

CRABTREE LANE, MANCHESTER

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report

March 2025



Report Control Sheet

Project Name: Crabtree Lane, Manchester
Project Reference: CW20-2148
Report Title: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report
Report Reference: CW20-2148 RPT 001
Printing Instructions: Print at A4 Portrait, Double Sided.

Rev	Date	Description	Prepared	Reviewed	Approved
I	04/09/2024	Draft report sent to Client for comment.	EC	OC	OC
II	03/03/2025	Final report sent to Client	EC	OC	OC

Quality Assurance

All ecological reports produced by Collington Winter Environmental Ltd are checked and approved by a Principal Ecologist with appropriate professional membership (CIEEM or IES) who are bound by a code of professional conduct and ethics.

Collington Winter Environmental Ltd disclaims any responsibility to Keepmoat Limited and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of this report. This report has been prepared with reasonable skill, care and diligence within the terms of the Contract with Keepmoat Limited and according to the proposed plans supplied by the client or the client’s agent upon commencement of the project.

The contents of this report are valid at the time of writing. As the ecological value of a site is constantly evolving and changing, if more than twelve months have elapsed since the date of this report, further advice must be taken before reliance upon on the contents. Notwithstanding any provision of the Collington Winter Environmental Ltd Terms & Conditions, Collington Winter Environmental Ltd shall not be liable for any losses (howsoever incurred) arising as a result of reliance by the client or any third party on this report more than twelve months after the report date.

This report is confidential to Keepmoat Limited and Collington Winter Environmental Ltd accepts no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report or any part thereof is made known. Any such party relies upon the report at their own risk.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Site Address	Crabtree Lane, Manchester, M11 4GU
Grid Reference	SJ 88713 98009
Approximate Site Area	2.67ha
Current Site Use	Currently the site is comprised of three derelict buildings surrounding by woodland and scrub which has developed. The northeast section of the site is used as a brick yard.
Designated Sites within Zone of Influence	Ashton Canal (West) is located adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. The site falls within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone for Hollinwood Branch Canal SSSI, Huddersfield Narrow Canal and Rochdale Canal SAC and SSSI.
Notable Habitat Features	Notable habitats present include woodland and scrub.
Notable Species Applicable to the Assessment	• Bats (Potential roosting, foraging and commuting) • Breeding birds • Common amphibians • Badger • Hedgehog
Mitigation Recommendations	• Construction and Environment Management Plan (CEMP). • Nesting bird check prior to vegetation removal. • Any proposed lighting/existing lighting should follow the guidance outlined in the Institute for Lighting Engineers document "Guidance for the Reduction of Obtrusive Lighting" (2005) and BCT's "Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night" (2023). • Any areas of dense vegetation should first be carefully hand searched to check for hedgehog. • Precautionary Working Method Statement (PWMS) for badgers • Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMs) for reptiles • Invasive non-native species method statement
Recommended Ecological Enhancements	The National Planning Policy Framework (2021) highlights the requirement for planning policies and decisions to conserve and enhance the natural environment. The proposed development provides the opportunity to enhance the site, and ecological enhancements have been recommended

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	4
1.1.	SCOPE & PURPOSE	4
1.2.	LOCATION	4
1.3.	OBJECTIVES	4
2	METHODOLOGY	5
2.1.	DESK STUDY	5
2.2.	VEGETATION AND HABITAT ASSESSMENT	5
2.3.	FAUNA ASSESSMENT	5
2.4.	PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT AND BAT ACTIVITY ASSESSMENT	5
2.5.	HABITAT SUITABILITY INDEX (GREAT CRESTED NEWT)	7
2.6.	SURVEY LIMITATIONS	7
2.7.	PROPORTIONALITY	7
3	SURVEY RESULTS.....	8
3.1.	SITE CONTEXT	8
3.2.	DESIGNATED SITES	8
3.3.	PRIORITY HABITATS	9
3.4.	HABITATS	9
3.5.	SPECIES	10
4	MITIGATION RECOMMENDATIONS.....	15
4.1.	DESIGNATED SITES	15
4.2.	SPECIES	15
5	FURTHER SURVEYS AND CONCLUSION	18
5.1.	CONCLUSION	18
6	BIBLIOGRAPHY	19

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1. SCOPE & PURPOSE

1.1.1. Collington Winter Environmental Ltd was commissioned by KeepMoat to undertake a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) at Crabtree Lane. This report has been prepared to inform an outline planning application for the construction of 70 residential dwellings and four apartment blocks, including access roads, private amenity gardens and Public Open Space.

1.1.2. The author of this report is Eleanor Clark BSc (Hons), MSc, ACIEEM Consultant Ecologist at Collington Winter Environmental Ltd. Eleanor is experienced managing schemes and has produced many ecological reports to inform planning management plans.

1.2. LOCATION

1.2.1. Please refer to Figure 1.1 for the site location. The site is located approximately 4km east of Manchester City Centre, north of Openshaw, a suburb of Manchester.



Figure 1.1 Site Location

1.3. OBJECTIVES

1.3.1. The objectives of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal are as follows:

- Identify the major habitats present
- Ascertain the presence or potential presence of any legally protected or notable species or habitats
- Identify any mitigation or further survey required and opportunities for strategic wildlife enhancements and long-term management.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1. DESK STUDY

2.1.1. An initial desk-based assessment of the site was undertaken to collate baseline data. The desk study included:

- Obtaining local records of notable species and locally designated sites within 1 km of the site from The Greater Manchester Record Centre (GMRC), obtained on the 21st August 2024.
- Review of Magic.gov.uk website for details of any designated sites, notable habitats and presence of European Protected Species Licences.
- Review of aerial and OS maps for habitat information, as well as determining locations of potential waterbodies to be considered in the assessment.
- Review of potential habitat links on and off site, to determine the potential zone of influence of the proposed development.
- On site consultation with the landowner which provided valuable information regarding historic land use and known species and habitats present within the site.

2.1.2. Please note, a lack of records for a species does not confirm absence. Instead, local surveys may not have been undertaken or records not submitted to GMRC.

2.2. VEGETATION AND HABITAT ASSESSMENT

2.2.1. An Ecological Appraisal of the site was undertaken by Eleanor Clark. The survey was undertaken on the 2nd August 2024. The weather was clear (2/8 oktas), with no precipitation, wind speed 2 and 21°C.

