

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal

Survey site:

Brierley CofE Primary School, Beech Close, Barnsley S72 9EJ

Client:

Joan Wood

Survey date:

08/04/2026

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application with Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council. This proposal can be described as the erection of a temporary Portakabin modular building serving as a nursery (educational) facility.

The survey results and recommendations contained within this report are valid for 18 months. An updated site visit may be required if the report is to be used any longer than 18 months after completion

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 Tables 1, 3 & 4 of this report.

Key Findings

Habitats on site:
Modified grassland g4, frequently mown 108
Introduced shrub 847, bare ground 510

NO habitats meet the criteria of an **Important Habitat** of high conservation value (e.g Section 41 Habitat of Principal Importance, Annex 1, Irreplaceable Habitat) (e.g Section 41 Habitat of Principal Importance, Annex 1, Irreplaceable Habitat), and the habitats on site are of no specific conservation value but have value at the **LOCAL** level. The loss of these habitats will contribute to net losses of biodiversity locally.

There are no specific concerns regarding any **Protected or otherwise Important Species** of a scale warranting further investigation. Precautionary measures of vegetation clearance/demolition methodology and construction site management are detailed for fauna. A Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEMP) may be requested as a condition of planning consent.

The development will need to achieve a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain to offset habitat losses, preferentially using onsite or adjacent means, supported by a 30 year, legally binding Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan, with offsite (per habitat unit) financial contributions required if not feasible.

An Ecological Management and Enhancement Plan (EMEP) or variant of that may be required by condition to secure habitat and wildlife enhancement measures in line with non BNG related local planning policy and national legislative requirements.

Further information including conclusions, justifications and opportunities for biodiversity enhancement, is provided within the body of the report.

Contents

Introduction and Context	3
Introduction.....	3
Methodology	3
Limitations	3
Results, Impacts and Recommendations	4
Site Location and Landscape Context	4
Habitats and Flora.....	6
Fauna.....	8
Appendix 1: Proposed Development Plan.....	20
Appendix 2: Site Location Plan	21
Appendix 3: Habitat Survey Plan.....	22
Appendix 4: Site Photographs	23
Appendix 5: Baseline Condition Assessments	25
Limitations and Copyright.....	26
Version Control	26

Introduction and Context

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.

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 - 2024](#).

Limitations

Whilst every effort has been made to describe the baseline conditions within the survey area, and evaluate these features, this report is a preliminary assessment and does not provide a complete characterisation of the site. Nor does it represent a full botanical assessment. It assesses the likelihood of protected, notable and important habitats and species being present, based on a site and landscape level habitat value-based risk assessment. This is based upon the ecology, biology and known distribution of species as currently understood.

A biological records data search has not been undertaken. However, given the location of the site, the nature of the habitats present and the assessed suitability of the site for protected or notable species, it is not anticipated that the purchase of biological records data will add any significant weight or alter the conclusions and recommendations outlined in this report.

Results, Impacts and Recommendations

Site Location and Landscape Context

Table 1: Site location and landscape context

Site Location
<p>The site is located at National Grid Reference SE 41196 11101 and has an area of approximately 0.03ha comprising modified grassland and introduced shrub. The site is located in a rural setting, immediately surrounded by the small village of Brierley with vegetated gardens and minor roads. Directly adjacent to the site lies a cemetery in the west. Approx 120m east of the sites lies a tree lined recreational park. The site, which is a school, is surrounded by palisade security fencing, lines of trees and hedgerow. There is an entrance for cars and walkers which is gated but offers routes for commuting.</p> <p>The wider landscape is comprised largely of arable fields, however they are surrounded by hedgerows and tree lined avenues, many of which offering direct connectivity to scattered woodlands particularly in the south and east, including Grimethorpe Nature Reserve approx 3km south. Approx 5.9km north-west however lies an A road which, while relatively small for a principal road, may still pose an obstacle to migration and commuting. Beyond that however, lies further scattered woodlands, well connected via hedgerows and tree lined avenues.</p> <p>A review of historic maps indicates that the village of Brierley did exist in the mid 1800's, however at a much smaller scale. The site itself had not yet been lost to development, and consisted of tree lined agricultural fields. Some aspects of the surrounding countryside remain the same however, such as Tom Bank Wood which lies approx. 787m south.</p> <p>There are multiple drains dotted throughout the wider landscape, with the River Dearne located 3.9km south, and Winterset Reservoir lying 4.7km north-west. None are connected to the site.</p> <p>The underlying bedrock of the site is Brierley Rock-Sandstone. This has weathered to generate soils that are slightly acid and loamy that are freely draining with low fertility.</p> <p>The elevation is 97m above sea level.</p>
Priority Habitats and Designated Sites

