO needs to closely monitor the sward height and work with MK and AF to book in contractors as necessary. This will be a reactive response to site conditions.
ACTION ⇒ CO, AF, MK to work together to ensure that two to three cuts are used to reduce the possibility of weed seed developing.
- xxvi) AF mentions that he has engaged with contactors in regards to Acid Grassland spraying at a third of the cost
- xxvii) AF also noted that he was seeking to source suitable implements for the tractor, which had undergone significant servicing / repairs, so that some management could be undertaken in house
- xxviii) DW noted that CO was chatting to Ernest Doe in Esher and that previous Viridor staff had also explored options with them, so this was a worthwhile place to start to seek second hand or lease equipment.

B) Fencing & Grazing

- i) JD updates that the Wet Grassland Phase 1 fence has been installed. The fencing skirt is 90% buried at this time. All the infrastructure is in. JD adds that the gates do not as yet have concrete pads underneath and that the northernmost gate is tight to the ground and the southern gate already has an old concrete pad covering some of the underlying area.
- ii) DW asks for some clarification on the concrete pads, as when DW last visited, both gates had rubble /cobbles in use to block gaps and if this has been remediated.
- iii) AF responds that no, remedial works have not taken place and that this is still the case but 4 concrete pads were to go in, in due course.

- iv) DW stated that this needed a swift and definitive resolution, as foxes were noted within the wet grassland.
- v) AF noted that a fox had buried under the skirt near the pylon on the northern side but this had now been filled in, so under the gates may not be the issue.
- vi) CO offers to undertake a full fence inspection once Viridor confirms that it is a sealed unit.
ACTION ⇒ CO to undertake a full fence inspection to confirm that P1 is a sealed unit.
- vii) CO also says that the crank close to the bird hide has been pulled down by intruders seeking wider access and that this requires remediation.
- viii) RD adds that there are still several gaps/holes in the site perimeter fence allowing easy access to intruders.
- ix) CO adds that yes, this is the case and that intruders on site is not just a Health & Safety concern but also one that relates to wildlife crime. There have been reports of intruders disturbing nests on lake islands and images of intruders using catapults to fire at wildlife. Given the dual issues here, is there a way that the restoration team can have Viridor undertake a full perimeter check and instigate a process to have these issues resolved?
- x) AF says that this is not a priority for the restoration team at present, as the site will be open to the public in due course.
- xi) DC is in agreement with AF for the most part but acknowledges that there will be areas of the site not open to public access, particularly the north.
- xii) DW adds that ASB should reduce once the site is open to the public. DW does think that the fence north of the Mile Road does need to be fixed.
- xiii) JD noted that the mesh covering the top viewing ports for the wet grassland hide had now been removed in full, following vandalism that had partly wrenched these off.
- xiv) All noted that once Phase 1 fencing is completely sealed, this would be reevaluated, if a fox was seen in the wet grasslands again but the chances of a fox gaining access through this hide were deemed remote.
- xv) RD states that he has heard that there is a significant hole in the southern fenceline, offering easy access to the site, where it joins with Beddington Park
ACTION ⇒ Viridor to investigate and repair, if necessary
- xvi) RD asks for an update on the grazing regime
- xvii) JD says that he undertook a Wet Grassland Phase 1 site walkover with Sean Gruffety from the Dowlands Partnership. SG suggested that the area could, with suitable forage, suffice for 3-4 head of cattle and that the area does meet the Five-Freedom requirements, should the vegetation grow sufficiently. SG did air concerns that the vegetation is not yet suitable for supporting livestock and the growth of hemlock is problematic, therefore grazing this season is not advised.

