



Harriet Pryer BA (Hons), MA, accredited on a Level 2 Natural England Bat Licence (number available on request)

Graduate Ecologist

Email: harrietpryer@arbtech.co.uk

Arbtech Consulting Ltd

arbtech.co.uk

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal & Roost Assessment

Survey site:

87 Copse Wood Way, Northwood HA62TX

Client:

Mr Viralkumar Kirtikumar Patel and Mrs Harshika Viralkumar Patel

Survey date:

11/06/2026

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application with London Borough of Hillingdon. Full demolition to build a new dwelling

On the assumption that site conditions and habitats remain unchanged, the results of this assessment will remain valid for 18 months from the date of this survey i.e. until December 2027, in accordance with CIEEM guidance in the lifespan of Ecological Reports and Surveys. This survey and report should be updated if a planning application has not been submitted within this timeframe.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following is work you will need to commission to obtain planning permission and to comply with legislation. Further information, along with opportunities for biodiversity enhancement, are outlined in the proceeding sections of this report.

Table 1: Summary of key findings arising from this survey.

Key Findings
• A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) may be requested by the LPA via condition. • Three Bat Emergence and Re-Entry surveys will be required for B1. No works to the property that may block or remove potential roosting features should be carried out until the required surveys have been completed. Undertaking such work beforehand could unlawfully affect bats if present and may compromise the validity of the surveys and hinder the planning application process. • Various precautionary working methods have been recommended which have been fully detailed within the fauna section of this report.

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of the PEA was to obtain data on existing ecological conditions, and to conduct a preliminary assessment of the likely significance of ecological impacts on the proposed development. The aim of the PRA was to determine the presence or evaluate the likelihood of the presence of roosting bats, and to gain an understanding of how bats could use the site for roosting, foraging or commuting.

No previous ecology reports have been produced for this site by Arbtech Consulting Ltd or, to the author’s knowledge, by any other consultancy.

Methodology

PEA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: [PEA Methodology and Legislation - 2025](#).

PRA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: [PRA Methodology and Legislation - 2025](#).

Survey Details

The site survey was undertaken on 11/06/2026 by Harriet Pryer BA (Hons), MA, accredited on a Level 2 Natural England Bat Licence (number available on request), Graduate Ecologist

Table 2: The weather conditions during the survey.

Temperature (°C)	Humidity (%)	Cloud Cover (%)	Wind (km/h)	Rain
11.3	91.0	100	4.8	Moderate rain

Survey Limitations

It should be noted that whilst every effort has been made to describe the baseline conditions within the survey area, and evaluate these features, this report does not provide a complete characterisation of the site. This assessment provides a preliminary view of the likelihood of protected species being present. This is based on suitability of the habitats on the site and in the wider landscape, the ecology and biology of species as currently understood.

No plans available at the time of survey; this report should be updated once plans become available. Recommendations are subject to change upon receipt and review of plans.

2. SITE LOCATION AND LANDSCAPE CONTEXT

2.1 Summary of Survey Findings

Site Location & Context

The site is centred at National Grid reference TQ 08037 90565 and has an area of approximately 0.12ha.

The site comprises on residential dwelling (B1) and a garage (B2), with associated vegetated garden and hardstanding. It is situated in Northwood, a suburban town in the London Borough of Hillingdon on the border with Hertfordshire. There are scattered trees within the site and extending into the local garden landscape. Aerial imagery shows the local landscape to have a woodland character, with several small copses and woodland swathes in close proximity to the site. Several. Such features likely enhance the area for a variety of species, including bats.

The site is well-connected to nearby habitats via the trees and hedgerow.

Priority Habitats

There are eight priority habitats within 2km of the site. These comprise deciduous woodland, ancient & semi-natural woodland, ancient replanted woodland, lowland dry acid grassland, infilled ancient wood pasture, wood pasture and parkland, open mosaic habitats on previously developed land and traditional orchard. The closest priority habitat comprises deciduous woodland, located 60m NW from the site, and the second ancient & semi-natural woodland, located 80m SW.

Designated Sites

Statutory Designations within 2km

There are three statutory designations within 2km of the site, as detailed below:

Table 3: The statutory designated sites within 2km of the site boundary.

