Amber Williams BSc (Hons) MSc MPhil
Consultant Ecologist
Email: amberwilliams@arbtech.co.uk
Arbtech Consulting Ltd
arbtech.co.uk

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost Assessment

Survey site:

Oakley Gardens, 188 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 6LJ

Client:

Greyslow Limited

Survey date:

20th November 2025

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application with the Manchester City Council. The proposal is described as:

The proposed scheme consists of partial demolition and refurbishment of existing buildings and new build development to provide 53 residential dwellings (Use Class C3), along with associated hard and soft landscaping, access and associated works.

PEA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: PEA Methodology and Legislation - 2025.

PRA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: PRA Methodology and Legislation - 2025.

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 SJ 85527 94329 and has an area of approximately 0.84ha. The site comprises four buildings; B1-2 are disused office blocks and B3-4 are associated outbuildings. There is woodland, introduced shrubs, grassland, and hardstanding on site. The site is surrounded by built-up urban infrastructure to the south and dominating the surrounding landscape. There are wooded areas to the north extending to the northeast and northwest of the site. Platt Fields Park is situated ~100m west of the site. This landscape feature comprises of grassland, hardstanding, woodland areas and watercourses. Such features likely enhance the area for a variety of species, including bats, amphibians and reptiles.

Survey Details

The site survey was undertaken by Amber Williams BSc, MSc, MPhil, Consultant Ecologist (Accredited on Natural England Bat Licence Number: 2023-11521-CL18-BAT.)

Date of survey	Temperature (°C)	Humidity (%)	Cloud Cover (%)	Wind (km/h)	Rain
20/11/2025	4	56	60	22	Light rain

Executive Summary

No works to the property that may block or remove potential roosting features should be carried out until the required surveys have been completed. Undertaking such work beforehand could unlawfully affect bats if present and may compromise the validity of the surveys and hinder the planning application process.

1. A Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment will be required to comply with the Environment Act (2021) and local planning policy.
2. Two bat emergence/re-entry surveys are required on B1 during the active bat season (May – September) to confirm presence/likely-absence of bats roosting in or on the building.
3. A Ground Level Tree Assessment (GLTA) will be required for all trees impacted by the proposed development to assess their suitability to support roosting bats.
4. Precautionary working measures will be followed to ensure that nesting birds, reptiles, amphibians, badgers and hedgehogs are not harmed by the works.
5. Best practice measures to minimise the possibility of pollution affecting the deciduous woodland and traditional orchards must be implemented during construction. A Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) may be required for this.
6. In the unlikely event that a protected animal is found during construction, all works must stop and a suitably qualified ecologist must be contacted.

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.

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. The PEA survey was completed outside of the optimal survey period (April to October) limiting the identification of ground flora species, however, an adequate judgement could be made from the vegetation visible.	
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 *(UKHab codes used)*	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 mixed woodland and grassland which 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** **u1b** – Developed land/sealed surface Dominating the site is a habitat of tarmacked hardstanding utilised as footpaths and carparking (Fig.1). **u1** – 847 - Built-up areas and gardens- introduced shrubs There are scattered parcels of introduced shrubs focused to the eastern and western site boundary, scattered to the south and surrounding the grassland (Fig.2). Species present include cherry laurel red tip photinia *Photinia × fraseri*, common yew *Taxus baccata*, hydrangea *Hydrangea macrophylla*, Japanese laurel *Aucuba japonica*, buddleia *Buddleja davidii*, Monterey cypress *Cupressus macrocarpa*, Darwin's barberry *Berberis darwinii*, Japanese skimmia *Skimmia japonica*, and feather reed grass *Calamagrostis × acutiflora*. All species were present frequently. **u1b5** – Buildings There are four buildings present on site (B1-4). Buildings are described in further detail within the bat section below.

u1- 32 – Scattered tree

There are fifteen scattered trees on site, detailed below (Fig.3).