2.2.2. The walkover survey was undertaken broadly in line with standard UK HAB Methodology, Version 2 (2023). The assessment is undertaken with consideration of methodology as per "Preliminary Ecological Appraisal" (CIEEM, 2018).

2.2.3. A UK HAB Plan has been produced and is presented in the Appendix of this report. Standard methodology has been used, though adjustments have been made based on judgement to demonstrate habitats in a clearer manner, or where standard guidance does not fit the conditions found on site.

2.3. FAUNA ASSESSMENT

2.3.1. A search for signs of protected and notable species of fauna was undertaken during the site walkover. This included both field signs of species, as well as potential for species to be present based on habitat availability.

2.3.2. The searches broadly included the following:

- Assessment of waterbodies on site and within 250m of the site boundary, and terrestrial habitats for suitability to support notable amphibians.
- Searches for field signs of, and habitat suitability for bats.
- Suitability of habitats to support reptiles, and searches for incidental field signs.
- Searches for field signs of badger (*Meles meles*), including setts, mammal paths, snuffle holes, badger hair and latrines to indicate activity.
- Searches of watercourses for signs of water vole (*Arvicola amphibius*), white-clawed crayfish (*Austropotamobius pallipes*) and otter (*Lutra lutra*), and assessment of habitat availability for the species.
- Assessment of the suitability of habitats to support notable birds and recording any field sightings of birds during the walkover.
- Assessment of the sites ability to support notable invertebrates and flora.
- Searches for non-native invasive species.

2.4. PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT AND BAT ACTIVITY ASSESSMENT

2.4.1. A Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (PRA) and Ground Level Tree Assessment (GLTA) of the site was undertaken by Eleanor Clark who holds a Class 1 Bat Survey Licence from Natural England (Reference 2024-11951-CL17-BAT).

- 2.4.2. The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) produced by Ascerta (June 2022), assessed all three buildings and the wall present on site as having low suitability for roosting bats.
- 2.4.3. Bat emergence surveys were carried out by Ascerta in June 2022, which identified the buildings as not being used by roosting bats. Updated bat emergence surveys have been undertaken by Collington Winter Environmental (August 2023). However, the analysis of Infrared Cameras is still under review.
- 2.4.4. The survey was undertaken following guidance set out in Collins (2023). This includes undertaking a detailed internal and external inspection of any features to compile information on potential and actual bat entry/ exit points, roosting locations and evidence of bats.
- 2.4.5. The commuting and foraging assessment methodology is based on information contained within the Bat Conservation Trust guidelines 4th edition (Collins 2023).
- 2.4.6. The GLTA and Potential flightpaths and foraging habitats were assessed as per categories listed in Table 4.1, 4.2 and 6.2, demonstrated below (Collins 2023).
- 2.4.7. If negative impacts on bat activity is suspected, further surveys may be required. Negative impacts anticipated on bats flights paths and foraging habitats may include:
- Modification of light paths or foraging habitats either physically or through disturbance such as light spill/noise
 - Severance of flight paths (fragmentation)
 - Loss of Foraging habitats

Table 4.1: Guidelines for assessing the potential suitability of proposed development sites for bats, based on the presence of habitat features within the landscape, to be applied using professional judgement.

Potential suitability	Description	Potential flight-paths and foraging habitats
None	No habitat features on site likely to be used by any roosting bats at any time of the year (i.e. a complete absence of crevices/suitable shelter at all ground/ underground levels).	No habitat features on site likely to be used by any commuting or foraging bats at any time of the year (i.e. no habitats that provide continuous lines of shade/protection for flight lines, or generous/sheltered populations available to foraging bats).
Negligible	No obvious habitat features on site likely to be used by roosting bats; however, a small element of uncertainty remains as bats can use small and apparently unsuitable features on occasion.	No obvious habitat features on site likely to be used as flight-paths or by foraging bats; however, a small element of uncertainty remains in order to account for non-standard bat behaviour.
Low	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by individual bats opportunistically at any time of the year. However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions* and/or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by larger numbers of bats (i.e. unlikely to be suitable for maternity and not a classic cost-effective hibernation site, but could be used by individual hibernating bats*).	Habitat that could be used by small numbers of bats as flight-paths such as a gappy hedge/row or overgrown stream, but isolated, i.e. not very well connected to the surrounding landscape by other habitat. Suitable, but isolated habitat that could be used by small numbers of foraging bats such as a lone tree (not in a parkland situation) or a patch of scrub.
Moderate	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions* and surrounding habitat but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status (with respect to insect type only, such as maternity and hibernation – the categorisation described in this table is made irrespective of species conservation status, which is established after presence is confirmed).	Continuous habitat connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for flight-paths such as lines of trees and scrubs or linked back gardens. Habitat that is connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for foraging such as trees, scrubs, grassland or water.
High	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis and potentially for longer periods of time due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions* and surrounding habitat. These structures have the potential to support high conservation status roasts, e.g. maternity or classic cost-effective hibernation site.	Continuous, high-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by bats for flight-paths such as river valleys, streams, hedgerows, lines of trees and woodland edges. High-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by foraging bats such as broadleaved woodland, tree-lined watercourses and grassed parkland. Site is close to and connected to known roasts.

Assessment Criteria for Bat Roosting Potential

Table 6.2: Guidelines for assessing the suitability of trees on proposed development sites for bats, to be applied using professional judgement.

Suitability	Description
NONE	Either no PRR's in the tree or highly unlikely to be any
FAH	Further assessment required to establish if PRR's are present in the tree
PRP	A tree with at least one PRR present

Table 6.2: Guidelines for categorising the potential suitability of PRR's on a proposed development site for bats, to be applied using professional judgement.

Suitability	Description
PRP-1	PRP is only suitable for individual bats or very small numbers of bats either due to size or lack of suitable surrounding habitats.
PRP-M	PRP is suitable for multiple bats and may therefore be used by a maternity colony.

2.5. HABITAT SUITABILITY INDEX (GREAT CRESTED NEWT)

2.5.1. No ponds were present on site or within 250 m of the site boundary. As great crested newts' upper dispersal limit is generally considered to be up to 250 m from a waterbody (though occurrence of greater distances does exist), ponds beyond this distance were not assessed due to limited connectivity (English Nature, 2001).