- xviii) DW agrees that there is not yet suitable forage for cattle and that hemlock is a site wide issue.
- xix) CO asks if there are any other issues or concerns that SG raised.
- xx) JD responds that SG did notice a substantial amount of flint within the fresh gravels/soils which can cause injuries to livestock hooves.
- xxi) DW agrees but reassures that overtime soils will develop and reduce the issue.
- xxii) MK asks if there is anywhere on site that would be suitable for a grazing trial. MK is very conscious that grazing has been on the table for years but no action has taken place. Also, keen to know how to tackle the hemlock issue
- xxiii) DW says that both hemlock and goat's-rue present issues for grazing stock but these plants are generally avoided if there is suitable grazing forage.
- xxiv) DW asks where MK would envisage a trial taking place?
- xxv) MK suggests the meadow grasslands but acknowledges the complications involved in running a trial.
- xxvi) DW thinks that due to the complications, tattered fencing and hidden/unseen problems in the meadowlands, grazing in P1 would be a more suitable option. DW adds that DP have produced a quote for a holistic grazing regime and a separate one for Wet Grassland Phase 1. Given the growth of suitable forage in phase 1 there remain few issues in setting up grazing here.
- xxvii) MK asks for more information on the five-freedoms in relation to cattle being exposed to poor weather on Phase 1.
- xxviii) DW says that WGP1 needs to have a hard autumnal graze and winter flooding combination. Ideally, this will suppress growth from late March/early April to June, when very light grazing is likely to be required to create the mosaic sward required for waders. In this time period, shelter is unlikely to be an issue. However, if grazing over winter on the meadowlands, although Sussex cattle grow a winter pelt and are hardy native breeds, it is likely some additional shelter may be required, as the scrub is not mature enough.

C) Wet Grassland

i) Phase 1

- (1) AF begins update by saying that contractors installed the lateral weir channels several weeks ago. The weirs themselves were held up in delivery due to import issues but they are now on site.
- (2) Contractors will install these weirs in the next couple of weeks and also look at the main outfall weir, which is on backwards.
- (3) There are now two screw pumps set up from the MEC into P1 and active management is taking place. The same network can also be used to facilitate water to 100Acre, via Phase2.

- (4) AF asks how the islands will be seeded post-breeding season. The boundaries can be seeded by mechanical means but the islands present a different problem.
- (5) DW asks MK if he sees any issue with disturbance to breeding birds if weirs are installed in the coming weeks.
- (6) MK says that there is very little breeding in proximity to the weirs but coots may be affected. LRPs are showing a strong association with P1 but are doing so at the western end.
- (7) JD adds that any installation work would be restricted to the immediate work area.
- (8) MK is pleased by this but still feels that the contractors need to work sensitively and that someone needs to give them working instructions prior to commencement.
- (9) RD has noted that the LRPs are showing association with the western side of P1.
- (10) CO is happy to give the contractors a ToolBox Talk prior to work commencing.
ACTION ⇒ CO to work with JD, AF to ensure that contractors get a work brief in relation to nesting.
- (11) AF adds that there is still an amount of slope regrading to be carried out but is unsure when this work will be completed but it will be 'later on', to be seeded in autumn.

ii) Phase 2 & 3

- (1) AF updates that a contractor has been engaged to start next month but that there was some difficulty in securing contractors. AF had to turn many away stating that a start date of mid-July would be too late. AF plans to have the remaining 1m depth of Wet Grassland Phase 3 (WGP3) bulk dig to go to phase 10 of the landfill area/capping infill. This is mainly the western areas of P3 that requires reducing to c28.5mAOD.
- (2) Some of this material may also be used to remediate the slip on the western edge of the meadowlands. Following the bulk dig, RW will be brought in to develop the microtopography in August.
- (3) AF has had 'Tonka' undertaking initial works to drain WGP3. This work uncovered sections of box culvert and revealed a potential source of water. The box culvert removal revealed that there is subterranean water coming from the River Terrace Gravels (RTGs) which could be used to fill the WGP3 perimeter moat. AF thinks that this water would naturally have drained west across the site but the landfill/capping is blocking its way so that it now flows south in the southern channel. This would remove the requirement to have a bunded area with a penstock to hold some water
- (4) MK is concerned that this new discovery is not set up to give us the