Summary of Survey Findings

Priority Habitats

There are 3 priority habitats located within 2 km of the site. These comprise deciduous woodland, traditional orchard and ancient & semi-natural woodland. The closest priority habitat comprises deciduous woodland, located ~155 m S of the site.

The site has relatively good connectivity to nearby habitats of principal importance via hedgerows and tree lined avenues, particularly to the south where there is an absence of main roads. The habitats themselves are also connected to one another, via hedgerows and tree lines avenues.

Designated Sites

There are no other statutory sites within 2 km of the site. There are no statutory sites within 10 km of the site.

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

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.

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.

Recommendations

No recommendations.

Habitats and Flora

The site survey was undertaken by Johnny Byrne BSc (Hons), MSc, FISC3, Graduate Ecologist.

Table 2: Survey weather conditions

Date of survey	Temperature (°C)	Humidity (%)	Cloud Cover (%)	Wind (km/h)	Rain
08/04/2026	11.2	78	43	5	None

Table 3: Habitats and flora

Habitats and Flora: Conclusion, Impact or Recommendations
<i>This table 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.</i>
Onsite habitats
<p>Summary of Survey Findings</p> <p><u>Modified grassland (g4) - Frequently mown (108)</u> The site of development comprises largely modified grassland bordered by three different areas. North and east is a palisade fence which while thickly covered in shrubby vegetation such as flowering currant, firethorn, forsythia and holly berry cotoneaster in parts, nowhere did it meet the requirements to be called a hedgerow. To the south and west the site is wooded and contains a pond. To the north-west is another strip of modified grassland before reaching a car park.</p> <p>Species present within this habitat include daisy (<i>Bellis perennis</i>), dandelion (<i>Taraxacum</i> agg.), greater plantain (<i>Plantago major</i>), cock's-foot (<i>Dactylis glomerata</i>), red fescues (<i>Festuca rubra</i>), perennial rye-grass (<i>Lolium perenne</i>), creeping buttercup (<i>Ranunculus repens</i>), cleavers (<i>Galium aparine</i>), common field-speedwell (<i>Veronica persica</i>), common mouse-ear (<i>Cerastium fontanum</i>), bristly ox-tongue (<i>Helminthotheca echioides</i>) and cow parsley (<i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i>).</p>

In accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessment Matrix, the modified grassland was assessed to have a poor condition value.

Introduced shrub (847) - Bare ground (510)

There are three small ornamental areas of elevated bare ground contained within rectangular linear rock piles, containing introduced shrubs. Herbaceous natives and bryophytes have colonised one of them, which contains box and variegated leaved Japanese spindle, while the other two remain largely bare ground apart from the shrub.

Species present within this habitat include cypress sp. (*Cupressus* sp.), box (*Buxus sempervirens*), groundsel (*Senecio vulgaris*), bristly oxtongue (*Helminthotheca echioides*), dandelion (*Taraxacum* agg.), caucasian stonecrop (*Phedimus spurius*), roseroot (*Rhodiola rosea* (probably a garden cultivar), sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus*), sticky mouse-ear (*Cerastium glomeratum*), annual meadow-grass (*Poa annua*), (*Acer* sp.), and japanese spindle (*Euonymus japonicus*).

In accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Condition Assessment Matrix, this habitat is not subject to a condition assessment and is automatically assigned a poor condition.

Impacts

No direct impacts to any notable habitats will occur as a result of the proposed development. However, indirect effects such as pollution or habitat damage could occur during construction.