Designation	Distance from Site
Ruislip Woods Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	75m S
Batchworth Heath Local Nature Reserve (LNR)	1680m N

Ruislip Woods National Nature Reserve (NNR)	75m S
---	-------

SSSI Risk Zone

The site does fall within the impact risk zone for Ruislip Woods SSSI however, the proposed development type is not listed as possible high risk with regard to this designation.

Non-Designated Sites

The presence of non-statutory designated sites within 2km of the site cannot be established without data from the local records centre. Whilst some habitats in the wider landscape may host designations, the immediate environs of the site do not host habitats likely to be of designable quality.

2.2 Foreseen Impacts

No direct impacts to any designated sites will occur as a result of the proposed development, due to the small scale and low overall impact of the development from such sites (where known), alongside additional factors such as distance in combination with connectivity disrupting barriers.

2.3 Recommendations

Best practice measures to minimise the possibility of pollution affecting the nearby ancient replanted and deciduous woodland must be implemented during construction. A Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) may be required for this.

3. ONSITE HABITATS

This section may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.

3.1 Summary of Survey Findings

Built-up areas and gardens (u1) - Vegetated garden (828) - Introduced shrub (847), Scattered trees (32), Bare ground (510)

An amenity lawn is present to the north and the south of the site. This lawn is actively managed via regular mowing, resulting in a short sward of ~5cm. Areas of bare ground and moss are frequently present in the parcel to the northeast, and highly concentrated under dense tree cover, with bare ground totalling <20% of

the area. The area to the southwest features perennial ryegrass, and no bare ground. Ornamental planting is present throughout the site, with species such as rhododendron featuring in the northwestern garden.

Species present within this habitat include haircap moss (*Polytrichum commune*), perennial rye-grass (*Lolium perenne*), carpet moss (*Hypnum cupressiforme*), wood avens (*Geum urbanum*), rhododendron (*Rhododendron ponticum*), cherry laurel (*Prunus laurocerasus*) and garden privet (*Ligustrum ovalifolium*).

In accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric, this habitat is not subject to a condition assessment.

Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface (u1c)

There is a parcel of artificial unsealed unvegetated surface to the south of the site, leading from the road to the house, comprising a gravel driveway.

In accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric, this habitat is not subject to a condition assessment.

Developed land; sealed surface (u1b)

There is an area of hardstanding, in the form of paving stones surrounding the house and leading away from the house to the north, with a strip extending to the rear amongst the scattered trees.

In accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric, this habitat is not subject to a condition assessment.

Native hedgerow (h2a)

The site is enclosed by native hedgerow along sections of the northwestern site boundary. The hedgerow is actively maintained at 1.5m(h) and 0.5m (w). The hedgerow appears densely vegetated at canopy level, though the understorey is relatively open and sparsely vegetated.

Species present within this habitat include beech (*Fagus sylvatica*).

In accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessment Matrix, the native hedgerow was assessed to have a good condition value.

Scattered Trees (32)

There are five scattered trees present on the site, all forming a single group. This group comprises three large hornbeam (*Betulaceae*) and two medium hornbeam, with over 50% of the trees considered mature. These trees are native to the UK, contributing to the woodland structure. No potential roosting features were identified. No evidence for bats was found.

In accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessment Matrix, the tree was assessed to have a good condition value.

Building (u1b5)

There are two buildings on site; one is a residential dwelling and one is a garage.

3.2 Foreseen Impacts

The proposed development will result in the removal of B1, B2 and the surrounding areas of hardstanding. This is likely to have a minimal impact on biodiversity due to the low ecological value of these habitats.

3.3 Recommendations

The project is unlikely to trigger the requirement for a biodiversity net gain assessment as it falls under the householder exemption. However, the Local Planning Authority may still request a net gain assessment under their own local planning policy.

Retained trees should be protected in line with the measures outlined in the British Standard "Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction to Construction - Recommendations" (BS 5837) (2012).

4. INVASIVE SPECIES

This section may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.

4.1 Summary of Survey Findings

Rhododendron (*Rhododendron ponticum*) was identified on the site which is listed as an invasive, non-native species under Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

4.2 Foreseen Impacts

Construction could result in the spread of rhododendron.