- hydrological control that is required for WGP3.
- (5) CO asks if Viridor are going to engage with a hydrological professional to investigate the reliability of this new source of water., as there are assumptions about the flow rate and it could be difficult to remediate P3 if P3 is built to those assumptions but they are incorrect.
 - (6) DW sees the logic of a moated system, as long as the water can be controlled both in and out of WGP3.
 - (7) AF adds that water has been flowing through these culverts at a consistent rate.
 - (8) DW asks AF if he thinks there is a long term sustainable source of water through the river terrace gravels.
 - (9) AF responds yes.
 - (10) DW asks if the levels coming from these RTGs are likely to change in correlation to the water table, resulting in lower water levels in spring that would prevent the perimeter moat from filling.
 - (11) AF says he would like to quantify the flow rate to be certain
 - (12) DC adds that the [SES website](#) provides ground water level data for the local area and adds that local borehole levels are high at the moment which may relate to the consistent flow from the RTGs.
 - (13) MA comments that as part of the RMP a Hydrological Risk Assessment was carried out for 2020. MA suggests that re-engaging this contractor may be of benefit in providing data on the RTGs and water tables. MA offers to look into this report in more detail.
ACTION ⇒ MA to study all previous information for the HRA and feed that into the redesign.
 - (14) DW adds that any redesign needs to be fed back to and commented on by RW.
 - (15) MK says that we have to consider the climate change impacts likely to be experienced at the local level. Given the time constraints, MK advises a strategic approach with this and how it fits into the South East Corner and the work being undertaken by Thames Water with Aquatic Engineering. MK also advises that each option must be seriously considered prior to committing to each water source.
 - (16) AF says that under current designs the plan is to feed WGP3 from the Wandle Overflow Channel via a perimeter moat. AF says that utilising this new RTG water source would not enquire any significant differential action in construction save for not installing a penstock at the WOC. The water supply will come from the RTGs.
 - (17) MK responds that the water from the RTGs is not yet a certainty
 - (18) AF adds that he will be doing nothing differently from the original design and that the bund is designed to stop the flooding of

WGP3.

- (19) DW asks that if a moat is installed around WGP3, does AF predict that it will be permanently wet and sit at a consistent level all year round?
- (20) AF responds that he thinks it would
- (21) DW asks that if there is a consistently wet moat, then there will be a requirement to drain it in flood conditions that would be necessary to prevent the flooding of WGP3. Where will this drainage infrastructure be situated?
- (22) AF adds that at the east end of WGP3 the level is 28.5m AOD and at the far western end the southern channel is 26m AOD. Therefore that is a +1.5m fall in levels. AF says that there would be a spillway installed into the southern channel.
- (23) DW states that the southern channel in flood events is 2m higher, so would this not cause an issue in trying to drain from the moat into the southern channel?
- (24) AF responds that the level at the southern channel here would be c.28.50m AOD, so should not be an issue, even if the moat did start to overflow, which may be unlikely if there is a consistent water source from the RTGs which may be impacted by raised river levels
- (25) Moving on to Wet Grassland Phase 2, DW asks if the compound/car park has been released to the restoration team by the ERF shutdown contractors. AF had informed DW that the 5th May had been previously agreed.
- (26) AF is uncertain if this has yet occurred but AF will chase on this.
- (27) AF updates that upon meeting with the project manager for the ERF that an agreement has been reached that the contractors cabins will also be removed in due course. Therefore the car park and cabins footprint will be released in one sign off and that commencement of WGP2 bulk dig can begin thereafter. AF adds that the IVC will remain in situ until their 2022 date.
- (28) DW highlights the importance of tying in this bulk dig with that of the work to be undertaken on WGP3.
- (29) AF responds that his priority at this moment in time is to develop WGP3 over that of WGP2, as he believes that this will be a more suitable wet grassland more quickly.
- (30) AF says that materials from WGP2 will be used to reprofile the Acid Grassland to smooth out the 'lumps and bumps'. AF adds that if Viridor were to follow the GeoChem directions and put down 300mm of gravel over the entire area that they do not have enough on site. Additional material would need to be brought in at a cost.
- (31) AF is also concerned at the phased development of WGP2 and the requirements to install additional and temporary fencing as the ERF and IVC phases are released to the restoration.