2.6. SURVEY LIMITATIONS

2.6.1. This survey does not constitute a full botanical survey. Key species for each habitat type have been identified to give a broad representation of habitats present within the site.

2.6.2. It should be noted that whilst every effort has been made to provide a comprehensive description of the site, no investigation can ensure the complete characterisation of the natural environment. This survey does not constitute a full botanical survey. Plant species may have been under-recorded, unidentifiable or not visible due to a number of factors including the time of year the survey was carried out.

2.6.3. The protected species assessment provides a preliminary view of the likelihood of protected species occurring on the site. This is based on the suitability of the habitat, known distribution of the species in the local area (provided by data searches) and any direct evidence within the survey area.

2.6.4. The findings of this report represent the professional opinion of qualified ecologists and do not constitute professional legal advice. The client may wish to seek professional legal interpretation of the relevant wildlife legislation cited within this document.

2.7. PROPORTIONALITY

2.7.1. Collington Winter Environmental Ltd provide recommendations in line with the British Standard for Biodiversity (BS42020). Within BS42020, proportionality is encouraged for both ecologists and Local Authority Decision Makers and Consultees. Please refer to the below extract from Section 5.5 of BS42020.

"The work involved in preparing and implementing all ecological surveys, impact assessments and measures for avoidance, mitigation, compensation and enhancement should be proportionate to the predicted degree of risk to biodiversity and to the nature and scale of the proposed development. Consequently, the decision-maker should only request supporting information and conservation measures that are relevant, necessary and material to the application in question. Similarly, the decision-maker and their consultees should ensure that any comments and advice made over an application are also proportionate."

NOTE 1 This approach is enshrined in Government planning guidance, for example, paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework for England [41].

NOTE 2 The desk studies and field surveys undertaken to provide a preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA) might in some cases be all that is necessary."

3 SURVEY RESULTS

3.1. SITE CONTEXT

- 3.1.1. The site is located within an urban area, approximately 4km east of Manchester City Centre. Ashton Canal is located directly north of the site and industrial buildings are located to the west. Residential properties are located to the south and allotments to the east.

3.2. DESIGNATED SITES

- 3.2.1. Clayton Vale, Clayton Local Nature Reserve (LNR) is located approximately 1km north of the site. The LNR comprises a former land fill site that was reclaimed by Manchester City Council in the early 1980's. The area forms a valley with the river Medlock.
- 3.2.2. Hollinwood Branch Canal Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and LNR is located approximately 2.49km northeast of the site. The canal is a branch of the Ashton Canal and is the best example of a mesotrophic standing water system in Great Manchester and Merseyside. Habitats include open water, swamp and tall fen with unimproved neutral grassland, scattered trees, shrubs and a hedge.
- 3.2.3. Rochdale Canal SSSI and Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is located approximately 2.87km north of the site. The Canal contains important habitats of submerged aquatic plants and emergent vegetation, including colonies of the nationally scarce SAC species floating water plantain (*Luronium natans*). There is also a diverse assemblage on pondweeds (*Potamogeton* spp), nice species of which reflect the quality of water.
- 3.2.4. Boggart Hole Clough LNR is located approximately 4.48km northwest of the site. The LNR is the largest woodland clough in Manchester and part is categorised as ancient woodland.
- 3.2.5. Highfield Country Park LNR is located approximately 3.85km south of the site. The LNR comprises various types of grassland, marshy grassland, scrub, wet woodland, ponds, relict hedges and plantation woodland. Fallowfield Brook also runs through the site.
- 3.2.6. Reddish Vale LNR is located approximately 4.56km southeast of the site. The River Tame runs through the site and provides habitat for a range of plant and animal species. The area is important for sand martins and kingfisher. Five ponds are located within the LNR, providing habitats for birds, mammals and insects.
- 3.2.7. Huddersfield Narrow Canal SSSI is located approximately 4.6km east of the site. The canal is the best example of a flowing eutrophic water system in Greater Manchester. The main habitats include standing and running water, swamp, tall fen and fragmentary marginal vegetation. Unimproved and semi-improved neutral and acidic grassland, scattered shrubs and areas of bracken occur along the towpath and canal banks.
- 3.2.8. No other statutory sites are located within 5 km of the site boundary.
- 3.2.9. Ashton Canal (West) Site of Biological Importance (SBI) is located adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. The canal is an important wildlife corridor linking Ashton with Manchester. The canal has been noted for its invertebrate fauna. The aquatic moss (*Fontinalis antipyretica*) was observed growing in the leats adjacent to locks and on lock walls. The European Protected Species floating water-plantain is also recorded. Both floating water-plantain and grasswack pondweed are UK Priority Biodiversity Species.
- 3.2.10. Ashton Canal (East) is located approximately 213m east of the site. The canal is an important wildlife corridor linking Ashton with Manchester. The canal has been noted for its invertebrate fauna. The canal between Edge Lane and Fairfield junction was drained in September 2014 which exposed good numbers of river snail (*Viviparus* spp) and a species of freshwater mussel. Brown Hawker dragonfly was observed near Edge Lane
- 3.2.11. The site also falls within the Impact Risk Zone of the following Statutory Site, based on consultation with MAGIC:
- Hollinwood Branch Canal SSSI

- Rochdale Canal SAC and SSSI
- Huddersfield Narrow Canal SSSI

3.3. PRIORITY HABITATS

3.3.1. Consultation with Magic.gov.uk highlighted the presence of the following Priority Habitats within 1km of the site boundary. No Priority Habitats were identified within or adjacent to the site boundary.



Figure 3.2 Priority Habitats within 1km from the Site (Magic.gov.uk, 2024)

3.4. HABITATS

3.4.1. Please refer to Drawing 20-2148– 001 for the UK HAB Map for the site. Photographs of the site are presented in the Appendix.

MIXED SCRUB

3.4.2. Parcels of mixed scrub are scattered across the site. The scrub located in the southern section of the site was dominated by buddleja (*Buddleja davidii*) with dog rose (*Rosa canina*), sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus*), silver birch (*Betula pendula*), wild cherry (*Prunus avium*), barberry cotoneaster (*Cotoneaster dammeri*) and bramble (*Rubus fruticosus*). Other species include rosebay willowherb (*Chamaenerion angustifolium*), ragwort (*Jacobaea vulgaris*), spear thistle (*Cirsium vulgare*), ribwort plantain (*Plantago lanceolata*), red clover (*Trifolium pratense*) and nettle (*Urtica dioica*).