4.3 Recommendations

Rhododendron present adjacent to B1 (*immediately west*) will be sensitively removed prior to the commencement of works to prevent the spread of a non-native, invasive species listed on Schedule 9 of the WCA (*see Appendix 1a*). The Rhododendron will be removed using hand tools only. The most effective method of removal is through hand pulling, which results in minimal soil disturbance. Hand-pulling young shrubs will typically result in the full removal of the shrub and associated root network, which will prevent the re-establishment. Mature shrubs are likely to have a deeper and more established root network unlikely to be removed in full by hand pulling alone. Where there are mature shrubs, removal should be aided using hand tools to expose the root network in full so the entire shrub and associated roots can be removed. Development works will not commence until Rhododendron has been successfully removed from the site.

5. FAUNA: BATS

This section may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.

5.1 Summary of Survey Findings

EPSL data and local records

A search of the magic.gov.uk database for granted EPSLs within a 2km radius of the site has been completed. Displaced bats from licensed sites <2km away from the survey site will find alternative habitat either within the mitigation measures implemented as part of the licence or will relocate to other known roosts sites in close proximity to the licensed site. There are 9 EPSLs within a 2km radius of the site, as detailed below:

Table 4: EPSL survey returns for bats within a 2km radius.

EPSL Reference	Bat Species Affected	Distance from Site <i>(EPSL records are accurate to 100m)</i>	Impacts Allowed by Licence
2017-31515-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared bat (BLE), common pipistrelle (C-PIP)	90m south	Destruction of a resting place
2018-36928-EPS-MIT	CPIP	180m east	Destruction of a resting place

2016-23261-EPS-MIT	CPIP	420m east	Destruction of a resting place
2016-23429-EPS-MIT	CPIP, soprano pipistrelle (SPIP)	430m east	Destruction of a resting place
2017-28939-EPS-MIT	CPIP	460m east	Destruction of a resting place
2017-29636-EPS-MIT	CPIP	1.4km west	Destruction of a resting place
2019-42658-EPS-MIT	BLE, CPIP	1.5km east	Destruction of a resting/breeding place
2020-48250-EPS-MIT	BLE, Leisler's bat (LEIS)	1.9km north	Destruction of a resting place
EPSM2013-5408	SPIP	1.9km north	Destruction of a resting place

There are no Special Areas of Conservation designated for bats within 10km of the site.

Foraging and commuting habitat

Habitats recorded on site are assessed to provide foraging and commuting opportunities for bats in the form of vegetated garden, native hedgerow and scattered trees, and offsite within 2km including deciduous woodland, ancient & semi-natural woodland, ancient replanted woodland, lowland dry acid grassland, infilled ancient wood pasture, wood pasture and parkland, open mosaic habitats on previously developed land and traditional orchard. These habitats are likely to provide micro-climatic conditions that support invertebrates that will in turn provide foraging opportunities for local bat populations. Most notably, the hedgerows and trees on site are mature and extend beyond the site adding to the continuity of vegetated linear features present in the wider landscape. Bats are well known to utilise linear features to aid navigation whilst travelling between foraging resources and roost sites.

Roosting habitat

Buildings to be impacted by the proposed development were assessed for their suitability to support roosting bats below. There are a total of two buildings on site; residential dwelling (B1) and garage (B2). All buildings were surveyed as they will be impacted by the proposed development. Evidence of roosting bats identified within B1.

Buildings

B1 : Residential dwelling

B1 is a residential dwelling, featuring a gabled roof with dormer windows to the north and south. The northern elevation features hanging tiles which are in good condition, with no gaps beneath. The roof features roosting features, including lifted tiles and gaps under lead flashing, particularly on the eastern extension and southern elevation, while the timber soffits on the northeastern elevation also present gaps. Internally, the loft void, lined with bitumen felt, features timber rafters and fiberglass insulation; although no clear external access points were noted, a rip in the felt lining could offer entry or roosting space. Approximately 50 bat droppings, suspected to be from brown long-eared bats, were found within the void, which have been sent for DNA testing. The building has been assessed to have high habitat value, and is a confirmed roost.



Building B1, southern elevation

Table 5a: The roosting features associated with building B1.

