Whitcher Wildlife Ltd.
Wildlife Consultants.

BOX MILL LANE, OXSPRING.

PHASE I HABITAT AND PROTECTED FAUNA SURVEY.

Ref No:- **120453.**

Date:- **10th May 2012.**

Cliff Edge, Cliff Road, Darfield, Barnsley, S73 9HR.
Tel. 01226 753271. Fax. 01226 270993.
info@whitcher-wildlife.co.uk www.whitcher-wildlife.co.uk
Company No. 4401613.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page Number
1. INTRODUCTION.	3
2. SURVEY METHODOLOGY.	4
3. SURVEY RESULTS.	6
4. EVALUATION OF FINDINGS.	15
5. RECOMMENDATIONS.	17
Appendix I. WATER VOLE INFORMATION.	18
Appendix II. BAT INFORMATION.	20
Appendix III. CRAYFISH INFORMATION.	21
Appendix IV. NESTING BIRD INFORMATION.	23
Appendix V. ANNOTATED MAP OF THE SURVEY AREA.	24
Appendix VI. KEY & TARGET NOTES.	25
Appendix VII. SPECIES LIST.	26
Appendix VIII. DATA SEARCH RESULTS.	27

1. INTRODUCTION.

1.1. A planning application has been submitted to Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council for the construction of several properties on land adjacent Box Mill Lane, Oxspring.

1.2. Whitcher Wildlife Ltd has been commissioned to carry out a Phase I Habitat and Protected Fauna Survey of the site to establish whether there are any issues that may affect the proposed works.

1.3. The site survey was carried out on 1st May 2012 and this report outlines the findings of that survey and makes appropriate recommendations.

1.4. Appendices I to IV of this report provide additional information on specific species and are designed to assist the reader to understand the contents of this report.

****

2. SURVEY METHODOLOGY.

2.1. Prior to visiting the site the survey area was cross referenced to maps and aerial photographs to give a general idea of the habitats within the area and to identify potential access and walking routes.

2.2. The survey area was walked where access was agreed and public rights of way were used where no access was agreed. All habitats within and immediately around the survey area were documented and the dominant species within that habitat listed in line with the JNCC Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat surveys.

2.3. The survey area and immediate surrounding area was thoroughly searched for evidence of badger (Meles meles) activity by looking for the following signs in line with Harris S, Cresswell P and Jefferies D (1989). *Surveying Badgers*. Mammal Society:-

* Badger setts.
* Badger latrines or dung pits.
* Badger snuffle holes and evidence of foraging.
* Badger paths.
* Badger prints in areas of soft mud.
* Badger hairs caught on fencing.

2.4. All watercourses within the survey area and for approximately 50m in each direction were thoroughly searched for evidence of water vole (Arvicola terrestris) activity by looking for the following signs, in line with the guidance in the Water Vole Handbook:-

* Water vole burrows.
* Water vole faeces and latrines.
* Water vole feeding stations.
* Water vole runs.
* Water vole prints in areas of soft mud.
* Water vole lawns.
* Predator field signs.

2.5. All watercourses within the survey area and for approximately 100m in each direction were thoroughly searched for evidence of otter (lutra lutra) activity by looking for the following signs in line with the National Rivers Authority guidelines:-

* Otter prints in soft mud.
* Otter spraints.
* Otter Holts.

2.6. All mature trees and derelict buildings were checked for potential bat roosting sites in line with the Bat Conservation Trust, Good Practice Guidelines by looking for the following signs:-

* Holes, cracks or crevices.
* Bat Droppings.

2.7. The land adjacent to the survey area was assessed for bat roosting and foraging potential including connective routes and flight lines.

2.8. The area within 500m of the survey site was cross referenced to maps to highlight all ponds close to the site. Where possible the ponds were accessed using agreed access or public rights of way to assess the potential for great crested newts (*Triturus cristatus*) to be present.