3.4.3. Mixed scrub surrounded the buildings present on site. The scrub was comprised of rockspray cotoneaster (*Cotoneaster horizontalis*), buddleja, bramble, silver birch, sycamore, dog rose, ragwort, gray birch (*Betula populifolia*), bebb's willow (*Salix bebbiana*). Large amounts of debris and rubbish were present within the scrub.

3.4.4. Scrub was colonising in the northern section of the site within self-set trees and shrubs growing amongst the dismantled hardstanding. Large rubble piles were present throughout. The scrub was comprised of gray willow, buddleja, goat willow (*Salix caprea*), silver birch, coltsfoot (*Tussilago farfara*), bebb's willow, common osier (*Salix viminalis*), bramble, rosebay willowherb, herb-Robert (*Geranium robertianum*), and garlic mustard (*Alliaria petiolata*).

OTHER BROADLEAVED WOODLAND

3.4.5. Broadleaved woodland dominated the eastern section of the site. Section of the woodland appeared to be comprised predominately of self-set trees of a similar age with a dense scrub understorey. The woodland was comprised of birch species (*Betula* spp.), goat willow, sycamore, wild cherry, elder (*Sambucus nigra*), hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*), dog rose, ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*), alder (*Alnus glutinosa*), hornbeam (*Carpinus betulus*), and rowan (*Sorbus aucuparia*). The ground layer was composed of Ragwort, hoary willow herb, bramble, rim plantain, bird vetch, rosebay willow herb, nettle, mouse ear chickweed, creeping buttercup, herb-Robert, spiny sowthistle, spear thistle, colts foot and mayweed (*Tripleurospermum* sp.). Japanese knotweed (*Fallopia japonica*), rockspray cotoneaster and Himalayan balsam were present within the woodland.

BRAMBLE SCRUB

3.4.6. A small parcel of bramble scrub was located on the eastern boundary of the site. The scrub was dominated by bramble with nettle, herb-Robert, elder, birch sp. and Himalayan balsam.

VACANT OR DERELICT LAND

3.4.7. A small parcel of vacant or derelict land was located on the eastern boundary of the site. The area was comprised of hardstanding with ragwort, coltsfoot, dandelion, hawthorn, bramble, herb-Robert, horsetail (*Equisetum* sp.) and mare's tail (*Hippuris* sp.).

DEVELOPED LAND; SEALED SURFACE

3.4.8. Hard standing was present across the site, allowing access to the existing three buildings. Large areas of hardstanding were no longer intact with scrub species developing.

3.4.9. A large area of hardstanding, currently used as a brickyard is located in the northwestern section of the site.

LINE OF TREES

3.4.10. Two lines of trees were located between Building 3 and the western boundary of the site. Both were surrounded by hardstanding with sparse vegetation. The trees species comprised wild cherry, silver birch, sycamore, and elder.

3.5. SPECIES

FLORA

3.5.1. The data search returned no records of notable vascular plants.

3.5.2. The majority of the site was comprised of broadleaved woodland and scrub habitats with limited floristic diversity. It is anticipated that the site is unlikely to support notable plant species as none were identified during the site survey. The woodland shrub layer was dense and impenetrable, therefore making it unlikely to support carpets of bluebell. There are no parcels of ancient woodland adjacent to the site with the closest being located almost 1km north of the site

3.5.3. Overall, it is unlikely that the site supports notable or protected floral species. As such, they will not be considered further in this report.

INVERTEBRATES

3.5.4. The data search returned a total of three records of cinnabar moth (*Tyria jacobaeae*). The most recent record was from 2020, located along the Ashton Canal path approximately 0.85km west of the site.

3.5.5. The scrub and woodland habitats present on site contains limited floristic diversity. The ragwort, thistles and buddleia will provide suitable food sources for invertebrates. However, notable species are not thought to utilise the site in significant numbers.

AMPHIBIANS

3.5.6. The data search returned no records of amphibians, including great crested newt (*Triturus cristatus*).

3.5.7. The following EPSLs for great crested newt were located within 5km from the site boundary, based of Magic.gov.uk:

Case reference of granted application	Species on the licence*	Distance from site (KM)	Licence Start Date	Licence End Date	Does the Licence				
					impact on a breeding site?	allow damage of breeding site?	allow damage of a resting place?	allow destruction of breeding site?	allow destruction of a resting place?
EPSM2010-2240	GCN	4.6	05/08/2011	01/07/2013	N			N	Y

3.5.8. No ponds were located onsite or within 250 m of the site boundary. As great crested newts' upper dispersal limit is generally considered to be up to 250 m from a waterbody (though occurrence of greater distances does exist), great crested newts are not anticipated to be present on site (English Nature, 2001).

3.5.9. The site comprised woodland and scrub habitats which may provide suitable foraging resources and cover for common amphibians such as common toads (*Bufo bufo*). Ornamental water bodies may be located within nearby residential gardens which may provide suitable conditions for breeding common amphibians.

3.5.10. The presence of great crested newts within the site is reasonably discounted, though common amphibians may occur on site.

REPTILES

3.5.11. The data search returned two records of slow worm (*Anguis fragilis*) within the local area. Both records are from 2008, located within the allotments approximately 0.18km east of the site.

3.5.12. The site offers some sheltering habitat in the form of woodland edge and rubble piles; however, the site does not offer the mosaic of habitats required for foraging, sheltering, and basking. There is connectivity between the site and the allotments to the east where slow worms have previously been recorded.

3.5.13. As such, low numbers of common reptiles such as slow worms may be present on site.

BIRDS

3.5.14. A total of 19 records of birds were returned during the 1 km data search. The species returned through the data search included dunnoek (*Prunella modularis*), herring gull (*Larus argentatus*), house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*), skylark (*Alauda arvensis*), and starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*).

3.5.15. The site provides a range of potential breeding habitats for a variety of birds in association with the woodland, scrub habitats, scattered trees and line of trees.

3.5.16. The buildings on site are considered to have potential nesting opportunities with pigeons being observed nesting at the time of the survey.