Feature	Materials/Details	Condition / description / suitability	Photograph
---------	-------------------	---------------------------------------	------------

Roof	Tiles	Condition/description The roof was in fair condition, though featured one missing rooftile on the lower, single-storey extension to the east, adjacent to the garage. An area of missing tiles was also noted under the ridgeline on the southern elevation. Areas of lifted lead flashing were seen to be present on the dormer window on the northeastern elevation. Suitability/access/evidence of bats Lifted tiles offer good roosting opportunity for roosting bats, and where multiple lifted tiles are present, the there is a greater opportunity for larger roosts to be formed. Gaps under lead flashing can support low or individual numbers of crevice dwelling species of bats.	 B1 roof, slipped tile, eastern outcrop  B1 roof, missing tiles under ridgeline
------	-------	---	--

			 <i>B1 roof, lifted lead flashing</i>
Eaves	Timber board	Condition/description Gaps were seen to be present where the wooden soffits join the walls of the dwelling on the northeastern elevation. Suitability/access/evidence of bats Soffit boxes have the capacity to host larger populations of crevice dwelling species of bats.	 <i>B1 eaves</i>

			 <i>B1 eaves, northeastern elevation</i>
Internal void 1	Timber rafters. Fiberglass insulation	Condition/description Internally, the bitumen felt lining was in good condition, featuring one rip in the material. On either side, the brick gable ends of the building to the northwest and southeast were in good condition. No clear access points were noted within the void, and no light ingress noted. All wooden beams were in good condition with no cracks or splitting within the wood that would provide suitable shelter for bats. Dimensions (approx): Approximately 10m in length. Suitability/access/evidence of bats Though no clear access points into the loft void were detected, rips in the bitumen felt lining of the roof could offer access into the void from	 <i>B1 internal void 1, facing southeast</i>

		beneath roof tiles, or offer up space for crevice dwelling species to roost. Approximately 50 bat droppings were found largely concentrated beneath the ridge beam in the centre of the void. Owing to shape and size, along with surrounding woodland habitats, the droppings are suspected to be of singular species: brown long-eared bat. The droppings have been sent for DNA testing.	
--	--	---	--

B2 : Garage

B2 is a detached garage to the southeast of B1. The walls are brick, and are in good condition, with no areas of missing mortar or cracks which provide suitability for bats. The building features windows to the north and east, allowing large amounts of light to fill the building. No access points were detected into the building internally or externally. B2 has been assessed to have negligible suitability for roosting bats.



Building B2, southern elevation



Building B2, interior, facing south

5.2 Foreseen Impacts

Roosting habitat [Buildings]

The proposed development will result in the demolition of B1 and B2. Any works to B1 could result in the destruction of any bat roosts present and could cause disturbance, death or injury to bats. B2 has been assessed to have negligible suitability for bats.

Roosting habitat [Trees]

No trees are to be impacted in line with proposed plans. Should plans change to involve the felling of any tree onsite, further surveys may be required.

Foraging and commuting habitat

The proposed development will not result in the removal of any habitats which could be used by foraging or commuting bats. However, the proposed development will include the use of lighting which could spill on to bat roosting, foraging or commuting habitat and deter bats from using these areas.

Artificial lighting

The proposed development may lead to an increase in the amount of current lighting of surrounding habitats or the retained building without mitigation. This may disturb commuting bats.

5.3 Recommendations

Roosting habitat [Buildings]

Three bat emergence/re-entry surveys are required on B1 during the active bat season (May – September) to characterise the roost/s present in or on the building. These survey visits should be completed during the optimal survey period mid-May to August inclusive. The survey visits should be at least three weeks apart. Sub-optimal: early May and September. Would require greater justification of timing e.g., weather conditions, known local bat activity. One of the surveys could be a dawn re-entry survey, or all three can be at dusk if supported by night vision aids (NVA).

Three survey positions are required to provide full coverage of the building's elevations to look for emerging/re-entering bats. An infrared camera should also be employed as part of the survey to see where any specific roost locations are located.

Lighting mitigation may be required based on the outcome of the night bat survey(s).

As the building contains a confirmed roost, a bat licence will be required to demolish the building as it would involve the destruction of roosts. This is applied for with the help of a class 2 licensed bat ecologist after planning permission is granted, but before commencement of works.

An EPSL application to Natural England will be required. The EPSL application requires that all surveys have been undertaken within the most recent active bat season and planning permission must have been granted and all relevant wildlife-related conditions have been discharged prior to submission.

Roosting habitat [Trees]

In line with current development plans, no trees will be removed. Therefore, no impacts on bats are anticipated.

Foraging and commuting habitat

No further surveys are required.

Artificial lighting

A low impact lighting strategy will be adopted for the site during post-development which outlines the areas of the site that will be retained as dark corridors. Parameters can be found on the Bat Conservation Trust website: <https://www.bats.org.uk/news/2023/08/bats-and-artificial-lighting-at-night-ilp-guidance-note-update-released>

Suggested biodiversity enhancements

Enhancements are dependent on the outcome of further surveys.

