Abby Pidgen BSc (Hons) MSc
Consultant Ecologist
Email: abbypidgen@arbtech.co.uk
Arbtech Consulting Ltd
arbtech.co.uk

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost Assessment

Survey site:

Hambrook School, Leylands Road, Burgess Hill, RH15 8HY

Client:

Space M Studio

Survey date:

23rd May 2025

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application with the Mid Sussex District Council. The proposal is described as: "*The installation of play equipment and a summer house at an existing school*".

PEA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: **PEA Methodology and Legislation - 2024.**

PRA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: **PRA Methodology and Legislation - 2024.**

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.

Site Location and Context

The survey site is centred on National Grid Reference TQ 31191 19608 and has an area of approximately 0.27ha.

The site comprises an area of grassland, trees and a small garden shed to the south of the main Hambrook School building. The site is surrounded by urban infrastructure with associated gardens in all directions and Marle Place Playground to the immediate south which contains amenity grassland and scattered trees. The trees within the site extend into the local garden landscape. Aerial imagery shows the local landscape to have a highly urbanised character, dominated by built developments such as dwellings, roads, amenity areas and commercial buildings.

Survey Details

The site survey was undertaken by Abby Pidgen BSc (Hons) MSc, Graduate Ecologist, an ecologist with three years of experience, and accredited agent on Natural England survey licence for bats [2018-33540-CLS-CLS].

Date of survey	Temperature (°C)	Humidity (%)	Cloud Cover (%)	Wind (km/h)	Rain
23/05/2025	16	56	20	8	None

Executive Summary

Due to the small scale of the development, surrounding urban infrastructure and lack of suitable habitats on site, **no further survey work is required**, however precautionary working methods will be implemented for small mammals, bats and birds during construction.

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, and the known distribution of species as recovered during the searches of historical biological records.

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.

There were no specific limitations to the survey.

Ecological Survey Factor **Conclusion, Impact or Recommendations**	**Detailed using desk study and site survey (carried out under good weather conditions). Any specific limitations noted within relevant section. 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.**
Habitats and plants (see habitat map in appendix 1, location plan in appendix 2, proposal plan in appendix 3 and photos in appendix 4). **Botanical species are described with reference to the DAFOR scale (D = Dominant; A = Abundant, F = Frequent, O = Occasional, R = Rare).**	
Summary of Survey Findings ***u1b5*** *– Buildings* ***u1c*** *– Artificial unvegetated; unsealed surface* ***g4*** *– Modified grassland* *32 – Scattered trees*	The site does not contain any habitats listed as a habitat of principal importance under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act (2006). However, the site contains scattered trees which are of good quality and could be of value to local wildlife populations (as detailed in subsequent sections of this table). Other habitats within the site are common and widespread and have low ecological value. Notable habitats are present within 2km. **On-site habitat descriptions** **u1b5** – Buildings There is a single building, B1, in the northwest corner of the site. B1 is a small wooden shed that is frequent use. B1 is assessed for its suitability to support roosting bats and nesting birds later in this report. **u1c** - Artificial unvegetated; unsealed surface Within the western half of the site is an area of bare ground and woodchip. The only vegetation present in this area are sporadic garlic mustard *Alliaria petiolata* and stinking iris *Iris foetidisssima* around the base of scattered trees. **g4** – Modified grassland The rest of the site comprises grassland that is considered to align best with UKHabs description of 'modified grassland'. The grassland is in regular use by the school, resulting in high level of damage and trampling. The sward length of the grassland is kept short through management and frequent use. The borders of the grassland have a higher species composition due to less footfall in these areas.

The vegetation is dominated by perennial rye grass *Lolium perenne*, with common daisy *Bellis perennis* and broadleaved plantain *Plantago major* being abundant. Broadleaved dock *Rumex obtusifolius* and meadow buttercup *Ranunculus acris* and frequent; black medick *Medicago lupulina*, curly leaved dock *Rumex crispus* and cleavers *Galium aparine* are occasional; bramble *Rubus spp.*, herb Robert *Geranium robertianum*, field speedwell *Veronica agresits* and spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare* are rare.