2.9. All watercourses and waterbodies within the survey area and for approximately 50m in each direction were thoroughly searched for the presence of crayfish where safe to enter the water. The survey was carried out in accordance with the Conserving Natural 2000 Rivers Monitoring Series No 1, Protocol for Monitoring the White Clawed Crayfish.

2.10. The survey area was thoroughly searched for the presence of reptiles or suitable reptile habitats.

2.11. All surveys were carried out in line with the IEEM survey standards and advice.

2.12. This survey was carried out by Michael Sims, Bsc. Environmental Conservation. This degree covered all aspects of the conservation sector, including biological recording and habitat management. In 2010 Michael began an apprenticeship with The Sheffield Wildlife Trust as a Biodiversity Skills Trainee. There he trained in Phase 1 Habitat survey, plant identification and bat survey. He also achieved an OCN in Environmental Conservation. In February 2011 he was recruited by Whitcher Wildlife Ltd. where he has specialised in Phase 1 Habitat Survey, but has also branched out into protected species survey. He has attended a number of courses, whilst at both The Sheffield Wildlife Trust and at Whitcher Wildlife Ltd., focussing upon plant identification but also crayfish and great crested newt survey. He is currently working towards his protected species licences.

****

3. SURVEY RESULTS.

3.1. Data Search Results.

3.1.1. The Sheffield Biological Records Centre (SBRC) and NBN Gateway & MAGIC websites were searched for records of protected species and designated sites which could potentially be impacted upon by the proposed works.

3.1.2. The SBRC held no records of designated sites within 1km of the proposed location of works. The SBRC held one protected species record: a common bat located 0.9km from the survey area. See Appendix VIII.

3.1.3. The NBN Gateway held the following protected species records: freshwater white-clawed crayfish within the River Don – 500m from the site, whiskered bat within 1km, Noctule bat within 1.25km and common pipistrelle bat within 2.5km.

3.1.4. The MAGIC website held the following designated site records: Ancient Woodland Biodiversity Action Plan Habitat (BAP) within 525m and Lowland Meadows (BAP) within 2.2km. See Figure 1 below.




Fig 1.

3.2. The Surveyed Area.

3.2.1. The survey area covered the location of 'Land Adjacent to 81 Sheffield Road, Penistone'. The boundary of this is shown on the aerial photograph in Figure 2 below.

3.2.2. Within the site boundary was an area of hard-standing, commercial buildings, woodland, grassland and running water.



Fig 2.

3.3. Description of Habitats.

3.3.1. Appendix V of this report contains an annotated map. This shows the habitats present at the site. Target notes have been used to highlight specific features. These are cross referenced to Appendix VI of this report.

The habitats on and adjacent to the site are:-

- ***A1.1.1. Broad-leaved Semi-natural Woodland.***
- ***A2.1. Continuous Scrub.***
- ***A3.1. Scattered Broad-leaved Trees.***
- ***B2.2. Semi-improved Neutral Grassland.***
- ***B4. Improved Grassland.***
- ***C3.1. Tall Ruderal.***
- ***J1.2. Amenity Grassland.***

3.3.1. - A1.1.1. Broad-leaved Semi-natural Woodland.

3.3.1.1. A band of woodland covered the northern and eastern site boundaries and the south-eastern corner of the site. A block of woodland also occurred just outside of the north-western boundary.

3.3.1.2. The woodland to the south-east was dominated by silver birch *(Betula pendula).* There was little in the way of ground flora species. Some areas were dominated by bramble scrub *(Rubus fruticosus).*

3.3.1.3. The woodland which occurred along the northern site boundary included several mature stands. Sycamore *(Acer pseudoplantanus)*, beech *(Fagus sylvatica)*, willow sp *(Salix sp.)* and hawthorn *(Crataegus monogyna).* occurred here. This strip was connected to a band of well-established woodland to the east of the site.