- (32) CO responds that there is no requirement for each sub-phase of WGP2 development to be fenced and that the requirement as per the RMP is that each Wet Grassland area must be fenced within the first year of its completion. Though the sub-phases may be completed, the WGP2 as a whole would be incomplete and therefore there is no obligation to fence it.
- (33) All agree that P1 fencing remains as is and that P1 is progressed as rapidly as possible, with final fencing once the IVCs have been removed and the final contours created. This would leave P2 'at risk' for the time being but with a secure P1, well managed displacement habitats and P3 online, this should be acceptable.
- (34) DW asks how the water management will function in P2 and if all control systems are in place and functioning.
- (35) AF responds that the infall and outfall P2 weirs are in place and that P2 could be used to store half a metre of water but an additional pen stock could be installed to retain additional water. An additional weir is required to drain the channel that will run around the north of P2, location to be determined.

D) Spring & Summer works

i) Water control & levels

- (1) CO updates that over-winter and into the spring the site team have been actively managing the water levels but this has been challenging without the appropriate gauging boards.
- (2) AF responds that there is a survey booked to take accurate readings of the mAOD data in the next couple of weeks
- (3) DW recalls the last CSG meeting in which AF confirmed that there would be topographical data of the islands across the various water bodies on site.
- (4) AF confirmed that this would take place at the end of July
- (5) DW asks if a commitment could be made for gauging board installation date

ACTION ⇒ AF, NG to install gauging boards as soon as the mAOD survey has taken place

ACTION ⇒ AF to commission survey on the topography of each of the water bodies and associated islands for the end of July.

ii) Reedbed

- (1) CO says that while some reed translocation took place over the winter period, there could be opportunities in the coming summer to plant additional areas. Furthermore, lower water levels in the

summer should enable a rough topographical survey to take place. Examination of the silt beds depth and extent needs to be determined.

- (2) AF confirms that extensive silt beds have been built but is supportive of an investigative survey.

ACTION ⇒ CO to undertake a survey of the silt beds and work with AF to develop a planting plan for the winter period.

iii) Orchard

- (1) CO says that following a site survey of the orchard many of the trees require watering and mulching. Dry conditions have exposed some roots and it seems as though a number of trees may have died. Watering and mulching are required as soon as possible.

- (2) CO has spoken with local arborists about donating mulch for this purpose.

- (3) AF agrees that watering and mulching are required

ACTION ⇒ Viridor to water and mulch ASAP and as required over the summer months

iv) Hedgerows, thickets & scrub

- (1) CO offers to remove plastic guards on established trees within the meadowlands.

- (2) CO has noticed that many of the whips planted along the southern edge of the reedbed area may have died. CO advises that a beat up survey be undertaken in order to provide replacement details.

- (3) AF says that much of this area is likely to be disturbed by the development of the southern access pathway route but removing dead whips would be useful in plotting the path course

ACTION ⇒ CO to undertake a beat up survey of this planting.

v) Sacrificial crops

- (1) MK starts by saying he has not yet met with DC to discuss sowing of sacrificial crops. However, MK sees that the most viable place for sacrificial crops would be in the South East Corner on top of old sludge beds that were previously filled with sludge cake and are now of little use to wetland species.

- (2) MK shows a map of the site to illustrate the intention. The beds on the western edge of SEC could be used and the mound of sludge cake east of the WGP3 could be utilized to create a suitable tilth.

- (3) AF confirms that removal of this mound would benefit the development of WGP3.

- (4) RD asks if there is much biological interest in this area

- (5) MK confirms that the current vegetation is largely dominated by annuals with little to no value to breeding birds. However, there is

the possibility of a badger set. MK asks if CO can investigate this more closely

ACTION ⇒ CO to locate badger set and install remote cameras is possible to monitor.