Modified grassland condition assessment:

A. There are 6-8 vascular plant species per m^2, including at least 2 forbs – Fail
B. Sward height is varied creating microclimates – Fail
C. Any scrub present accounts for less than 20% of the total area – Pass
D. Physical damage is evident in less than 5% of total area – Fail
E. Cover of bare ground is between 1 and 10% - Fail
F. Cover of bracken is less than 20% - Pass
G. There is an absence of invasive non-native plant species – Pass

The modified grassland achieves a condition score of **Poor**.

<u>Scattered trees 32</u>

There are 12 scattered trees throughout the site. The species, measurements and condition assessments are included within Table 1. Tree condition assessment categories can be found in Appendix 5. Tree numbers correlate with those found within Arboricultural Report with Tree Constraints Plan and Arboricultural Impact Assessment (JAG Arboricultural Company, 2023).

Table 1: The scattered trees with their measurements and condition assessments.

Tree Number	Tree Species	Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) CM	Condition Assessment
T3	Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	10	**Moderate** Passed: B, C, D
T4	Ash *Fraxinus excelsior*	70	**Good** Passed: A, B, C, D, F

T5	Holly *Ilex aquifolium*	16	**Good** Passed: A, B, C, D, F
T6	Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	66	**Moderate** Passed: B, C, D, F
T8	Wellingtonia *Sequoiadendron giganteum*	145	**Good** Passed: B, C, D, E, F
T9	Wellingtonia *Sequoiadendron giganteum*	127	**Good** Passed: B, C, D, E, F
T10	Ash *Fraxinus excelsior*	12	**Good** Passed: A, B, C, D, E, F
T11	Wellingtonia *Sequoiadendron giganteum*	165	**Good** Passed: B, C, D, E, F
T13	English Oak *Quercus robur*	67	**Moderate** Passed: A, B, C, D
T15	Yew *Taxus baccata*	25.5	**Moderate** Passed: A, B, C, D
T16	Ash *Fraxinus excelsior*	12	**Moderate** Passed: A, B, C, D
T17	Laurel *Prunus spp.*	44	**Good** Passed: A, B, C, D

Local notable habitats

There are no priority habitats within or immediately adjacent to the site. The nearest priority habitat is good quality semi-improved grassland located ~0.6km east of the site, as detailed in Table 2 below. All priority habitats are detached from the site by significant urban infrastructure.

Table 2: Priority habitats within 2km of site.

Priority Habitat	**Distance from Site (approx.)**
Good quality semi-improved grassland	Single large parcel located ~0.6km east.

	Lowland mixed deciduous woodland	Small copses located in all directions, the closest being ~0.65km east of the site.
	Ancient and semi-natural woodland	A series of small parcels located in all directions, the closest being ~0.7km east.
	Traditional orchard	Two very small patches located ~0.95km north of the site.
Foreseen Impacts	**On-site habitats** The habitats on-site are widespread and not notable; however the proposed development will result in the loss or disturbance of ~0.14ha modified grassland and the felling of some scattered trees. This is likely to have minimal impact on biodiversity considering the small area of commonplace habitat (modified grassland) being lost. **Notable habitats** No impacts to any notable habitats are anticipated due to the small scale and distance of the proposed development from such habitats as well as the urban location of the site with surrounding physical barriers.	
Recommendations	**On-site habitats** 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). **Notable habitats** None. **Biodiversity net gain** The Environment Act (2021) requires all developments (excluding exemptions) to deliver a 10% net gain in biodiversity. This is mandatory for larger developments and comes into force for smaller developments on 2nd April 2024. Therefore, the planning application must be accompanied by a landscaping/habitat creation and enhancement strategy, biodiversity net gain calculations and a habitat management and monitoring plan to ensure the proposed development delivers a 10% net gain.	