3.3.1.4. The woodland outside of the north-western boundary was well established. This is dominated by silver birch and willow sp.. Along the woodland edge was a mix of wild flowers and bramble scrub. Wild flowers included creeping forget-me-not *(Myosotis secunda)*, garlic mustard *(Alliaria petiolata)* and hedgerow cranesbill *(Geranium pyrenaicum).*

3.3.2. - A2.1. Continuous Scrub.

Scrub dominated at three locations within the site boundary: towards the south-eastern corner, towards the western corner and towards the eastern corner. Bramble was the dominant species in all three locations.

3.3.3. - A3.1. Scattered Broad-leaved Trees.

Broad-leaved trees were scattered through the centre of the site and occurred as part of the woodland edge towards the east. Hawthorn dominated the species mix. These trees were semi-mature.

3.3.4. - B2.2. Semi-improved Neutral Grassland.

A thin strip of semi-improved grassland occurred along the north of the site, running parallel to the southern bank of the River Don. A wider range of herb species was present in this band than elsewhere at the site, likely due to the less intensive management that takes place in this area.

3.3.5. – B4. Improved Grassland.

A large proportion of the site has been classed as Improved Grassland. The body of this occurred within the centre of the site. Although this grassland has been left to grow long, many of the species expected in a semi-improved sward are missing. The species mix is small, both of the grass and herb species. Grasses, such as Yorkshire fog *(Holcus lanatus)* and perennial rye-grass *(Lolium perenne)*, dominated. Common herbs, such a dandelion *(Taraxacum officinale)*, white clover *(Trifolium repens)*, common sorrel *(Rumex acetosa)* and ragwort *(Senecio jacobaea)*, were present throughout the sward, but were in low density.

3.3.6. C3.1. Tall Ruderal.

An area of monoculture rosebay willowherb *(Epilobium angustifolium)* occurred towards the south of the improved grassland area.

3.3.7. - J1.2. Amenity Grassland.

Two areas of Amenity occurred within the survey area. One is located towards the west, the other towards the south. Both of these were areas of the improved grassland which have been mown short. The intensive management utilised and the limited species mix present are why these areas have been classed as Amenity Grassland.

3.4. Description of Ecological Issues.

3.4.1. Badger.

No badger setts or badger field signs, such as well worn paths, latrines or snuffle holes were identified within the survey area.

3.4.2. Water vole.

3.4.2.1. The River Don is known to support populations of water vole, and the section of The Don which is located adjacent to the northern site boundary was assessed as being potentially suitable water vole habitat, see Figure 3 below.

3.4.2.2. Due to very heavy rainfall in the week preceding this survey, it was not possible to properly survey for water vole field signs. At the time of survey, the bank

area which could potentially be utilised by water vole was submerged and field signs, such as burrows, droppings and foot prints, would have either been submerged or would have washed away.

3.4.2.3. The watercourse to the east of the site was assessed as being unsuitable water vole habitat due to its brick /concrete lined banks, see Figure 4 below.



Fig 3.



Fig 4.

3.4.3. Otter.

The River Don is known to support populations of otter, and the section of The Don which is located adjacent to the northern site boundary was assessed as being potentially suitable otter habitat, see Figure 3 above. No otter holts or otter field signs, such as prints or spraints, were identified during this survey.

3.4.4. Freshwater white-clawed crayfish.

3.4.4.1. Both the River Don and the smaller watercourse to the east of the site were assessed as being potentially suitable freshwater white-clawed crayfish habitat.

3.4.4.2. As this survey was conducted at an inappropriate time of year, a freshwater white-clawed crayfish survey could not be conducted.

3.4.5. Bat.

3.4.5.1. Several mature trees located along the eastern and northern boundaries of the site were assessed as being potentially suitable bat roosting habitat, due to the presence of suitable structural cracks and holes. See Figure 5 below.



Fig 5.

3.4.5.2. Three buildings are located within the south-west of the site. These were assessed for their potential as bat roosting habitat. These are referred to as building '1', '2' and '3', see figure 6 below.