3.5.17. Overall, it is anticipated that a number of bird species may utilise the site for breeding purposes

BATS

3.5.18. A total of 108 records of bats were returned within 1 km of the site boundary, six of which related to bat roosts. Species included soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*), unidentified pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus* sp.), common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*), Daubenton's bat (*Myotis daubentonii*), *Myotis* species (*Myotis* sp.), noctule (*Nyctalus noctula*) and whiskered bat (*Myotis mystacinus*). The most recent record is of a soprano pipistrelle roost from 2020, located approximately 0.52km east of the site.

3.5.19. The following EPSL were located within 5km from the site boundary based on consultation with magic.gov.uk:

Case reference of granted application	Species on the licence*	Distance from site (KM)	Licence Start Date	Licence End Date	Does the Licence				
					impact on a breeding site?	allow damage of breeding site?	allow damage of a resting place?	allow destruction of breeding site?	allow destruction of a resting place?
2016-22910-EPS-MIT	C-PIP	2.9	25/04/2016	24/04/2021	N	N	Y	N	Y
2016-22910-EPS-MIT-1	C-PIP	2.9	08/09/2016	24/04/2021	N	N	Y	N	Y
2019-41924-EPS-MIT-1	C-PIP	3.0	13/01/2020	31/08/2031	Y	N	N	N	Y
2019-43484-EPS-MIT	C-PIP	3.1	14/11/2019	31/08/2020	N	N	N	N	Y
2014-487-EPS-MIT	C-PIP	3.1	22/04/2014	31/07/2015	N	N	N	N	Y
2015-17752-EPS-MIT	C-PIP	3.1	04/01/2016	30/09/2016	N	N	N	N	Y
2014-4438-EPS-MIT	C-PIP	3.6	27/11/2014	26/11/2019	N	N	N	N	Y
2014-4438-EPS-MIT-1	C-PIP	3.6	06/07/2017	06/07/2022	N	N	N	N	Y
2014-3531-EPS-MIT-2	C-PIP	3.6	01/12/2016	01/12/2016	N	N	N	N	Y
2014-3531-EPS-MIT	C-PIP	3.6	01/10/2014	30/09/2019	N	N	N	N	Y
2014-3531-EPS-MIT-1	C-PIP	3.6	06/01/2015	30/09/2020	N	N	N	N	Y
2020-50604-EPS-MIT	C-PIP	3.7	22/01/2021	16/01/2022	N	N	N	N	Y
2014-4400-EPS-MIT	C-PIP	3.7	23/12/2014	30/04/2015	N	N	Y	N	N
2014-4400-EPS-MIT-1	C-PIP	3.7	25/03/2015	30/04/2015	N	N	Y	N	N
EPSM2011-3552	C-PIP	3.8	06/10/2011	01/09/2013	N			N	Y
2016-24504-EPS-MIT	C-PIP	3.8	15/07/2016	01/01/2018	N	N	N	N	Y
2016-24504-EPS-MIT-1	C-PIP	3.8	21/11/2016	21/11/2016	N	N	N	N	Y
2019-38955-EPS-MIT	C-PIP	3.8	14/02/2019	28/02/2021	N	N	Y	N	Y
2015-15766-EPS-MIT	C-PIP	3.8	01/11/2015	31/07/2016	N	N	N	N	Y
2015-15766-EPS-MIT-1	C-PIP	3.8	20/07/2016	20/07/2016	N	N	N	N	Y
EPSM2013-5644	C-PIP	3.9	04/07/2013	01/03/2015	N			N	Y
2016-21779-EPS-MIT	C-PIP	3.9	01/04/2016	01/04/2021	N	N	N	N	Y
EPSM2010-1888	C-PIP S-PIP	4.2	25/10/2010	29/02/2012	N			N	Y
2014-490-EPS-MIT	C-PIP S-PIP	4.2	23/04/2014	30/06/2017	N	N	N	N	Y
2014-6380-EPS-MIT	C-PIP	4.5	18/02/2015	16/02/2020	N	N	N	N	Y
2014-6380-EPS-MIT-1	C-PIP	4.5	01/12/2015	16/02/2020	N	N	N	N	Y
2014-6380-EPS-MIT-2	C-PIP	4.5	15/08/2017	30/06/2023	N	N	N	N	Y
2018-33674-EPS-MIT	C-PIP	4.5	12/03/2018	30/04/2040	N	N	Y	N	Y
2018-33756-EPS-MIT	C-PIP	4.6	01/03/2018	31/05/2019	N	N	N	N	Y
2018-33756-EPS-MIT-1	C-PIP	4.6	13/04/2018	31/07/2019	N	N	N	N	Y
EPSM2013-5575	C-PIP	4.9	23/05/2013	30/09/2016	N			N	N

Species on the licence*	Species name	Latin
C-PIP	Common pipistrelle	<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>
S-PIP	Soprano pipistrelle	<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>
BRAN	Brandt's bat	<i>Myotis brandtii</i>
BLE	Brown long-eared bat	<i>Plecotus auritus</i>
DAUB	Daubenton's bat	<i>Myotis daubentonii</i>
L-HORSE	Lesser horseshoe bat	<i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i>
NOCT	Noctule	<i>Nyctalus noctula</i>
NATT	Natterer's bat	<i>Myotis nattereri</i>
WHISK	Whiskered bat	<i>Myotis mystacinus</i>

3.5.20. The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) produced by Ascerta (June 2022), assessed all three buildings and the wall present on site as having low suitability for roosting bats.

3.5.21. Bat emergence surveys were carried out by Ascerta in June 2022, which identified the buildings as not being used by roosting bats. Updated bat emergence surveys have been undertaken by Collington Winter Environmental (August 2023). However, the results were unknown at the time of writing and will be presented in a separate Nocturnal Bat Survey Report.

3.5.22. The woodland edge habitats on site are anticipated to provide value for foraging and commuting bats. The scrub edge on the northern boundary adjacent to Ashton Canal provides habitat for foraging and commuting. Additionally, Ashton Canal also provides connectivity between the site and other areas of suitable habitat in the wider landscape.

3.5.23. As such, that habitats on site are considered to be of moderate suitability for foraging and commuting bats.

BADGER

3.5.24. A total of five records of badgers (*Meles meles*) were returned during the data search. Four of the records related to badger setts and their location is to remain confidential.

3.5.25. No signs of badger presence were recorded within the site or the surrounding 30 m during the site visit. The site provides suitable conditions for sett building within the woodland and scrub habitats. Therefore, it is considered that badgers may be present on site.