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Locality and Designated Sites</th></tr>
<tr><td>Summary of Survey Findings</td><td>
On-site designations
The site is not subject to any designation.

Statutory designated sites (within 2km)
There is a single statutory site within 2km of the site, as detailed below:
The site also lies within the impact risk zone for the Ditchling Common Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

Table 2: Statutory designated sites within 2km of the site
<table>
<tr><th>Designated Site Name</th><th>Distance from Site (approx.)</th><th>Reasons for Notification</th></tr>
<tr><td>Bedelands Farm Local Nature Reserve (LNR)</td><td>~0.92km northeast</td><td>Habitats include wildflower meadows, grazed meadows, wetlands, ancient hedgerows and woodland.
Plants include bluebells in woodland, adders tongue fern, wild service tree, locally rare sedges, ancient hornbeam, yellow rattle.</td></tr>
</table>
Statutory designated sites (within 2km)
No national network sites (SAC, SPA, Ramsar) are located within 2km.

Non-statutory designated sites
The presence of non-statutory designated sites within 2km of the site cannot be established without data from the Sussex Biodiversity Records Centre (SBRC).
</td></tr>
<tr><td>Foreseen Impacts</td><td>
On-site designations
No impacts foreseen.
</td></tr>
</table>

	Statutory and non-statutory designated sites No impacts to designated sites are anticipated due to the small scale and distance of the proposed development from such sites (where known) as well as the urban location of the site with surrounding physical barriers. The site lies within the impact risk zone for Ditchling Common SSSI. The proposed development type is not listed as a possible high risk for this designation.
Recommendations	**On-site designations** None required. **Statutory and non-statutory designated sites** None required.
Invasive / Non-native species	
Summary of Survey Findings	No problematic invasive and non-native species recorded on site.
Foreseen Impacts	N/A
Recommendations	No further surveys but remain vigilant.
Invertebrates	
Summary of Survey Findings	The habitats present on-site, including modified grassland and scattered 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.
Foreseen Impacts	Modified grassland will be removed during construction. The loss of such habitats is likely to be inconsequential to local invertebrate populations owing to their low value and the presence of more extensive habitat locally.
Recommendations	No further surveys. **Suggested biodiversity enhancements**

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>The incorporation of bee houses (e.g. RSPB Solitary Bee Home or similar alternative brand) onto retained trees or fencing 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.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Bats</td></tr>
<tr><td>Summary of Survey Findings</td><td>
EPSL data
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 4 EPSLs within a 2km radius of site as detailed below:
<table>
<tr><th>EPSL Reference</th><th>Bat species affected</th><th>Distance from site</th><th>Impacts allowed by licence</th></tr>
<tr><td>2016-26440-EPS-BDX</td><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>~0.42km northeast</td><td>Damage and destruction of a breeding and resting site.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2020-50065-EPS-MIT</td><td>Brown long-eared and soprano pipistrelle</td><td>~0.96km northwest</td><td>Destruction of a resting site.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014-2981-EPS-MIT</td><td>Soprano pipistrelle</td><td>~1.5km northwest</td><td>Damage of breeding site.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2017-29042-EPS-MIT</td><td>Soprano pipistrelle</td><td>~1.8km south</td><td>Destruction of a resting site.</td></tr>
</table>
There are no Special Areas of Conservation designated for bats within 10km of the site, however South Downs National Park is located ~2.3km south which is known to be home to a wide array of bat species and contains several high value and national important bat roosts.

Foraging and commuting habitat
Habitats recorded on site are assessed to provide foraging and commuting opportunities for bats primarily in the form of scattered trees. These habitats are likely to provide micro-climatic conditions that support invertebrates that will in turn provide foraging opportunities for local bat populations. The scattered trees on site are directly connected to scattered trees within surrounding playgrounds and residential
</td></tr>
</table>

	gardens adding to the continuity of vegetated linear features present in the wider landscape. Additionally, there is a railway line ~0.68km to the east. Railway lines act as a dark commuting corridor throughout the wider landscape, allowing bats to disperse over great distances. They also provide foraging habitat. Bats could use the edges of the surrounding wooded areas for foraging and commuting. These could also be used by bats dispersing from nearby roosts outside of the site and commuting around the area. **Roosting habitat** Buildings and trees to be impacted by the proposed development are assessed for their suitability to support roosting bats below. No evidence of roosting bats was identified on or within B1 or any of the surveyed trees on-site.