- (6) DW asks about the soil fertility and if they will require some chemical treatment to kill weed growth.
- (7) MK responds that, with the addition of the sludge cake, much of the present soils will be buried and seed growth suppressed.
- (8) DW asks how deep they expect the topping soils to be
- (9) AF answer that the sludge cake mound should account for 6000m³ of cake so we could expect a bury depth of 400mm+ over the proposed area.
- (10) DW agrees that this should be sufficient to suppress growth but it will be key to plant this season as soon as the soils have been spread
- (11) MK agrees that seeding sowing as soon as soils have been spread should provide us with a head start ahead of weed growth
- (12) DW asks if there are logistical issues with moving this amount of sludge cake in the closing window of sowing season
- (13) AF has been in discussion with 'Tonka' in regards to shifting this bulk and with MK in regards to disturbance to lapwing in adjacent beds.
- (14) DW adds that the sowing season is almost over with end of May being the latest possible date. DW asks if this is an achievable deadline
- (15) MK accepts that time is running out for a spring sowing but mentions the benefits of the unusually cool spring experienced at present and notes that this has had a suppressive effect on herb growth. MK suggests that an early June planting could be an option. Should this not work or prove to be too difficult in terms of time, the soils will have to sit bare until the autumnal sowing. This would then require some form of chemical treatment to kill weed species.
- (16) DW adds that if the soils can be moved and sown within the month of May then that would be the ideal. If not, the soils will require additional rotivation and chemical treatment prior to preparing the seedbed ahead of autumnal sowing.
ACTION ⇒ AF to initiate these works as soon as possible and focus on a spring sowing.

vi) SDEN & Orchard

- (1) AF states that SDEn has been watered and some additional ,ulching has been undertaken but more is required
ACTION ⇒ CO to source free mulch / woodchip, if possible.

E) 100 Acre & SEC

i) Watering regime

- (1) MK leads the update on the displacement habitats
- (2) Water is being pumped to SEC from the lake west of lagoon 6.
- (3) Bed 73 has received substantial quantities of water and that the bed has recovered. Water levels in this bed have been reducing since March.
- (4) South of 73 is the 'Asda bed' which MK has been working with 'Tonka' to create additional redshank habitat.
- (5) RD asks for more detail on the bed levels. RD has received comments from a BFBG member in regards to the drying of some of the beds and that the bed holding reeds could also use input. RD asks if there are plans to do this work and manage water levels better, as there are reports lapwing chicks have been predated by foxes.
- (6) MK responds that water management in SEC has been proactive and weekly pumping has been ongoing. MK adds that bed 73 has less water than is desirable but still appears effective against predators. 2 pairs of lapwing were sitting.
- (7) MK acknowledged that the surface of the beds appeared cracked (CO also confirmed this observation) but did not think it was solid enough for foxes to cross, and the predation may have been through corvids.
- (8) MK also asked for any observation from the BFBG to come straight to him if there were concerns over water levels /drying, as they could react more quickly to this than it being raised in the quarterly meeting
ACTION ⇒ RD & BFBG to provide information directly to MK if they have any concerns
- (9) MK updates that 100Acre is holding water far more effectively than SEC.
- (10) MK has arranged for more water to bed 174.1 but is disappointed that no lapwing have taken to this bed or 100acre though, there is one bird moving from the conservation lake to the north lake.
- (11) MK adds that work should focus on managing SEC, as this is where the population of lapwing are.
- (12) MK says that there is an LRP pair present on the gravel bank west of lagoon 5. This is an unfortunate location, as birds present here are not safe from predation from foxes. MK worked with the site team to have water pumped onto lagoon 6 in an effort to make it more attractive to LRPs but that this lagoon drained very rapidly. The LRP pair are continuing to associate with the mainland gravel bank.