6. FAUNA: BIRDS

This section may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.

6.1 Summary of Survey Findings

Buildings

No evidence of nesting birds was identified on or within B1 and B2. B1 and B2 are deemed to provide negligible habitat value for nesting birds due to a lack of suitable nesting sites or access points.

Trees and vegetation

No bird nests were identified within the vegetation on-site, however vegetated garden, native hedgerow and scattered trees offer both nesting and foraging opportunities.

Due to the small size of the site and the extent and type of the habitats recorded, the site is not considered suitable to support a significant assemblage of protected and/or notable birds.

Barn Owls

The site does not appear to provide any suitable nesting sites for barn owls.

6.2 Foreseen Impacts

Buildings / trees

The proposed development could result in the destruction or the disturbance and subsequent abandonment of active bird nests.

Trees and vegetation

The proposed development could result in the destruction or the disturbance and subsequent abandonment of active bird nests.

Barn Owls

None foreseen.

6.3 Recommendations

Buildings / trees

None.

Precautions should be taken with machinery and noise levels when working close to any retained habitats so as not to disturb any nearby nesting birds during construction works.

Trees and vegetation

No additional surveys required.

Barn Owls

No further barn owl surveys required.

Suggested biodiversity enhancements

The installation of a minimum of two bird boxes on mature trees around the site boundaries will provide additional nesting habitat for birds e.g. Schwegler 1B Nest Boxes (trees), Schwegler 2H Robin Boxes (trees), Woodstone Nest Box (buildings or trees) or a similar alternative brand.

Tree boxes should be positioned approximately 3m above ground level where they will be sheltered from prevailing wind, rain and strong sunlight. Small-hole boxes are best placed approximately 1-3m above ground on an area of the tree trunk where foliage will not obscure the entrance hole.

7. FAUNA: REPTILES

This section may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.

7.1 Summary of Survey Findings

EPSL data and local records

A review of the MAGIC database returned no granted EPSL records for protected reptiles within 2km of the site.

Habitat suitability

Habitats recorded on site are assessed to provide foraging, commuting, basking and refuge opportunities for reptiles. Given that the site is dominated by frequently managed grassland, introduced shrubs, buildings, and hardstanding, the habitats onsite are largely of limited value to reptiles. These habitats are suboptimal due to an absence of notable habitat structure and diversity, which significantly limits refuge, foraging, and commuting opportunities. It should be noted that the hedgerow onsite could offer some structure for refuge, foraging or commuting opportunities. The site has good connectivity to further suitable reptile habitat in the wider landscape via woodland to the south of the site. The presence of reptiles on site cannot be discounted, albeit likely limited to low, transient numbers.

Wider landscape

The adjacent sections of woodland to the south of the site are of elevated ecological value within the wider landscape and may represent important resources for local reptile populations. These adjacent habitats provide optimal foraging, commuting, and refuge opportunities for reptiles and are well connected to further suitable woodland and riparian habitats in the wider landscape (particularly those connected to Ruislip Woods). The presence of reptiles utilising these adjacent habitats cannot be discounted.

7.2 Foreseen Impacts

While no suitable habitats will be removed during construction, site clearance could result in the death or injury of reptiles, if present.

7.3 Recommendations

A precautionary working method will be implemented for widespread reptiles during construction, including the following measures:

- Vegetation will be maintained at a short sward (5cm) to discourage reptiles. OR Grassland will be subject to a two-stage cut (if sward is >10cm) prior to removal in a directional manner, the first cut at 10cm and the second to ground level and maintained as a short sward (5cm) or bare ground throughout construction.
- Any excavations will be covered overnight, or a ramp will be installed to enable any trapped animals to escape.
- Best practice pollution prevention measures will be implemented to minimise impacts to nearby habitats.
- Any chemicals or pollutants used or created by the development should be stored and disposed of correctly according to COSHH regulations.
- If any reptiles are found in the working area these should be allowed to disperse of their own accord or, if at immediate risk, should be moved by hand to a sheltered, vegetated area away from disturbance.
- In the unlikely event that a reptile is identified, works must cease and advice must be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist.

8. FAUNA: AMPHIBIANS

This section may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.