B1 Building description			***Photographs***
Summary B1 is a small wooden garden shed comprising a bitumen felt roof and large glass windows on the eastern aspect. The entire shed is single-skinned. The building has **negligible** habitat value for roosting bats.			
Feature	***Materials***	***Condition/description/suitability***	***Photograph(s)***

Walls	Timber	**Condition/description** Good condition, no areas of damage and all tight fitting to surrounding structures. **Suitability/access/evidence of bats** No suitable roosting features present for bats.	
Roof	Bitumen felt	**Condition/description** Pitched roof in excellent condition with no areas of damage. **Suitability/access/evidence of bats** No suitable roosting features present for bats.	
Window/doors frames and lintels	Timber	Tight fitting	
Internal voids	Timber	**Condition/description** Internal space is in excellent condition with no areas of damage. The shed is used frequently by the school for amenity uses. Therefore, there is regular disturbance as well as a large ingress of natural light from the windows. **Suitability/access/evidence of bats**	N/A

		No suitable roosting features present for bats.	

T17 description			
Summary T17 is a mature Laurel located within the T17 group of trees to the south of the main school building (TQ 31173 19609). The tree has a DBH of 44cm and a height of 11.5m. Features identified on T1 during the survey are detailed below.			
PRF ref	***Type of PRF***	***Condition/description/suitability***	***Photograph(s)***
PRF-1	Decay on main stem	A large decay feature was present on the main stem of this tree. The feature was approximately 2.5m from ground level and was ~0.5m in length on the northern aspect (facing north) of the stem. The decay feature has a shallow depth of around 10cm. Due to the shallow depth and lack of cavity observed, this feature is considered suitable for only individual or low numbers of bats (i.e. **PRF-I**).	
Foreseen Impacts	**Roosting habitat [Buildings]** Bats are very unlikely to be roosting within this B1 and as such, there are not anticipated to be any impacts on bats in this location as a result of the proposed development. **Roosting habitat [Trees]**		

	All trees on site are to be retained, therefore there are unlikely to be any impact to bats as a result of the development. **Foraging and commuting habitat** The proposed development will result in the loss of small areas of modified grassland, but given its low value and the presence of more extensive areas of foraging and commuting habitat in the locality, this is likely to be inconsequential for bats. **Artificial lighting** No new artificial lighting is proposed as part of the development.
Recommendations	**Roosting habitat [Buildings and Trees]** In the unlikely event that a bat or evidence of bats is discovered during the development all work must stop and a bat licensed ecologist contacted for further advice. **Foraging and commuting habitat** No further surveys are required. **Suggested biodiversity enhancements** The installation of one bat box at the site will provide additional roosting habitat for bats. The bat box will be fixed to retained mature trees on site. It will be suitable for pipistrelles (which have been identified locally through EPSL data). Suitable bat boxes include Improved Crevice Bat Box by Wildcare or similar alternative brand. The bat box should be positioned 3-5m above ground level facing in a south or south-westerly direction with a clear flight path to and from the entrance, away from artificial light.
Birds	
Summary of Survey Findings	**Buildings** No evidence of nesting birds was identified on or within B1. B1 is 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 the tree on site all offer nesting opportunities and nest-building resources for birds. Additionally, bird boxes are located on trees T9, T11 and T13 which will provide nesting opportunities for a range of common and widespread small birds. **Barn owls** The site does not appear to provide any suitable nesting sites for barn owls. **Overwintering birds** Due to the small size of the site and the extent and type of the habitats recorded, the site not considered suitable to support a significant assemblage of protected and/or notable birds.
Foreseen Impacts	**Buildings/trees** The proposed development could result in the destruction or the disturbance and subsequent abandonment of active bird nests. **Barn owls** None foreseen. **Overwintering birds** None foreseen.
Recommendations	**Trees** Any vegetation removal should be undertaken outside the period 1st March to 31st August. If this timeframe cannot be avoided, a close inspection of the vegetation should be undertaken immediately, by a qualified ecologist, prior to the commencement of work. All active nests will need to be retained until the young have fledged.