- (13) RD asks if water could be pumped from lagoon 5 to lagoon 6
- (14) MK responds that this is not required as there is water resource in the adjacent lakes and reiterates that water pumped into this lagoon was readily absorbed within a few days.
- (15) MK adds that water resource is limited and that SEC is the most important conservation priority
- (16) AF asks which species has management priority
- (17) MK confirms that lapwing population is of more significance than a single LRP pair.
- (18) AF confirms that water is not an unlimited commodity so we need to ensure that we have the resources for SEC over anything else.
- (19) AF then confirmed that he had heard nothing back from Thames Water / Aquatic Engineering since his follow-up meeting with them a few months back
- (20) MK adds that we still need long term watering solutions and that it is disappointing that we do not yet have feedback from IC or TW or Aquatic Engineering.

ACTION ⇒ IC to provide update to these minutes

F) Acid Grassland

- i) MA leads the update.
- ii) MA is still working on collating the documentation and data to present to the CSG and CAMC. MA confirms that Viridor have been in contact with the Environment Agency's contact, as provided by DW and that they have received an initial response. The EA have requested a site visit in May. Alongside this there will be a project investigation to produce documentation for a final opinion on whether or not Acid Grassland gets the green light. This is to happen in the coming few weeks
- iii) MA adds that two reports have been contracted.
 - (1) An environmental risk assessment
 - (2) A habitat restoration assessment
- iv) Viridor are still waiting for the consultants to send final versions of these reports
- v) MA goes on to say that they are waiting for the site visits but following that things should progress quickly thereafter.
- vi) AF says that he has chased the EA for the on site meeting but is waiting for a response. AF would like this to happen before the upcoming CAMC. AF also expressed concerns that he did not feel that the EA fully understood the complexities involved nor the flow of water around the site and associated with the Wandle catchment area.
- vii) DW reminds those involved that there is an upcoming meeting to discuss the Acid Grassland progress. DW adds that we also need to brief Cllr

- Foster on this, prior to the CAMC.
- viii) SC is supportive of having the EA attend the site prior to the upcoming Acid Grassland meeting so that there is new information to discuss.
 - ix) DW asks if AF has made good on the action to produce a cost for the v-ditch.
 - x) AF confirms that this has been done but still needs to add those calculations to the last CSG minutes. From memory AF says that the cost would be circa £300,000. This is an initial cost and not one that takes into consideration ongoing and management costs, such as replenishment of alkaline infill. AF is also concerned about flash floods overtopping the v-ditch.
 - xi) DW accepts that flash floods could lead to the v-ditch overtopping
 - xii) AF adds that, in order to fulfil the GeoChem advice of a 300mm of gravel toppings, Viridor would have to import large quantities (c.50,000m³) to cover the 15ha.
 - xiii) AF's rough calculations estimate the cost of Acid Grassland delivery to be around £2.5 million though AF stresses that this number is a very rough estimate.
 - xiv) SC responds that he is pleased to have some numeration in connection with delivery, even if it is a rough estimate.
 - xv) AF reiterates the point that there is a lack of gravel on site that at 300mm depth additional material would need to be brought in at market price.
 - xvi) DC asks for some blue sky thinking about the plausibility of extracting additional gravels from beneath the South East Corner but observes the complications with the Scheduled Ancient Monument
 - xvii) DW adds that the SEC is likely to be mainly sludge and not hold significant volumes of gravel
 - xviii) DC responds that gravels were extracted in larger volumes than had been anticipated north of Beddington Park and that therefore there could be untapped resources below SEC
 - xix) MK joins to say that this sort of option has been previously discussed but at 100 Acre. MK adds that 100 Acre has not been previously extracted and that there are likely to be such volumes under there. Extraction from 100 Acre could be sustainable and following closure of extraction works, a better wetland area could be created in its place.
 - xx) AF responds that while this would provide gravel it is likely to be of an undesirable pH, much like the rest of the gravels out of the area. There would also need to be some sort of infrastructure (cf. CEMEX extraction) to process the gravels once extracted
 - xxi) AF moves on to practical management of the acid grassland in the coming weeks. Contractors are expected this week to kill off the vegetation north of the Mile Road divide.
 - xxii) A drill rig is coming to site to do some additional gas well infrastructure in the area. 200m of surface laid gas mains will be buried in the next few