Recommendations

Best practice measures to minimise the possibility of pollution must be implemented during construction. This should include the following measures:

- Remove only the minimum of habitat required to facilitate the development
- Protect retained turf and soil resource from destruction and compaction using plastic matting and wooden boarding. Do not store skips and other heavy materials on retained turf.
- Grasscrete, cell web or any other porous surface treatment facilitating recovery of vegetation is preferred to hard standing.

A Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEMP) may be required, outlining best practice measures delineate the construction zone and to minimise the possibility of pollution and habitat damage during construction.

The proposed development may require a Biodiversity Net Gain assessment, to calculate the value of habitats on site and ensure

the delivery of a minimum of 10% measurable biodiversity net gain. However it is likely to fall below the thresholds for qualification.

Invasive / Non-native species

Summary of Survey Findings

Hollyberry cotoneaster, a Schedule 9 Invasive Species was found on site. No further non-native invasive or otherwise problematic plants were recorded on site but given seasonal limitations and the sites wider context, may be visible at other times of year. However, while outside of the optimal time for botany surveys, it is expected that seedlings would by now be visible. Therefore, it is considered unlikely that they are on site.

Impacts

The impacts of leaving the plant in situ are unlikely to enact significant ecological impacts.

Recommendations

None, further surveys deemed disproportionate.

Fauna

Table 4: Fauna

Fauna: Conclusion, Impact or Recommendations

This table 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.

Roosting Bats

Summary of Survey Findings

A review of the MAGIC database for European Protected Species Licences (EPSL) for bats within a 2km radius of the site has been completed. 1 EPSL was identified, as detailed below:

Table 4a: EPSL records within 2km of the site - bats

EPSL reference	Bat species affected	Distance from site	Impacts allowed by licence
EPSM2012-4323	Common pipistrelle	~970m south	Destruction of resting place

No buildings or trees were present on site with suitable roosting features for bats to utilise.

Impacts

No impacts on roosting bats are anticipated.

Recommendations

None.

Foraging and Commuting Bats

Summary of Survey Findings

Modified grassland could be used in a limited capacity by local bat populations for foraging for invertebrates. In addition, the site is well connected to more suitable habitats in the wider landscape such as woodland.

Impacts

The proposed development will result in the loss of a minor area of modified grassland. Given the presence of more extensive areas of foraging and commuting habitat in the locality, this is likely to be inconsequential for bats.

Recommendations

No further surveys required.

Amphibians

Summary of Survey Findings

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

A check was also completed for great crested newt class survey license returns and historic pond surveys. No records were identified.

The grounds of the school contain a pond, although it is not part of the area of development and will not be directly effected. The pond itself was little more than mud at the time of visit with very few areas of water, with those that did exist being only around a centimetre deep at most.

While a drain of unknown water levels exists approx 180m south-east, a review of aerial imagery shows there are no further known ponds within 500m of the site.

Great crested newts *Triturus vulgaris* exist in metapopulations and persistence within a landscape requires; a) free, unimpeded movement between breeding ponds and b) intervening, invertebrate and refugia rich terrestrial habitat with good connecting linkage habitat (e.g. hedgerows) to provide commuting routes during the migratory parts of their life cycle. Most adults are thought not to range far beyond 250m from their breeding ponds but scattered, transient individuals may occur up to 500m from breeding ponds. Section 41 Species of Principal Importance the common toad exhibits similar landscape requirements in terms of its migration between breeding ponds, although its waterbody requirements are more cosmopolitan.

Adult amphibians spend a significant proportion of their life cycles on land, with most of their time in water comprising the breeding season. Their terrestrial requirements must provide abundant ground ranging invertebrate food items and sufficient cover to avoid predation and desiccation. There must be a high availability of dark and damp refugia and hibernacula options.

Landscape Connectivity

While the local and wider landscape contains a lot of arable land, there are also pockets of woodland which are well connected to one another via tree lined avenues and hedgerows, accessible from the site via a small number of vegetated gardens. Dispersal routes around the landscape are relatively unimpeded by major barriers such as principal roads, large gaps between hedgerow sections and major/fast flowing watercourses, thus enabling migratory amphibians such as GCN and common toad to migrate

without obstruction.