8.1 Summary of Survey Findings

EPSL and survey data

A review of the MAGIC database returned one EPSL record for amphibians within 2km of the site. The MAGIC database also returned evidence indicating the presence of great crested newts (GCN) resulting from historic pond surveys undertaken in 2017. These records are located 1.4km southeast. Great crested newts exist in metapopulations and are known to utilise ponds and their connecting terrestrial habitat during their life cycle; great crested newts are typically found within terrestrial habitats up to 500m from breeding ponds (Langton et al. 2001). As such, the great crested newt metapopulation known to be present 1.4km southeast are not suitably connected to the site.

Table 6: EPSL survey returns for amphibians within a 2km radius.

EPSL Reference	Amphibian Species Affected	Distance from Site <i>(EPSL records are accurate to 100m)</i>	Impacts Allowed by Licence
EPSM2012-4868	GCN	1.2km southeast	Destruction of a resting place

A review of MAGIC database found no granted EPSL for great crested newts (GCN) within 2km of the site.

Table 7: Great crested newt search results.

Record type	Distance from Site
GCN class survey licence return	1.4km southeast

Aquatic habitat suitability (including ponds within 500m)

Great crested newts (GCN) exist in metapopulations and are known to utilise ponds and their connecting terrestrial habitat during their life cycle; great crested newts are typically found within terrestrial habitats up to 500m from breeding ponds (Langton et al. 2001).

No ponds are present on site or have been identified within 500m of the site.

Terrestrial habitat suitability

While no hibernation or breeding opportunities were identified on-site, areas of shrubbery and hedgerows onsite may provide foraging, sheltering and commuting opportunities for amphibians.

8.2 Foreseen Impacts

Given the lack of suitably connected breeding ponds within 500m of the site, the presence of GCN on-site is considered unlikely and therefore impacts to amphibians as a result of the proposed development are deemed to be acceptably low.

8.3 Recommendations

Owing to the nature of the proposed development and the low potential for impacts to great crested newts, further surveys are considered to be disproportionate. A precautionary working method will be implemented for common amphibians during construction, including the following measures:

- Should plans change to involve vegetation clearance, a staged approach will be adopted, whereby the vegetation will be trimmed to 15cm and left overnight to allow any amphibians to disperse. The vegetation can then be cleared to ground level and must be maintained at this level for the duration of construction to deter amphibians from the working area.
- Best practice pollution prevention measures will be implemented to minimise impacts to nearby aquatic habitats that amphibians could use.
- Any chemicals or pollutants used or created by the development should be stored and disposed of correctly according to COSHH regulations.
- If any common amphibians are found in the working area these should be allowed to disperse of their own accord or, if at immediate risk, should be moved by hand to a sheltered, vegetated area away from disturbance.
- In the unlikely event that a great crested newt is identified, works must cease and advice must be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist.

9. FAUNA: RIPARIAN ANIMALS

This section may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.

9.1 Summary of Survey Findings

A search of the magic.gov.uk database for granted EPSLs within a 2km radius of the site has been completed for riparian animals (otters and water voles). No EPSLs relating to riparian animals are present within a 2km radius of the site.

Habitat suitability

There are no water courses on or connected to the site. There are also no riparian habitats present on site or within an influencing distance.

9.2 Foreseen Impacts

No impacts are anticipated on riparian animals as a result of the proposed development.

9.3 Recommendations

No further surveys for riparian animals required.

10. FAUNA: HAZEL DORMOUSE

This section may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.

10.1 Summary of Survey Findings

EPSL data and local records

A search of the magic.gov.uk database for granted EPSLs within a 2km radius of the site has been completed for hazel dormouse. No EPSLs relating to hazel dormouse are present within a 2km radius of the site.

Habitat suitability

Dormice typically utilise a three-dimensional habitat structure as to commute between feeding and breeding sites whilst avoiding predation. While the native beech hedgerow to the north of the site could offer some opportunity for dormice to commute, this habitat is considered disconnected from further suitable habitats in the vicinity. Further, the nearest woodland is located 70m to the south and is separated from the site by 70m of hardstanding and residential properties. As such, the likelihood of this species being present on site is considered acceptably low. Furthermore, given that this hedgerow is to be retained in line with current development plans, further surveys are considered disproportionate.

10.2 Foreseen Impacts

No impacts are anticipated on hazel dormice as a result of the proposed development.

10.3 Recommendations

No further hazel dormouse surveys required.

11. FAUNA: BADGERS

This section may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.