	Precautions should be taken with machinery and noise levels when working close to any retained nests so as not to disturb any nearby nesting birds during construction works. At least a 3-5m buffer should be created between any machinery and active nests until the young have fledged. **Barn owls** None required. **Overwintering birds** None required. **Suggested biodiversity enhancements** Bird boxes are already installed throughout the site. The installation of 1no. additional bird box on mature trees around the site boundaries will provide further nesting habitat for birds. Suitable models include; • 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.
Reptiles	
Summary of Survey Findings	**EPSL data** A review of the MAGIC database returned no granted EPSL records for protected reptiles within 2km of the site. **Habitat suitability**

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>There is no suitable habitat present on site for reptiles due to a lack of habitats such as scrub and rank grassland which would offer refuge for these species. Further, the site is surrounded by urban development (i.e. roads and buildings) which is considered sub-optimal for reptile migration and therefore reptiles are considered unlikely to migrate from any nearby suitable habitats to the development site. As such it is likely that reptiles are absent from the development site.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Foreseen Impacts</td><td>No impacts are anticipated on reptiles as a result of the proposed development.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Recommendations</td><td>None required.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Amphibians</td></tr>
<tr><td>Summary of Survey Findings</td><td>EPSL and survey data
A search of the magic.gov.uk database for granted EPSLs within a 2km radius of the site has been completed. There are 16 EPSLs for great crested newts within a 2km radius of site as detailed below. Further, 27 records of positive class survey licence return or DLL historic survey data (2017 – 2019) was present within 2km of the site.
<table>
<tr><th>EPSL Reference</th><th>Distance from site</th><th>Impacts allowed by licence</th></tr>
<tr><td>2015-13175-EPS-MIT</td><td>~0.78km north</td><td>Destruction of a breeding pond.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014-689-EPS-MIT
2014-689-EPS-MIT-1
2014-689-EPS-MIT-2
2014-689-EPS-MIT-3
2014-689-EPS-MIT-4</td><td>~1km southeast</td><td>Damage and destruction of a resting and breeding site.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2014-572-EPS-MIT
2014-572-EPS-MIT-2
2014-572-EPS-MIT-3
EPSM2010-2596
2014-572-EPS-MIT-4
2014-572-EPS-MIT-5</td><td>~1.2km southeast</td><td>Damage and destruction of a resting and breeding site.</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
</table>

	<table><tr><td>EPSM2011-3094</td><td>~1.5km southwest</td><td>Destruction of a resting site.</td></tr><tr><td>2017-28201-EPS-MIT 2017-28201-EPS-MIT-1</td><td>~1.6km east</td><td>Damage and destruction of a resting site.</td></tr><tr><td>EPSM2009-984</td><td>~1.6km northwest</td><td>Destruction of a resting site.</td></tr></table> **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 within 500m of the site. **Terrestrial habitat suitability** The site provides limited suitable terrestrial habitat for amphibians given the lack of optimal habitat (i.e. scrub, rank grassland). The areas of amenity grass offer sub-optimal habitat for terrestrial amphibians and given the urban nature of the surrounding landscape (i.e. dominated by roads and hard standing which are sub-optimal for amphibians) it is unlikely that amphibians will migrate on to site. Further, the site is surrounded by large, good condition wooden panel fencing further limiting dispersal opportunities for amphibians within the wider environment.
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.
Recommendations	None required.
Badger	
Summary of Survey Findings	No badger setts were noted on site or within a 30m radius of the site. The site is considered unsuitable for badgers given the lack of suitable sett excavation areas/ground. Further, there is limited suitable badger foraging habitat on site given the lack of fruiting trees/scrub. The site