Terrestrial Habitat

The site is considered sub-optimal for GCN because the habitats on site and their management provide little in the way of cover and refugia. Foraging opportunities are likely to be rather limited and the risk of predation on crossing the open lawns would be high. However, the connected wooded area of the site provides good GCN habitat value, therefore the presence of transient individual GCN or common amphibians cannot be ruled out.

Ponds

There is a pond adjacent to the site. This was subject to a Habitat Suitability Assessment (HSI) which resulted in a Below Average rating. Despite the presence of good quality habitat there are no further ponds (known from Magic or aerial photographs) within 500m of the site, which reduces the likelihood of GCN presence to negligible, particularly when combined with the poor condition and low water levels of the pond on site.

Other amphibians

The site has no meaningful connectivity to any habitats in the locale known to host populations of the European Protected Species natterjack toad, nor does the site provide for their specialist habitat requirements (shallow, usually temporary ponds within sparsely vegetated terrestrial habitat such as heathland that may be too arid for other species). In addition, their populations are scattered and their dispersal abilities low. It is therefore considered highly unlikely that they would be present on site.

Impacts

Modified grassland and areas of introduced scrub will be removed during construction. The loss of such habitats is unlikely to have adverse effects on local amphibian populations owing to the presence of similar well-connected habitat of a size capable of supporting a viable population. However, site clearance could result in the death or injury of common amphibians and GCN if present.

The proposed development will not result in the loss of any ponds. However, there are ponds within close proximity of the site, and should they be damaged, inadvertently destroyed or become polluted during construction, or during the life of the development this could have adverse impacts upon any amphibians (or other fauna/flora) using them. Additionally, it may lead to a higher frequency of human disturbance once the project is completed.

Recommendations

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

- Heras fencing will be erected around the working area to prevent encroachment towards aquatic habitats where amphibians could be present.
- A pre-commencement inspection of the site will be undertaken for amphibians.
- Any rubble piles will be dismantled by hand and debris and brash will be stored on pallets or removed from the site to prevent amphibians from utilising these areas.
- 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.

Potential enhancements:

Enhance the existing pond
Creation of rock piles

Reptiles

Summary of Survey Findings

The site contains some features of value to reptiles (such as the woodland edge and rocks on which to bask) in a relatively well-connected landscape of suitable habitats for some reptile species.

Reptiles may be present as transient individuals in low numbers.

Impacts

Sufficient similar habitat will remain surrounding the site to support the continued functioning of the population. As such there are anticipated to be no population level impacts on reptiles. However, site clearance could result in the death or injury of reptiles, if present on site during construction.

Recommendations

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

- A pre-commencement inspection of the site will be undertaken for reptiles.
- Any rubble piles will be dismantled by hand and debris and brash will be stored on pallets or removed from the site to prevent reptiles from utilising these areas.
- 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.

Possible enhancements:

- Enhancement of existing pond
- Creation of rock piles

Birds

Summary of Survey Findings

While the site as a whole contains habitat for nesting birds (although no evidence of nesting was found), the area where the development is to take place does not. It does however provide limited opportunities for foraging.

The site is not likely to be of value to either breeding or wintering bird assemblages, or other Important Bird Assemblages (e.g. farmland, upland, water and wetland, seabird).

Impacts

The loss of habitats on site is likely to be inconsequential to local bird populations due to the presence of similar local habitat of sufficient acreage to continue supporting foraging and nesting birds.

However, the proposed development could result in the disturbance and subsequent abandonment of active bird nests in the adjacent wooded area.

Recommendations

No further survey required.

Possible enhancements:

- The installation of two integrated swift bricks (e.g. Ibstock Swift Eco Habitat or similar alternative brand) at the site will provide additional nesting habitat for birds in line with the measures outlined in the British Standard " Integral nest boxes. Selection and installation for new developments. Specification" (BS 42021:2022).

Swift bricks will be integrated into the fabric of the building during construction. Boxes will be positioned close together (0.6-1.0m between bricks) as swifts prefer to nest gregariously.

The boxes will be placed at least 5m above ground level under the eaves of a building, on a north or east elevation, where they will be sheltered from prevailing wind, rain and strong sunlight. To be suitable for swifts, the bricks require an open aspect with no trees or large shrubs potentially obstructing the birds' flight path up to 5m from the brick. Swift bricks are a "universal nest brick" for small bird species, including red-listed species such as common swift, house sparrow, house martin, and starling."