- weeks.
- xxiii) AF adds that soils/gravels from WGP2 will be used to top some of the Acid Grassland area to create a stale seedbed in preparation for autumnal seeding of the RMP nursery mix with the addition of the full final mix as shown in the RMP on RW's advice. This is to see what, from those mixes are likely to take.
 - xxiv) DW notes that, as discussed previously, many of these species are catholic and should be able to establish but this will not create an acid grassland, nor conditions of the delivery of heathland

6) Predator and Goose control

- A) MK says that the majority of Canada goose nests are on the central island and in the region of 10-11 pairs. MK adds that he used to have a license to treat the eggs and that this work was undertaken whilst out on surveys. This was not efficient and that now there was a warden in place this work could be adopted into that role.
- B) DW asks if we are now seeing more nests on the islands due to the lack of vegetation following winter management or if this is just an artefact of increased visibility.
- C) MK says that this is the case but in addition the lack of vegetation has probably made it more suitable for nesting. They are now more concentrated on the lake islands
- D) DC says that there are a lot of geese dotted around the site and would like to see a population reduction and that a site wide approach would be the best option.
- E) MK agrees but would be keen to see targeted treatment where there is a concentrated population.
- F) DW agrees but suggests that plan be put together for next year
- G) DW moves onto foxes. At the previous CSG, AF had contractors in to survey the WGP1 population situation. What were the results from this?
- H) AF states this has not progressed much further than initial surveying. AF would like to have the WGP1 fence as a sealed unit before decisive action is taken. Once the site is fully sealed then an additional survey will be taken to re-assess to determine if there is a problem.

7) Site Monitoring

- A) MK leads the update starting with the BBS. Fair to say that WGP1 has attracted many migratory waders though it is not looking as though much will use the area to breed. The habitat still has some establishing to do before it is likely to host breeding waders.
- B) MK suspects that there will be a reduction in breeding passerines this year due to the reductions of scrub habitat, specifically in 100Acre and SEC.
- C) Some passerines, such as linnets are seemingly doing well and present in good numbers

- D) Whitethroats appear down on previous years but suspects that the unusually cool spring may have worked against migration and therefore the numbers are suppressed. The current weather conditions are not favourable.
- E) Sedge warblers were present in good numbers during BBS but suspects that this was a migratory movement rather than territorial establishment
- F) DC has been on site to undertake the BTO Breeding Waders of Wet Meadows Survey. DC adds that the path birders have been enjoying the migratory movements, especially yellow wagtails, and that the bird hides are proving popular. DC also added that he feels whitethroat numbers are down in connection with the atypical spring but we won't know the true impact until late June. Cetti's warblers are seemingly in every available habitat, with around 9 birds in song around the lakes.
- G) RD adds that reed warblers seem to be in most if not all reed patches and that whitethroats are present where habitat is available.
- H) DW moves onto botanical monitoring and suggests that this needs to begin this spring and summer

ACTION ⇒ CO to co-ordinate botanical surveys between LBS and MKA

8) AOB

- A) Cycle path & Access
 - i) AF is still pulling together final drawings for this and presents current plans on screen. AF talks through the images and says that the area running adjacent to the north lake will change the most.
 - ii) A site meeting took place between AF and DW on 07/04/2021, which discussed desire and view lines along the pipeline route, meadow creation via creating a sloping bank to infill the existing path, in places, and the removal of c. 6 trees to open the area up
 - iii) AF has been investigating site access options and has remodelled the slip remediations. The plan will be to develop a terraced system along the northwestern edge of the landfill opposite the southern lake here to create a slope that is DDA compliant.
 - iv) AF proposes that access from the Mile Road gate between the lakes needs to be leveled to create a much more friendly slope up to the meadowlands. In its current state the ground level on site is c.3m feet below the gate entrance height. The concrete box culvert sections from WGP3 could be used to create culverts through a new bund linking Mile Road with the meadowlands
 - v) AF goes on to say that much of the site is being investigated for DDA compliance. AF has engaged with contractors to deliver a 100m path trial adjacent to the north lake, to include in the planning submission, to illustrate how the site would look.
 - vi) MK asks if in developing the raised walkway between the two lakes if it would still be possible to develop an extended marshy/bog area to the north of the southern lake.