3.4.5.3. Building 1.

This is a brick-built building which has rendered walls, see Figure 7 below. It has a tiled roof and wooden fascia boards, see Figure 8 below. There are gaps behind the fascia boards and within the mortar of the gable-end tiles. Both of these features make that the roof of this building is potentially suitable habitat for crevice dwelling bats. No bat field signs were identified in this location.




Fig 6.



Fig 7.




Fig 8.

3.4.5.4. Building 2.

This is a corrugated roofed single-story building, see Figure 9 below. There is poor bat roosting potential in this building.



Fig 9.

3.4.5.5. Building 3.

This a single-story building with a flat roof which has been clad with roofing felt. There are no suitable gaps in this roof, so there is poor potential for roosting bats.



Fig 10.

3.4.6. Great Crested Newt.

No ponds are located within 500m of the site, so there is no potential for great crested newt to be present within the site boundary.

3.4.7. Invasive plant species.

No schedule 9 invasive plant species, such as Japanese Knotweed and Himalayan Balsam, were identified within the site boundary.

3.4.8. Nesting birds.

No active bird's nests were identified within the site boundary. A high level of bird activity was observed within site vegetation. The large proportion of site vegetation is potentially suitable for use as nesting bird habitat.

3.4.9. Reptiles.

Due to a general lack of refugia, this site has been assessed as being unsuitable habitat for reptiles.

****

4. EVALUATION OF FINDINGS.

4.1. No Biodiversity Action Plan habitats or plant species were located within the site boundary. The mature trees which were located along the northern and eastern site boundaries represent the best ecological resources of the site as they will support large quantities of invertebrates and will potentially provide bird nesting and bat roosting opportunities. The woodland to the west of the site and the River Don to the north of the site are both important ecological resources, but they are located outside of the proposed site boundary and should not be impacted upon by the works.

4.2. The grassland habitats were of poor species diversity. Grass species dominated within these habitats and wild flowers, which could provide feeding resources for invertebrates and their associated predators, were scarce.

4.3. As no badger field signs or badger setts were identified within the site boundary, the works will have no impacts upon badgers.

4.4. Due to unsuitable weather conditions, it was not possible to survey for water vole along the section of the River Don located adjacent to the northern site boundary. This section of The Don was assessed as being potentially suitable water vole habitat, and it is known that water vole is present within other sections of The Don. If development does not impact the banks of The River Don, there will not be impacts upon water vole. If the banks of The River Don are to be impacted upon by the proposed works, there could potentially be direct impacts upon water voles.

4.5. As no otter field signs were identified along the section of The River Don located adjacent to the northern site boundary, the works will have no impacts upon otter.

4.6. Both the River Don, and the smaller watercourse located to the east of the site were assessed as being potentially suitable habitat for freshwater white-clawed crayfish. A crayfish survey could not be conducted as the crayfish survey season does not begin until July. If the beds of these watercourses are to be unaffected by the works, there will be no impacts upon crayfish. If the beds of these watercourses are to be impacted upon, there could potentially be direct impacts upon crayfish.

4.7. The site was assessed as being potentially suitable bat roosting habitat.

Building #1 was assessed as being potentially suitable habitat for roosting bats, due to the presence of wooden fascia boards and missing mortar from the gable-end tiles. If this roof is to be impacted upon by the proposed works, there could potentially be direct impacts upon roosting bats. If this building is to remain unaffected, there will be no associated bat issues.

4.6.1. Building #2 and #3 were assessed as having poor potential as bat roosting habitat. If these buildings are to be impacted by the proposed works, it is unlikely that there will be associated bat issues.

4.6.2. Several of the mature trees located along the northern and eastern site boundaries possessed cracks and holes which could be potentially suitable as bat roosting habitat. If these trees are to be impacted upon by the proposed works, there could potentially be direct impacts upon roosting bats. If they are to remain unaffected, there will be no associated bat issues.