Badgers

Summary of Survey Findings

Rural badger territories range from 50-150ha around their sett depending on the richness of foraging resources within the

landscape. The largest are in Scotland. Urban badgers may hold ranges of half that of the size of rural populations, with badgers splitting into more numerous but smaller groups. Tracking has revealed a home range of 200 x 100m (around a cemetery) for one urban badger and an allotment and approximately 25 peripheral gardens for another. They also tend to avoid the edges of their territories, to avoid both conflict and the wasting of energetic resources in areas where other badger clans may be foraging (Wildlife Online, 2024).

Habitat Suitability (High)

Suitable foraging habitat for badgers was found on site in association with the lawn, understory of the wooded area and other garden/ornamental habitats. Badgers are likely to be present within the local landscape. While largely fenced in, the entryway to the car park is of sufficient size that badgers could use it for entry and exit of the site.

No Badger Evidence

No badger evidence (e.g. latrines, droppings, snuffle pits, turned over turf, holes with associated dug out spoil heaps, mammal tracks, footprints, hair caught in fencing/brambles, push through gaps beneath fencing, D-shaped holes) were found on site or within 30m of the proposed development.

Conclusions of likely absence (Access restrictions within 30m)

Badgers demonstrate high fidelity to their ancestral commuting routes and engage in predictable nightly patterns of activity. Being large and robust animals they tend to leave clear evidence in areas of regular use. Whilst the entirety of the sites 30m perimeter radius could not be explored, the lack of evidence of badger activity on site and in particular around the site boundaries, indicates that badgers are not using the site on a habitual basis and as such, the site is not anticipated to fall within the core territory of a local sett or regularly commuting individual/clan. Whilst this cannot be determined to an absolute degree without further inspection it is considered unlikely that active setts are present within 30m of the proposed development. The presence of transient individuals cannot be ruled out.

Impacts

The project will incur no significant loss of badger habitat and is predicted to incur no impacts (in terms of damage, destruction or disturbance) on any local setts (none of which occur/are thought to occur within 30m of the site). However, construction activities could result in the death or injury of badgers, if present.

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 pre-commencement inspection of the site will be undertaken for any new badger activity if works do not commence within three months..
- Any excavations will be covered overnight, or a ramp will be installed to enable any trapped animals to escape.
- Any pipework exceeding 150mm will be capped overnight.
- 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.

Possible enhancements:

- Planting fruit and nut bearing trees
- Creating species-rich turf

Riparian animals

Summary of Survey Findings

There are no watercourses on or connected to the site and the proposed development will therefore have no impacts upon riparian or aquatic species. As such, they are not considered further.

Hazel dormouse

Summary of Survey Findings

Dormice typically require a three-dimensional habitat structure permitting them to move around the landscape without coming to ground or crossing open space. Flower, berry and nut producing vegetation is required to provide foraging opportunities. Typical suitable habitats include dense, tall, wide well-connected native hedgerows, dense bramble stands, mixed scrub and woodland

with a dense understory of bramble/recent coppice. They will however come to ground to hibernate in leaf litter and amongst cavities associated with tree buttresses.

For isolated habitats in the UK, research indicates that dormice require at least 20ha of woodland habitat to support a viable population. They can also thrive in landscapes where woodland is small but plentiful and commutes between blocks are reasonably short and unfragmented. Generally treeless landscapes, such as intensive arable landscapes, which are characterised by closely flailed, low, post enclosures act hedgerows are generally sub-optimal.

The site is outside the known distribution for dormice in the UK but they could be present within suitable habitat within the local landscape .

Whilst there is suitable habitat on site in the form of a wooded area and vegetated fencing, dormice have poor connectivity to woodland and other habitats within the landscape, reducing the habitat value of the site and the risk that dormice will be present to LOW

Impacts

The habitat losses proposed as part of the development are minor and will not lead to any significant reduction in availability of suitable habitat or fragmentation of the landscape. As such they will have a negligible impact upon the conservation status of dormice in this area. However, any dormice present during the works could be injured or killed.