11.1 Summary of Survey Findings

No evidence of badgers (setts, latrines, footprints or hairs) were noted on site or within a 30m radius of the site. While the habitats onsite are sub-optimal for badgers given the lack of fruiting trees/scrub/rank grassland, the possibility of badgers commuting onto site to forage in shrubs should not be discounted, particularly with the presence of ancient replanted woodland located nearby (70m south of the site).

11.2 Foreseen Impacts

The proposed development could kill or injure any badgers onsite, if present.

11.3 Recommendations

Owing to the nature of the proposed development and the low potential for impacts to badgers, further badger surveys are considered to be disproportionate. A precautionary working method will be implemented during construction, including the following measures:

- A toolbox talk will be given to contractors regarding the possible presence of badgers at the site.
- A pre-commencement inspection of the site will be undertaken for any new badger activity if works do not commence within three months.

- Heras fencing will be erected around the working area to prevent encroachment into retained habitats where badger setts could be present.
- Any excavations will be covered overnight, or a ramp will be installed to enable any trapped animals to escape.
- The use of night-time lighting will be avoided, or sensitive lighting design will be implemented to avoid light spill on to retained habitats which badgers could use.
- Any chemicals or pollutants used or created by the development should be stored and disposed of correctly according to COSHH regulations.
- In the unlikely event that a badger sett is identified, works must cease and advice must be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist.

12. FAUNA: INVERTEBRATES

This section may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.

12.1 Summary of Survey Findings

The habitats present on-site, including lawns, shrubs and trees, likely provide common invertebrates with opportunities to forage and shelter. The site contains no further notable habitats which may provide niches for specialised or protected invertebrates.

12.2 Foreseen Impacts

None foreseen.

12.3 Recommendations

No further surveys.

Suggested biodiversity enhancements

The incorporation of bee bricks (e.g. Ibstock BeeHabitat or similar alternative brand) into the fabric of the new buildings would provide sheltering opportunities for pollinators. These should be installed 0.5m above ground level on a south-facing elevation with no obscuring vegetation. The site could be further enhanced via the provision of native wildflowers or wildflower turf, which would provide foraging opportunities for invertebrates.

13. FAUNA: OTHER NOTABLE SPECIES

This section may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.

13.1 Summary of Survey Findings

Hedgehogs

The lawn and shrubs associated with the garden onsite provide good foraging and commuting opportunities for hedgehogs, particularly with woodland habitat nearby.

13.2 Foreseen Impacts

Hedgehogs

While no habitats are to be removed during construction, construction activities could result in the death or injury of hedgehogs, if present.

13.3 Recommendations

Hedgehogs

Similar to the badgers, a precautionary working method will be implemented during construction, including the following measures:

- Any excavations will be covered overnight, or a ramp will be installed to enable any trapped animals to escape.
- The use of night-time lighting will be avoided, or sensitive lighting design will be implemented to avoid light spill on to retained habitats which hedgehogs could use.
- Any chemicals or pollutants used or created by the development should be stored and disposed of correctly according to COSHH regulations.

If any hedgehogs are found in the working area these should be allowed to disperse of their own accord or, if at immediate risk, should be moved by hand to a sheltered, vegetated area away from disturbance.

13.4 Suggested Biodiversity Enhancements

Hedgehogs

The following habitat creation and enhancement opportunities could be incorporated into the proposed development which would be beneficial for hedgehogs:

- Creation of hedgehog houses in shady areas.
- Installation of gaps under boundary fencing to enable hedgehogs to move freely through the site.

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY/HABITAT MAP

PEA Map



PRA Map



APPENDIX 2: LOCATION MAP



APPENDIX 3: PROPOSED PLAN

No plans available.

DRAFT

APPENDIX 4: HABITAT IMAGES



Vegetated garden, northern parcel, facing west, featuring rhododendron shrubs



Vegetated garden, southern parcel, facing northeast



Vegetated garden, northern parcel facing northeast



Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface



Developed land; sealed surface, northern garden surrounding B1 and B2



Developed land; sealed surface, northern garden between scattered trees



Native hedgerow, northeastern site boundary



Scattered trees; hornbeam



Scattered trees; hornbeam

APPENDIX 5: BASELINE CONDITION SCORE TABLES

Native hedgerow (h2a) condition assessment.