WATER VOLE

3.5.26. No records of water vole (*Arvicola amphibius*) were obtained within 1 km of the site boundary.

3.5.27. Ashton Canal was located adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. The banks of the canal in the vicinity of the site are constructed of concrete blocks and are not suitable for burrow construction. Additionally, there is minimal vegetation present along the banks of the canal. However, water vole may utilise this section of the canal for commuting purposes.

3.5.28. Overall, water vole are deemed likely absent from Ashton Canal.

OTTER

3.5.29. No records of otter (*Lutra lutra*) were obtained within 1 km of the site boundary.

3.5.30. No evidence of otter was noted within the site or along Ashton Canal adjacent to the site during the field survey. No potential otter holts across the banks of the stream were identified during the site walkover. However, otters have large territories and may utilise the stretch of Ashton Canal adjacent to the site for commuting and hunting.

3.5.31. Otter holts are deemed likely absent from site though the species may be occasionally present.

WHITE-CLAWED CRAYFISH

3.5.32. No evidence of white-clawed crayfish (*Austropotamobius pallipes*) was noted during the field survey and no records of the species were located within 1 km of the site boundary.

3.5.33. Ashton Canal is located off site to the north and is considered to be unsuitable for the species due lack larger stones and boulders, which are important sheltering spots for this species (Peay, 2002) and no records obtained.

OTHER TERRESTRIAL MAMMALS

3.5.34. Five records of west European hedgehog (*Erinaceus europaeus*) were located within the 1 km search area. Given the habitats present within the site including woodland and scrub, it is anticipated that hedgehog could be present within the site.

3.5.1.No records of brown hare (*Lepus europaeus*) were located within 1 km of the site. The site is considered to have limited value for brown hare due to the lack of expanses of agricultural field which are the preferred habitats for the species. Brown hares are not anticipated to be present on site.

NON-NATIVE INVASIVE SPECIES

- 3.5.35. No records of invasive non-native species were located within the 1 km search area.
- 3.5.36. Rockspray cotoneaster (*Cotoneaster horizontalis*) was scattered across the site, predominantly located within the scrub present on site. Additionally, Himalayan balsam (*Impatiens glandulifera*) was identified within the woodland on site.

SPECIES DISCOUNTED FROM ASSESSMENT

- 3.5.37. Hazel Dormouse (*Muscardinus avellanarius*) mainly occur in southern counties, especially in Devon, Somerset, Sussex, and Kent. There are few recorded localities north of the Midlands, though they are present in parts of the Lake District and in scattered Welsh localities (Matthews et al, 2018). The species are not generally known to be present within the Greater Manchester area (Wembridge et al., 2016). The habitats on site are of limited value due to limited areas of extensive woodland and scrub. As such, the species are reasonably discounted from site.
- 3.5.38. Red squirrel (*Sciurus vulgaris*) has been discounted from the assessment. Red squirrel populations are limited to small areas of northern England and are not known to be present in the Greater Manchester area; with no previous records returned in the data search. It is anticipated that high abundances of grey squirrel are present within this region (Shuttleworth/RSST n.d.). This species will displace red squirrel through competition as well as cause increased red squirrel mortality through the spread of squirrel pox (The Mammal Society, 2020).

4 MITIGATION RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. DESIGNATED SITES

- 4.1.1. The site is located within the Impact Risk Zone for Hollinwood Branch Canal SSSI, Huddersfield Narrow Canal SSSI and Rochdale Canal SAC and SSSI. It is anticipated that the designated sites are a sufficient distance away and are separated by anthropogenic barriers such as the residential areas, such that no impacts as a result of development are anticipated.
- 4.1.2. Ashton Canal (West) SBI is adjacent to the northern boundary of the site and Ashton Canal (East) SBI is located approximately 213m east of the site. Due to the proximity of the site to the SBI, negative impacts may occur to the SBI during the construction phase of the development.
- 4.1.3. It is recommended that a minimum 10 m “no development” buffer be implemented from the northern boundary of the site to protect the SBI. The buffer should be suitably signed and fenced during site clearance and construction to ensure no works or storage are undertaken in this area.
- 4.1.4. It is recommended that a detailed Construction and Environment Management Plan (CEMP) specific to the proposed development is created (and adhered to throughout the course of construction works) to avoid, minimise and mitigate for negative impacts resulting from construction practices on all habitats surrounding the site.
- 4.1.5. This plan will detail measures to avoid, minimise or mitigate any potential negative effects caused by construction practices on the environment on and surrounding the site including:
- The control of run-off from areas of arisings to prevent any pollutants/contaminants entering nearby waterbodies.
 - Appropriate measures to suppress dust during hot, dry and/or windy conditions.
 - Excavations should be sealed overnight or should have at least one shallow-sloping side to allow any animals that may fall in to escape.
 - An ecologist should be contacted for advice should any protected species be discovered during construction.

4.2. SPECIES

AMPHIBIANS

- 4.1.6. Great crested newts were deemed unlikely to be present on site and no further consideration for the species is required. However, there is a possibility that common amphibians such as common toad may be present on site.
- 4.1.7. It is recommended that consideration of amphibian presence during habitat management is considered. Any debris is to be cleared by hand, and any common amphibians located moved carefully, by hand, to outside of the impacted area.

BREEDING BIRDS

- 4.1.8. Any vegetation management should be undertaken outside of the breeding bird season (March to September, inclusive). If this is not possible, a suitably qualified ecologist should undertake a nesting bird check no more than 48 hours prior to removal. If nesting activity is observed, the nest(s) should be left in situ until the young have fledged. A suitable buffer will be maintained and determined by the ecologist.

BATS

- 4.1.9. Nocturnal bat surveys were carried out by Collington Winter in August 2023. The IRC footage is under review at the time of writing. Further mitigation will be informed by the results of the nocturnal bat survey and will be included within the Nocturnal bat Survey Report.
- 4.1.10. The majority of trees on site were self-set and did not provide roosting features for bats. However, if any mature trees are identified on site, a ground level tree assessment is required prior to the removal of trees.