4.6.3. No other potential bat roosting habitat was identified within the site boundary. This site could potentially be utilised as bat foraging territory.

4.7. As no suitable ponds were identified within 500m of the site, there is no potential for great crested newts to be present within the site boundary. The works will have no impacts upon great crested newts.

4.8. No Schedule 9 invasive plant species were identified within the site boundary, so there are no associated issues.

4.9. Although no active bird's nests were identified during this survey, a high level of bird activity was observed during the survey. As the site contained potentially suitable nesting bird habitat, any vegetation clearance carried out during the nesting bird season, March to September, could potentially impact upon nesting birds.

4.10. As this site was assessed as being generally unsuitable habitat for reptiles, the works will have no impacts upon reptiles.

****

5. RECOMMENDATIONS.

5.1. Although many of the habitats present within the site have been assessed as not being of much note, development on this area will constitute a loss of habitat for invertebrates and their associated predators. Therefore, it is recommended that areas of wild flower planting are incorporated into any forthcoming development.

5.2. If the banks of The River Don are to be impacted upon by the proposed works, it is recommended that water vole surveys are conducted after the flow level has dropped to its normal level.

5.3. If the beds of either The River Don or the smaller watercourse to the east of the site are to be impacted upon by the proposed works it is recommended that freshwater white-clawed crayfish surveys are carried out. These surveys must be carried out between July and October.

5.4. If the roof of the building referred to as 'Building 1' throughout this report is to be impacted upon by the proposed works, it is recommended that dusk emergence bat survey are carried out to assess the presence or absence of roosting bats. This survey must be carried out between May and September.

5.5. If vegetation clearance is to be carried out, it is recommended that this takes place outside of the nesting bird season, which extends from March to September. If vegetation clearance must be carried out within this period, it must be immediately preceded by a nesting bird survey.

****

Michael Sims.
Bsc. Environmental Conservation.

10.05.2012.

Appendix I. WATER VOLE INFORMATION.

It is necessary to understand a little about water voles, their basic nature, ecology and legal protection in order to evaluate the findings of this report.

The water vole is the largest of the British voles. It lives in a series of holes or burrows at the waters edge and can be found along the banks of ditches, streams, rivers, lakes and canals. Although water voles live in colonies, the breeding females are territorial, each defining their contiguous territory with latrines during the breeding season. This lasts from March to October.

The water vole is herbivorous, feeding primarily on the lush aerial stems and leaves of waterside plants growing alongside the watercourse. Its activity is normally confined to the area within two metres of the watercourse. Bankside vegetation in this area is not only essential for food but also for cover from predators.

The water vole population has been on the decline in recent years. This is partly due to loss of suitable riverside habitats but also due to the increasing population of predators, particularly the escaped American mink. Population decline has been dramatic and has accelerated over the last seven years. Surveys carried out by the Vincent Wildlife Trust show a loss of 67% of occupied sites and of 88% of the remaining population in the last seven years.

The water vole has received limited legal protection since April 1998 when it was included in Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Section 9(4) of the Act protects the water vole's place of shelter or protection but does not protect the water vole itself.

From the 6th April 2008 water voles received an increased level of protection, becoming fully covered by the provisions of section 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

Full legal protection under the Act makes it an offence to:

- Intentionally kill, injure or take water voles.
- Possess or control live or dead water voles or derivatives.
- Intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy or obstruct access to any structure or place used for shelter or protection.
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb water voles whilst occupying a structure or place used for that purpose.
- Sell water voles or offer or expose for sale or transport for sale.
- Publish or cause to be published any advertisement which conveys the buying or selling of water voles.

****

Appendix II. BAT INFORMATION.

It is necessary to understand a little about bats, their basic nature, ecology and legal protection in order to evaluate the findings of this report.

Over 15 species of bat have been recorded in Britain. These fall into two families, the horseshoe bats and the 'ordinary bats'. They are extremely difficult to identify in the hand and even more so in flight.