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>is also surrounding by urban development (i.e. roads and buildings), which is sub-optimal habitat therefore reducing the likelihood of badgers being present within the surrounding area of the site.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Foreseen Impacts</td><td>No impacts are anticipated on badgers as a result of the proposed development.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Recommendations</td><td>None required.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Riparian animals</td></tr>
<tr><td>Summary of Survey Findings</td><td>A review of the MAGIC database returned no granted EPSL records for otters or water voles within 2km of the site. 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.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Foreseen Impacts</td><td>No impacts are anticipated on riparian animals as a result of the proposed development.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Recommendations</td><td>None required.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Hazel dormouse</td></tr>
<tr><td>Summary of Survey Findings</td><td>EPSL data
There are 8 EPSLs for hazel dormice within a 2km radius of site as detailed below.
<table>
<tr><th>EPSL Reference</th><th>Distance from site</th><th>Impacts allowed by licence</th></tr>
<tr><td>2020-44380-EPS-MIT
2020-44380-EPS-MIT-1
2020-44380-EPS-MIT-2</td><td>~1km north</td><td>Damage and destruction of a resting and breeding site.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2020-45515-EPS-MIT
2020-45515-EPS-MIT-1</td><td>~1.2km north</td><td>Damage and destruction of a resting and breeding site.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2020-48403-EPS-MIT
2021-50974-EPS-MIT</td><td>~1.3km north</td><td>Destruction of a breeding site.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2017-28572-EPS-MIT</td><td>~1.8km southeast</td><td>Destruction of a resting site.</td></tr>
</table>
Habitat suitability</td></tr>
</table>

	Habitats on site are assessed to provide foraging, commuting, and nest building opportunities for dormice in the form of mature scattered trees. However, the site is enclosed by urban infrastructure including roads and significant residential development. These landscape features fragment suitable dormice habitat in the wider landscape and are likely to limit dispersal opportunities to the site.
Foreseen Impacts	No impacts are anticipated on hazel dormice as a result of the proposed development.
Recommendations	None foreseen.
Other e.g. hedgehog	
Summary of Survey Findings	The modified grassland provides limited suboptimal foraging and commuting opportunities for hedgehogs. Additionally, the site is fenced, further limiting access for hedgehogs on and off site. However, the presence of transient hedgehogs cannot be wholly ruled out.
Foreseen Impacts	Modified grassland will be removed during construction. The loss of such habitats is likely to be inconsequential to local hedgehog populations owing to their low value and the presence of more extensive habitat locally. However, construction activities could result in the death or injury of hedgehogs, if present.
Recommendations	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. **Suggested biodiversity enhancements** The following habitat creation and enhancement opportunities could be incorporated into the proposed development which would be beneficial for hedgehogs: • Planting fruit bearing trees and species-rich grassland to increase foraging opportunities.

	• Creation of brash piles or installation 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

Appendix 2: Location map

Appendix 3: Proposed plan

Appendix 4: Habitat Photos

Artificial unvegetated, unsealed surface	
Photograph	**Description**
	Figure 1: The area of chipped wood along the western border of the site.
	Figure 2: The sporadic garlic mustard and stinking iris.
Modified grassland	
Photograph	**Description**

 		Figure 3: Modified grass lawn with patches of bare ground throughout.
Scattered trees		
Photograph		**Description**

Figure 5: Scattered trees present on site (along eastern site boundary)

Limitations and Copyright

Legal

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.

Version control			
Status	**Issue**	**Name**	**Date**
Draft	0.1	Abby Pidgen BSc (Hons) MSc, Consultant Ecologist	23/05/2025
Final	1.0	Abby Pidgen BSc (Hons) MSc, Consultant Ecologist	27/05/2025