Recommendations

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

- Heras fencing will be erected around the working area to prevent encroachment into retained habitats where dormice could be present.

In the unlikely event that a dormouse or evidence of dormouse is identified, works must cease and advice must be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist.

Invertebrates

Summary of Survey Findings

The PEA assesses the sites habitat value for protected and otherwise Important Species of invertebrate. These include; Schedule 8 Protected Species Wildlife & Countryside Act, 1981 (as amended) and Schedule 5 Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019), Species of Principal Importance s.41 NERC Act 2006 (England), endemic, red listed, nationally rare/scarce species, species at the edge of their range, species on local biodiversity and rare lists and common species present on sites containing a large proportion of the species local or regional population.

The site is not located within a Buglife Important Invertebrate Area, nor is it reasonably close to or contextually related to one.

Informed by Natural England (2006/7) guidelines , the site is assigned the following preliminary value for invertebrates.

Low Invertebrate Interest

The site contains features of some value for a limited assemblage of most likely common and widespread invertebrates. These are limited in their habitat value and are unlikely to provide for any specialist niches. Habitats on site are unlikely to support important populations of more commonplace species.

Impacts

The development will result in an insignificant loss of invertebrate habitat. Sufficient habitat of invertebrate value will be retained to maintain the sites current populations. The development is anticipated to have negligible impact upon invertebrates. Future management/habitat creation may result in net gains for invertebrate biodiversity.

Recommendations

No further surveys recommended.

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

- Planting of pollinator friendly grassland species
- Installation of insect hotels
- Incorporation of log piles/dead wood
- Creation of rock and brash piles

Other e.g. small mammals

Summary of Survey Findings

There is suitable habitat onsite for terrestrial Section 41 Species of Principal Importance under the NERC Act (2007) terrestrial mammals such as the hedgehog.

Impacts

There will be no significant loss of small terrestrial mammal habitat during construction, however construction activities could result in the death or unnecessary suffering of small mammals if present, the latter of which constitutes an offence under the Wild Mammals (Protection) act 1996.

Recommendations

No further surveys required.

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.
- Any pipework exceeding 100mm will be capped overnight.
- Any chemicals or pollutants used or created by the development should be stored and disposed of correctly according to COSHH regulations.
- If any small mammals 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.


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

- Creation of fence gaps (14cm x 14cm) to enable small mammals to travel freely through the site
- Creation of brash piles

Appendix 2: Site Location Plan



Appendix 3: Habitat Survey Plan



Appendix 4: Site Photographs



Photo 1: Modified grassland



Photo 2: Modified grassland



Photo 3: Introduced shrub, 1



Photo 4: Introduced shrub, 2



Photo 5 – Introduced shrub, 3



Photo 6 – vegetation lined fence

Appendix 5: Baseline Condition Assessments

Table 6a: Modified grassland condition assessment.

	Criteria Description	Criteria Passed?
A	There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m ² present, including at least 2 forbs. Note - this criterion is essential for achieving Moderate or Good condition.	N
B	Sward height is varied (at least 20% of the sward is less than 7 cm and at least 20% is more than 7 cm) creating microclimates which provide opportunities for vertebrates and invertebrates to live and breed.	N
C	Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total grassland area. (Some scattered scrub such as bramble <i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg. may be present). Note - patches of scrub with continuous (more than 90%) cover should be classified as the relevant scrub habitat type.	Y
D	Physical damage is evident in less than 5% of total grassland area. Examples of physical damage include excessive poaching, damage from machinery use or storage, erosion caused by high levels of access, or any other damaging management activities.	N
E	Cover of bare ground is between 1% and 10%, including localised areas (for example, a concentration of rabbit warrens). For example, this could include small, scattered areas of bare ground allowing establishment of new species, or localised patches where not exceeding 10% cover.	Y
F	Cover of bracken <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> is less than 20%.	Y
G	There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species (as listed on Schedule 9 of WCA).	Y
		Total 4/7
	Condition Poor due to failing one or more essential criteria.	

Limitations 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	Johnny Byrne BSc (Hons), MSc, FISC3, Graduate Ecologist	10/04/2026
Review/Final	1	Fay Brotherhood, BSc (Hons), MSc, Principal Ecologist	15/04/2026