All appear to be diminishing in numbers, probably due to shortage of food, caused by pesticides, as insects are their sole diet, and habitat change.

As their diet consists solely of insects, bats hibernate during the winter when their food source is at its most scarce. They will spend the winter in hollow trees, caves, mines and the roofs of buildings.

Certain species, particularly the pipistrelle (the commonest and most widespread British bat) can quickly adapt to man made structures and will readily use these to roost and to rear their young.

Bats are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, The Habitats Regulations 1994 and the Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000.

It is an offence to intentionally or recklessly kill, injure or capture or disturb bats or to damage, destroy or obstruct access to any place used by bats for shelter or protection.

A breeding or resting site of any bat is known as a bat roost. A bat roost is therefore any structure a bat uses for shelter or protection. Because bats tend to use the same roosts each year, legal opinion is that the roost site is protected whether or not the bats are present at that time.

Bat roosts can be identified by looking for:-

- Suitable holes, cracks and crevices.
- Bat droppings.
- Prey remains.
- By carrying out night observations using a bat detector.

Where development proposals are likely to affect a bat roost site, a licence is required from Natural England.

The person applying for that licence has to be suitably qualified and experienced in bat matters. That person is then responsible for ensuring that the measures contained in the licence are carried out.

Appendix III. CRAYFISH INFORMATION.

It is necessary to understand a little about crayfish, their basic nature, ecology and legal protection in order to evaluate the findings of this report.

Crayfish are the largest and most mobile freshwater invertebrate. The white-clawed crayfish *(Austropotamobius pallipes)* is the only native crayfish and this is protected under European and UK legislation.

White clawed crayfish are generally found in areas with relatively hard, mineral rich waters on calcareous and rapidly weathering rocks. They can be found in a wide variety of environments including canals, streams, rivers, lakes reservoirs and water-filled quarries.

White clawed crayfish are typically found in water between 0.75 and 1.25m deep but can occur in very shallow streams with as little water as 50mm and in deeper, slow flowing rivers. They are typically found under rocks and submerged logs or among tree roots and in river-banks. White clawed crayfish are omnivorous but primarily carnivorous eating macro invertebrates and carrion when available. They will also eat worms, insect larvae, snails, small fish, macrophytes, algae and calcified plants.

Crayfish can live for up to ten years and generally reach sexual maturity after three to four years. Breeding takes place between September and November when the water temperature drops consistently to below ten degrees centigrade. Females over winter with a clutch of eggs held beneath their tail. These may number from 20 to 120 and hatch on the female. The juveniles are released from the mother from June in the south to August in the north.

The main threat to the indigenous white-clawed crayfish is the spread of introduced non indigenous species, particularly the larger, faster growing and aggressive North American signal crayfish *(pacifastacus leniusculus)*. They are also vulnerable to disease, particularly porcelain disease and crayfish plague, and the latter carried by the signal crayfish.

Crayfish are also extremely vulnerable to pollution incidents, particularly those involving biocides, silage and sheep dip.

As a result, white-clawed crayfish are endangered across most of its range and has been given protection under both European and UK legislation.

The white-clawed crayfish is listed on Annex V of the Habitats Directive (EEC 1992), which means that Member States should take measures to ensure that the taking of white-clawed crayfish in the wild is compatible with their being maintained at a favourable status.

In 1998, the white-clawed crayfish was added to Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act giving it partial protection in relation to Section 9(1) as far as it relates to taking and in respect of Schedule 9(5). It is therefore an offence to

intentionally take any white-clawed crayfish from the wild and an offence to sell wild crayfish.

Licences are available from English Nature to allow the taking of white-clawed crayfish for certain specified purposes, including scientific or educational purposes and for conservation purposes. An English Nature survey licence is required where any survey is aimed at finding white-clawed crayfish and involves handling them for counting or identification purposes.

An English Nature Conservation Licence is required for the purpose of conserving white-clawed crayfish or introducing them to particular areas.