Tree ID	Species	Size
T1	Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	~90cm DBH (extra-large)
T2	Sweet chestnut *Castanea sativa*	~55cm DBH (medium)
T3	Silver birch *Betula pendula*	~7cm DBH (small)
T4	False acacia *Robinia pseudoacacia*	~20cm DBH (small)
T5	Lime *Tilia cordata*	~45cm DBH (medium)
T6	Lime *Tilia cordata*	~55cm DBH (medium)
T7	Lime *Tilia cordata*	~42cm DBH (medium)
T8	Oak	~50cm DBH (medium)
T9	Lime *Tilia cordata*	~45cm DBH (medium)
T10	Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	~35cm DBH (medium)
T11	Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	~45cm DBH (medium)
T12	Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus*	~43cm DBH (medium)
T13	Beech *Fagus sylvatica*	~65cm DBH (large)
T14	Beech *Fagus sylvatica*	~60cm DBH (large)

T15	Ash *Fraxinus excelsior*	~70cm DBH (large)

This habitat was subject to a condition assessment using the Individual trees habitat type condition sheet. The results are detailed below:

A. <70% of the trees are native species.
B. The tree canopy is continuous.
C. The tree is mature.
D. There is evidence of leaf miner on the horse chestnut and wounds on the sycamore.
E. There is a presence of ecological niches including knot holes.
F. <20% of the tree canopy area is oversailing vegetation beneath.

It is considered that the individual scattered trees are classified as **moderate** condition.

g4 – Modified grassland

To the centre of the site is a parcel of modified grassland (Fig.4). Sward height was varied and tussocky ranging from 20-35cm. There was no evidence of recent management or damaged/bare ground. Species present include red fescue *Festuca rubra* (D), perennial rye *Lolium perenne* (D), creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens* (A), wood avens *Geum urbanum* (A), red-stem feathermoss *Pleurozium schreberi* (A), cleavers *Galium aparine* (A), colonial bent grass *Agrostis capillaris* (F), common columbine *Aquilegia vulgaris* (F), ragwort *Jacobaea vulgaris* (F), Yorkshire fog *Holcus lanatus* (F), cow parsley *Anthriscus sylvestris* (O), feverfew *Tanacetum parthenium* (O), tiny vetch *Vicia hirsuta* (O), dandelion *Taraxacum officinale* (O), common yarrow *Achillea millefolium* (R), wood sedge *Carex sylvatica* (R).

This habitat was subject to a condition assessment using the Grassland habitat type: Grassland – Modified grassland habitat condition sheet. The results are detailed below:

A. There are less than 6-8 vascular plant species per m^2.
B. Sward height is varied 20-35cm.
C. Presence of scrub accounts for <20% of total area.
D. Physical damage is evident in <5%
E. Cover of bare ground is <10%
F. Cover of bracken is <20%
G. There is an absence of invasive non-native species.

It is considered that the modified grassland is classified as **poor** condition.

w1g – Other broadleaved woodland

To the northeastern aspect of the site is a parcel of other broadleaved woodland (Fig.5). Species present include lime *Tilia cordata* (D), holly *Ilex aquifolium* (A), cherry laurel (A), oak *Quercus* sp. (F), sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus* (F), common yew Taxus *baccata* (O), ash *Fraxinus excelsior* (O), beech *Fagus sylvatica* (R). The woodland understory included the following species:, rhododendron scrub *Rhododendron ponticum* (D), box-leaf honeysuckle *Lonicera nitida* (A), bramble scrub *Rubus fruticosus* (A), nettle *Urtica dioica* (A), male fern *Dryopteris filix-mas* (F), ground ivy *Glechoma hederacea* (F), privet *Ligustrum vulgare* (F), Japanese laurel *Aucuba japonica* (F), elder scrub *Sambucus nigra* (O), male fern *Dryopteris filix-mas* (R). Standing dead wood was also occasionally present within the habitat parcel (Fig.6). This habitat was subject to a condition assessment using the Woodland habitat type: Woodland and forest – Other woodland; broadleaved habitat condition sheet. The results are detailed below:

A. There are two age classes present.
B. There was no significant browsing damage.
C. There was a dense presence of invasive species.
D. >5 native tree species were present.
E. >80% of canopy trees were native but <50% understory shrubs were native.
F. There was 21-40% of open space.
G. Two age classes were present.
H. Tree mortality <10%.
I. The understory composition most closely resembles NVC type W10, however the presence of invasive and ornamental species do not fit the description.
J. There were two stories across all survey points.
K. No veteran trees present.
L. 25% of survey plot has presence of deadwood.
M. There was evidence of enrichment.