- 4.1.11. Slow-flying species such as brown long-eared, are sensitive to lighting and may be impacted by the proposed development, should no mitigation for lighting be considered.
- 4.1.12. Any proposed lighting/existing lighting should follow the guidance outlined in the Institute for Lighting Engineers document “Guidance for the Reduction of Obtrusive Lighting” (2005) and BCT’s “Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night” (2023).
- 4.1.13. An External Lighting Scheme had not been produced on the writing of this report. As such, the following recommendations are to be considered within the scheme during its condition, to minimise impacts of lighting. The recommendations are as follows:
- Keep site lighting to minimum levels.
 - Luminaries should lack UV elements and preferably LED lighting with a warm white light should be used over cool white light (ideally <2700Kelvin).
 - Lighting should feature peak wavelengths greater than 550nm.
 - Light placement should be downward facing to prevent excess horizontal or vertical light spill.
 - The use of integrated fittings such as cowls, shields, louvres and hoods, that effectively contain light spill from unintended areas.
 - The use of hard landscaping features to block light and create dark corridors.
 - Avoid illuminating habitats of value.
 - Use of timed security lights should be set on motion-sensors and using short, 1-minute timers, to minimise light use.
 - Column heights of lighting can be considered to minimise light spill.

BADGERS

- 4.1.14. No badger setts were identified during the survey; however, they may be within the local area. The following Precautionary Working Methods will be adhered to during the construction phase to ensure that no badgers are impacted by the proposed development (Badger Trust, 2023):
- A pre-commencement of work badger survey should be conducted by a suitably qualified ecologist to ensure the current badger situation is known and that the recommendations are correct.
 - All site personnel should be fully briefed concerning the method statement, the presence of badgers, the mitigation measures to be followed, the relevant legislation, the penalties imposed and who to contact should they need to.
 - Trees and shrubs should be felled so that they fall away from the direction of a sett and outside exclusion zones.
 - Ensure excavations or trenches left overnight are covered or have an escape route such as a shallow gradient at one or both ends.
 - Ensure excavations or trenches are inspected each morning and evening to ensure no badgers have become trapped.
 - Open pipework with a diameter of more than 120mm should be properly covered or capped at the end of the working day to prevent badgers from entering and becoming trapped.
 - During the work, the storage of any chemicals should be contained in such a way that they cannot be accessed or knocked over by any roaming badgers.
 - The storage of topsoil or other “soft” building materials within the site should be given careful consideration. Badgers will readily adopt such mounds and dig setts which would then be afforded the same protection as established setts. To avoid the adoption of such mounds, they should be subject to daily inspections before work commences or alternative measures put in place, such as being fenced off for higher-risk areas.
 - Litter, tools and potentially dangerous materials on site should be cleared at the end of the working day. Care should be taken that there are no sharp metal objects or pointed protrusions on the ground which could seriously injure a badger due to their poor eyesight.
 - Ensure no dogs are brought to the work site.
 - Security lighting should be kept to a minimum and away from setts to avoid disturbance to any badgers on site.
 - Fires should be lit only in secure compounds away from areas of badger activity and should be fully extinguished at the end of the working day.
 - Badger paths must not be blocked to ensure access to foraging areas is maintained.
- 4.1.15. Adherence to these measures should be confirmed to planners at regular intervals by the project ecologist.

REPTILES

4.1.16. The majority of the site is of limited value for reptiles; however, they cannot be discounted. Due to the potential presence of reptiles, it is recommended that Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMs) are followed to minimise the likelihood of killing, injuring or disturbing any reptiles present on site during the construction phase.

4.1.17. The RAMs should follow the following measures:

- An experienced Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) shall be appointed to ensure RAM's are enforced.
- A walkover of the area should be undertaken by the ECoW to determine any change in status of the habitats/structures on site prior to the initiation of any work.
- A toolbox talk by the appointed ECoW will be given to the site manager and all contractors working on site with respect to the surrounding habitats and potential for protected/notable species. A copy of species factsheets relating to reptiles will be provided for display within the site office or other suitable location.
- Areas of unmanaged vegetation are to be strimmed under supervision of the ECoW to approximately 15cm in height in a northern to southern direction. It is to be checked by the ECoW following strimming to identify individual reptiles. If discovered, they will be removed from the working area and covered. Once the areas are deemed reptile free, the vegetation is to be strimmed to ground level and maintained at this length for the remaining construction phase.
- Any excavations will be backfilled on the same day as excavation or checked immediately prior to backfilling. If not possible, a ramp, will be provided in all excavations that cannot be backfilled on the same day or alternatively, all excavations should be well-covered with plywood.
- No piles of loose construction materials that could act as refugia for GCN (such as bricks, rubble, wooden boards) are to be created during works. If not possible, all material will be either kept on hardstanding, stored off the ground on pallets, removed immediately from the site or checked by an ECoW prior to being removed. The piles of materials may provide suitable cover reptiles.
- In the event reptiles are discovered when the ECoW is not present, works will halt immediately and the ECoW will be contacted for advice. Contractors are not to handle reptiles unless informed to do so by the ECoW.

4.1.18. The precautionary destructive search work will be undertaken during the summer at a time of year when reptiles are active. The ECoW will be present during the strimming. Any reptiles found during the destructive search will be relocated to the retained grassland to the south of the site.

OTTER & WATER VOLE

4.1.19. Otter and water vole are not considered to be present on site. However, Ashton Canal is located adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. The recommended 10 m "no development" buffer should provide protection for the watercourse. In addition, a CEMP specific to the proposed development is to be created (and adhered to throughout the course of construction works) to avoid, minimise and mitigate for negative impacts resulting from construction practices on all habitats surrounding the site. See Section 4.1 for further details.

TERRESTRIAL MAMMALS

4.1.20. European Hedgehog are anticipated to be present within the site and are a Species of Principal Importance. During habitat management, any areas of dense vegetation should first be carefully hand searched to check for the species. If identified during management, should be relocated carefully by hand to a location away from the working area. If any injured either species are located, they should be taken to a local vet.

NON-NATIVE INVASIVE SPECIES

4.1.21. Three species of invasive non-native species were identified during the survey. An Invasive Non-Native Species Method Statement is required for the removal and management of Japanese knotweed, Himalayan balsam and rockspray cotoneaster.

5 FURTHER SURVEYS AND CONCLUSION

5.1. CONCLUSION

4.2.1. The site was found to predominantly comprised of woodland, scrub and developed land anticipated to provide a range of habitats for local notable flora and fauna. The site was found to have value or potential value for bats, birds, reptiles and terrestrial mammals. Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is to be utilised for the compensation for the loss of habitats on site.