Non indigenous crayfish species are also covered under the wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Section 14 makes it an offence for any person to (a) release or allow to escape, any wild animal which is of a kind not ordinarily resident in or a regular visitor to Great Britain in a wild state or; (b) is included in Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act.

Three species of non-indigenous crayfish are listed on Schedule 9. These are the signal crayfish *(Pacifastacus leniusculus)*, the narrow clawed crayfish *(Astacus leptodacylus)* and the noble crayfish *(Astacus astacus)*. Any of these three species found during a survey cannot be returned to the wild.

Appendix IV. NESTING BIRD INFORMATION.

It is necessary to understand a little about the legal protection offered to nesting birds in order to evaluate the findings of this report.

Part 1.-(1) Of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981states that:-

If any person intentionally:-

(a) kills, injures or takes any wild bird;
(b) takes, damages or destroys the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or being built; or
(c) takes or destroys an egg of any wild bird,

he shall be guilty of an offence.

Part 1.-(5) of the Act states that:-

If any person intentionally:-

(a) disturbs any wild bird included in Schedule 1 while it is building a nest or is in, on, or near a nest containing eggs or young; or
(b) disturbs dependant young of such a bird,

he shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a special penalty.


The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 amends the above by inserting after "intentionally" the words "or recklessly".

The nesting season will vary according to the weather each year but generally commences in March, peaks during May and June and continues until September.

It is also worth remembering that some birds nest in trees and scrub but others are ground nesting.

The best way to avoid this issue is to plan for vegetation clearance to be carried out outside the bird-nesting season.

Appendix V. ANNOTATED MAP OF THE SURVEY AREA.




Appendix VI.

KEY.



Amenity Grassland



Continuous Scrub



Tall Ruderal



Broad-leaved Woodland



Semi-improved Grasslan



Improved Grassland


TARGET NOTES.

1. Area of planted daffodils and tulips
2. Woodland edge habitat of bramble scrub
3. Woodland wild flower edge with wood forget-me-not, wood anemone and garlic mustard

Appendix VII. SPECIES LIST.

A (trees and shrubs)		
	Sycamore	*Acer pseudoplatanus*
	Hawthorn	*Crataegus monogyna*
	Beech	*Fagus sylvatica*
	Ash	*Fraxinus excelsior*
	Oak	*Quercus*
	Grey willow	*Salix atrocinerea*
	Goat willow	*Salix caprea*
B (herbs and wild flowers)		
	Garlic mustard	*Alliaria petiolata*
	Cow parsley	*Anthriscus sylvestris*
	Lady's smock	*Cardamine pratensis*
	Spanish bluebell	*Endymion hispanicus*
	Hedgerow cranesbill	*Geranium pyrenaicum*
	Common hogweed	*Heracleum sphondylium*
	Water forget-me-not	*Myosotis scorpioides*
	Creeping forget-me-not	*Myosotis secunda*
	Daffodil	*Narcissus*
	Curled dock	*Rumex crispus*
	Broad-leaved dock	*Rumex obtusifolius*
	Ragwort	*Senecio jacobaea*
	Common chickweed	*Stellaria media*
	Dandelion	*Taraxacum officinale*
	Tulip sp.	*Tulipa*
	Common nettle	*Urtica dioica*
C (grasses)		
	Cock's foot	*Dactylis glomerata*
	Sheep's fescue	*Festuca ovina*
	Yorkshire fog	*Holcus lanatus*
	Creeping soft-grass	*Holcus mollis*
	Perennial rye-grass	*Lolium perenne*
D (rushes and sedges)		
	Compact rush	*Juncus conglomeratus*
	Soft rush	*Juncus effusus*
	Hard rush	*Juncus inflexus*

Appendix VIII. DATA SEARCH RESULTS.



SE2403	Tennyson Close Penistone, Barnsley MDC	31/07/2008		terrestrial mammal	Pipistrellus pipistrellus	Pipistrelle