	Criteria Description	Criteria Passed?
A	Height >1.5 m average along length. (The average height of woody growth estimated from base of stem to the top of the shoots, excluding any bank beneath the hedgerow, any gaps or isolated trees. Newly laid or coppiced hedgerows are indicative of good management and pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice). A newly planted hedgerow does not pass this criterion (unless it is >1.5 m height).)	Y
A	Width >1.5 m average along length. (The average width of woody growth estimated at the widest point of the canopy, excluding gaps and isolated trees. Outgrowths (such as blackthorn <i>Prunus spinosa</i> suckers) are only included in the width estimate when they are >0.5 m in height. Laid, coppiced, cut and newly planted hedgerows are indicative of good management and pass this criterion for up to a maximum of four years (if undertaken according to good practice).)	Y
B	Gap between ground and base of canopy <0.5 m for >90% of length. (This is the vertical 'gappiness' of the woody component of the hedgerow, and its distance from the ground to the lowest leafy growth. Certain exceptions to this criterion are acceptable (see page 65 of the Hedgerow Survey Handbook).)	Y
B	Gaps make up <10% of total length; and No canopy gaps >5 m. (This is the horizontal 'gappiness' of the woody component of the hedgerow. Gaps are complete breaks in the woody canopy (no matter how small). Access points and gates contribute to the overall 'gappiness' but are not subject to the >5 m criterion (as this is the typical size of a gate).)	Y
C	>1 m width of undisturbed ground with perennial herbaceous vegetation for >90% of length: Measured from outer edge of hedgerow; and Is present on one side of the hedgerow (at least). (This is the level of disturbance (excluding wildlife disturbance) at the base of the hedgerow. Undisturbed ground is present for at least 90% of the hedgerow length, greater than 1 m in width and must be present along at least one side of the hedgerow. This criterion recognises the value of the hedgerow base as a boundary habitat with the capacity to support a wide range of species. Cultivation, heavily trodden footpaths, poached ground etc. can limit available habitat niches.)	Y
C	Plant species indicative of nutrient enrichment of soils dominate <20% cover of the area of undisturbed ground. (The indicator species used are nettles <i>Urtica</i> spp., cleavers <i>Galium aparine</i> and docks <i>Rumex</i> spp. Their presence, either singly or together, does not exceed the 20% cover threshold.)	N

D	>90% of the hedgerow and undisturbed ground is free of invasive non-native plant species (including those listed on Schedule 9 of WCA) and recently introduced species. (Recently introduced species refer to plants that have naturalised in the UK since AD 1500 (neophytes). Archaeophytes count as natives. For information on archaeophytes and neophytes see the JNCC website, as well as the BSBI website where the 'Online Atlas of the British and Irish Flora' contains an up-to-date list of the status of species. For information on invasive non-native species see the GB Non-Native Secretariat website.)	Y
D	>90% of the hedgerow or undisturbed ground is free of damage caused by human activities. (This criterion addresses damaging activities that may have led to or lead to deterioration in other attributes. This could include evidence of pollution, piles of manure or rubble, or inappropriate management practices (for example, excessive hedgerow cutting).)	Y
		Total 7/8
	Condition good due to passing 7 of 8 criteria.	

Scattered trees (Group 1) condition assessment.

	Criteria Description	Criteria Passed?
A	The tree is a native species (or at least 70% within the block are native species).	Y
B	The tree canopy is predominantly continuous, with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide (individual trees automatically pass this criterion).	Y
C	The tree is mature (or more than 50% within the block are mature).	Y
D	There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by human activities (such as vandalism, herbicide or detrimental agricultural activity). And there is no current regular pruning regime, so the trees retain >75% of expected canopy for their age range and height.	Y
E	Natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates are present, such as presence of deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	Y
F	More than 20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.	Y
		Total 6/6
	Condition good due to passing 6 of 6 criteria.	

LIMITATION AND COPYRIGHT

Arbtech Consulting Limited has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named client or their agents in accordance with our General Terms and Conditions, under which our services are performed. It is expressly stated that no other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Limited. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by third parties. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Limited.

© This report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

VERSION CONTROL

Status	Issue	Name	Date
Draft	0.1	Harriet Pryer BA (Hons), MA, Graduate Ecologist	17/06/2026
Proof	0.2	Jamie-Lee Anderson BSc (Hons), Principal Ecologist	19/06/2026
Final	1.0	Harriet Pryer BA (Hons), MA, Graduate Ecologist	19/06/2026