4.2.2. Specific enhancement recommendations for the site include the following:

- Bat and bird boxes could be placed on the new buildings / retained trees. A plan to show the locations of these boxes and the specifications should be produced by a suitably qualified ecologist once the layout is finalised.
- Planting of linear features such as hedgerows and trees between garden plots where possible, to add commuting features withing the site.
- The inclusion of 'hedgehog highways' to facilitate movement across the site. This includes holes of 13 x 13cm at the bases of fence panels, leaving a sufficient gap beneath gates and/or leaving brick spaces at the bases of brick walls.

6 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aire Rivers Trust. (2020). Wonderful Wildlife. Available from: <https://airerivertrust.org.uk/wonderful-wildlife/#:~:text=The%20White%2Dclawed%20crayfish%20is,White%2Dclawed%20in%20our%20catchment>. Last accessed 20/11/2020.
- Badger Trust (2023). Badger Protection: Best Practice Guidelines for Developers, Ecologists and Planners (England).
- Bat Conservation Trust and Institute of Lighting Professionals (2023). Bats and artificial lighting at night – Guidance Note (GN08/23)
- British Hedgehog Preservation Society / People's Trust for Endangered Species (2019). Hedgehogs and Development. BHPS / PTES.
- Chanin P (2003). Ecology of the European Otter. Conserving Natura 2000
- CIEEM (2019). Advice Note on the Lifespan of Ecological Reports and Surveys. CIEEM.
- CIEEM (2019). Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. CIEEM.
- Reason, P.F. and Wray, S. (2023). UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines: a guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Ampfield.
- Collins (2023). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (Fourth Edition). The Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- Rivers Ecology Series No. 10. English Nature, Peterborough.
- Dean M., Strachan R., Gow D., Andrews R. (2016). The Water Vole Mitigation Handbook (The Mammal Society Mitigation Guidance Series). Eds Fiona Mathews and Paul Chanin. The Mammal Society, London.
- Eaton MA, Aebischer NJ, Brown AF, Hearn RD, Lock L, Musgrove AJ, Noble DG, Stroud DA and Gregory RD (2015) Birds of Conservation Concern 4: the population status of birds in the United Kingdom, Channel Islands and Isle of Man. British Birds 108, 708–746. Available online at britishbirds.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/BoCC4.pdf IEA (1995). Guidelines for Baseline Ecological Assessment. E & F Spon.
- English Nature (2004). Bat Mitigation Guidelines. English Nature, Peterborough.
- Froglife (1999) Reptile Survey: An Introduction to Planning, Conducting and Interpreting Surveys for Snake and Lizard Conservation. Froglife Advice Sheet 10. Froglife, Halesworth.
- Gent, A.H & Gibson, S.D. (2003) Herpetofauna Workers' Manual. Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Peterborough.
- Gov.uk (2020). Guidance Otters: surveys and mitigation for development projects. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/otters-protection-surveys-and-licences>.
- Harris S., Cresswell P., Jefferies D. (1989). Surveying Badgers. The Mammal Society.
- IEA (1995). Guidelines for Baseline Ecological Assessment. E & F Spon.
- JNCC (2004). Bat Workers Manual. JNCC, Peterborough.
- JNCC (2010). Handbook for Phase One Habitat Survey – 2010 Edition. England Field Unit, Nature Conservancy Council. Reprinted JNCC.
- Liles, G. (2003). Otter Breeding Sites. Conservation and Management. Conserving Natura 2000 Rivers Conservation Techniques Series No. 5. English Nature, Peterborough.
- Maddock, A. (2008). UK biodiversity action plan; priority habitat descriptions. UK Biodiversity Action Plan.

- Mathews, F., Kubasiewicz, L.M., Gurnell, J., Harrower, C.A., McDonald, R.A., and Shore, R.F. (2018). A review of the population and conservation status of British mammals.
- Langton, T.E.S., Beckett, C.L., and Foster, J.P. (2001), Great crested newt conservation handbook, Froglife, Halesworth.
- Oldham, R.S., Keeble, J., Swan, M.J.S., and Jeffcote, M. (2000). Evaluating the suitability of habitat for the Great Crested Newt (*Triturus cristatus*). *Herpetology Journal* 10 (4), 143-155.
- UKHab Ltd (2023). The UK Habitat Classification, Version 2.0 (at <https://www.ukhab.org>).
- Peay, S. (2002). Guidance on Habitat for White-clawed Crayfish and its Restoration. Environment Agency.
- Shuttleworth, C., RSST (n.d.). Red and grey squirrels distribution in the British Isles in 1945 and 2010.
- The Mammal Society (2020). Species Factsheet: Red Squirrel. Available: <https://www.mammal.org.uk/species-hub/full-species-hub/discover-mammals/species-red-squirrel/>.
- Wembridge, D., Al-Fulaij, N. and Langton, S. (2016). The State of Britain's Dormice 2016. Population index, p.100

Description	Photographs
Mixed scrub adjacent to building 1.	 A photograph showing a dense thicket of green shrubs and trees. In the background, a red brick building with a green roof is visible under a blue sky with scattered white clouds. The foreground consists of a light-colored, rocky or gravelly ground.
Mixed scrub adjacent to building 3.	 A photograph of a dense green scrub area. The ground in the foreground is a mix of dirt and gravel. The background shows a clear blue sky with some light clouds.
Mixed scrub in southern section of the site.	 A photograph showing a dense green scrub area. The foreground is filled with tall, yellowish-brown grasses and some green plants. The background is a dense wall of green trees and shrubs under a blue sky with white clouds.

Mixed scrub adjacent to building 3.		
Woodland present in eastern section of the site.		
Woodland present in eastern section of the site.		
Rubble piles scattered across the site.		

Fly tipping scattered across the site.



Wall present in western section of the site.



Building 1



Building 2



Building 3		
Developed land in the northwest section of the site		



Crabtree Lane - UKhab
Date: 03.03.2025

-  Red Line Boundary
-  Line of Trees
-  Vacant or Derelict Land
-  Other Broadleaved Woodland
-  Developed Land Sealed Surface
-  Dense Scrub
-  Buildings
-  Bramble Scrub

Scale: 1:3000

Drawn By: CW

Checked By: EC

Approved By: EC



Client: Keep Moat

Site: Crabtree Lane

Project Number: 20-2148

Rev: 2.0

© Collington Winter Environmental 2024