- vii) AF agrees that this should be deliverable
- viii) DW asks when AF expects the planning application to be delivered to LBS
- ix) AF is hoping to achieve this within the next couple of weeks /early June.
- x) CO adds that at the end of May he will be leading a site walk for the Access Task and Finish Group to explore the possibilities of east-west access

B) Warden update

- i) CO is now back on site following the end of COVID shielding almost everyday and is undertaking regular check on the lapwing
- ii) CO stated that the draft MeadowLands Management Plan required CSG feedback
ACTION ⇒ CSG to provide feedback by 30 June 2021
- iii) DW stated that it was also his wish that Charlie undertake some guided walks across the site during the summer months, to increase public access to the site
ACTION ⇒ CO to discuss with Andrew Turner

C) Other AOB

- i) MK says that he is pleased that CO is now back on site
- ii) MK would like the Himalayan balsam looked at along the southern Channel
ACTION ⇒ CO to keep an eye on the balsam, report back and undertake hand pulling (possibly with SNCV volunteers)
- iii) RD raised some outstanding issues from the last meeting:
 - (1) Nest boxes - Now that CO is back on site he will locate the stock of nest boxes and store them for later reuse or disposal if damaged beyond repair.
 - (2) Feeders - Now that CO is back on site he will take responsibility for feeders.
 - (3) RD asked for confirmation about the new feeder plan
 - (4) CO responds that due to the loss of TS it has previously been agreed that all feeders, save for the North Lake station, have been closed and collected.
ACTION ⇒ CO to work with landfill office to purchase new bird seed
 - (5) RD asks about the tools supply for the warden
 - (a) DW updates that a proposal was put to LBS. The S106 states that when the warden is not in position, Viridor are able to claim back, pro rata the money that has previously been paid. Viridor's proposal was that half of the paid monies could be used to supply the warden with tools and that Viridor would claim the remaining half back.

- (b) DW confirmed that following internal discussions, a letter outlining these terms will be sent from planning obligations to Viridor shortly, hopefully this week
 - (c) RD asks if there is a place to store this equipment
 - (d) DW says that previous site managers have suggested that a spare container be used for this purpose and moved to the landfill office area.
 - (e) AF adds that we can see part of the current storage options in this area but there is also an agreement to collect the Wet Grassland container for this purpose. However there is need to think beyond the 2023 deadline as at this point it is likely that the landfill offices will be demolished.
 - (f) DW adds that this should be tied in with plant, equipment and livestock considerations. There will be a need for a volunteer welfare space and a place to maintain plant and equipment. During the life of the site management
- (6) RD moves on to say that he is disappointed in the absence of Thames Water/IC. RD requests that a message is sent from the CSG to IC for response to actions from the previous meeting and to provide an update on progress that should have been made at this meeting.
- ACTION ⇒ IC to update these minutes**
- iv) MK noted that there were a number of nest boxes lying around the north of Phase 1 and the landfill office that needed to be put away
 - v) MK requests a copy of the letter outlining Thames Waters' plans/commitments for the displacement habitats
 - vi) DW agrees to check with Thames Water if this is acceptable
 - vii) MK says that Thames Water have many times assured CSG members that the displacement habitats are secure but there is as yet no written agreement/commitment to their long term management as valuable wader habitat.
 - viii) DW asks MK if he wouldn't mind raising this as an AOB at the CAMC as it is more likely to produce a response from TW management.

10)Date of next meeting:

Wednesday 4th August

ACTION ⇒ JD to set up meeting (Teams), although it may be able to be held face-to face, depending on legislation changes from c.21 June

With no further business, the meeting closed at 14:15