It is considered that the woodland is classified as **poor** condition.

h3g – Rhododendron scrub

There were several parcels of rhododendron scrub *Rhododendron ponticum* situated within the woodland parcel (Fig.7).

h3j – Willow scrub

	There are two scattered parcels of willow scrub on site surrounding the grassland (Fig.8). The parcels contain goat willow *Salix caprea.* This habitat was subject to a condition assessment using the Scrub habitat type: Heathland and scrub – Willow scrub habitat condition sheet. The results are detailed below: A. The parcel does not represent a good example of its habitat type. B. Saplings are present. C. There is absence of an invasive species. D. There is a well-developed edge between the habitat and adjacent habitats. E. There are no clearings within the scrub. It is considered that the mixed scrub is classified as **moderate** condition. **Local notable habitats** There are several Priority habitats situated within 2km of the site boundary. These are as follows: - **Deciduous Woodland – on site to the north.** - **Traditional Orchards - ~130m west.** - **Woodpasture and Parkland - ~1.8km west.**
Foreseen Impacts	**On-site habitats** The proposed development will result in the loss of grassland, scrub and woodland. This could result in a net loss in biodiversity at the site. **Notable habitats** Direct impacts to the deciduous woodland on site will occur due to tree removal. Additionally, due to the proximity of the site to the woodland and traditional orchards ~130m west, indirect effects (e.g. pollution, dust, litter, surface run off, etc.) could occur during construction.
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 - Recommendations" (BS 5837) (2012). **Notable habitats**

	Best practice measures to minimise the possibility of pollution affecting the deciduous woodland and traditional orchards must be implemented during construction. A Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) may be required for this. **Biodiversity net gain** The Environment Act (2021) requires all developments (excluding exemptions) to deliver a 10% net gain in biodiversity. Therefore, the planning application must be accompanied by a biodiversity net gain calculation to ensure the proposed development delivers a 10% net gain.
Locality and Designated Sites	
Summary of Survey Findings	**On-site designations** The site is not subject to any designation. **Statutory designated sites (within 2km)** There are no known statutory sites within 2km of the site. The site is not listed as having a significant impact to any Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). **Non-statutory designated sites** The presence of non-statutory designated sites within 2km of the site cannot be established without data from Manchester local record centre. Whilst some habitats in the wider landscape may host designations, the immediate environments of the site do not host habitats likely to be of designable quality.
Foreseen Impacts	**On-site designations** No impacts foreseen. **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.
Recommendations	**On-site designations** None required. **Statutory and non-statutory designated sites** None required.
Invasive / Non-native species	

Summary of Survey Findings	Rhododendron *Rhododendron ponticum* was identified on the site which is listed as an invasive, non-native species under Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.
Foreseen Impacts	Construction could result in the spread of Rhododendron.
Recommendations	No further surveys but remain vigilant. Rhododendron scrub scattered across site will be sensitively removed prior to the commencement of works to prevent the spread of a non-native, invasive species listed on Schedule 9 of the WCA. The Rhododendron will be removed using hand tools only. The most effective method of removal is through hand pulling, which results in minimal soil disturbance. Hand-pulling young shrubs will typically result in the full removal of the shrub and associated root network, which will prevent the re-establishment. Mature shrubs are likely to have a deeper and more established root network unlikely to be removed in full by hand pulling alone. Where there are mature shrubs, removal should be aided using hand tools to expose the root network in full so the entire shrub and associated roots can be removed. Development works will not commence until Rhododendron has been successfully removed from the site. When designing the planting scheme for new garden areas, the planting of any Schedule 9 invasive species of any other non-native plants likely to escape into any semi natural habitat on site or adjacent, must be avoided.
Invertebrates	
Summary of Survey Findings	Due to the suburban context of the site and small extent and type of habitats recorded, the site is not considered suitable to support a protected and/or notable assemblage of invertebrates. The habitats present on-site, including lawns, ornamental shrubs, deadwood, and woodland, likely provide common invertebrates with opportunities to forage and shelter.
Foreseen Impacts	Grassland, woodland and scrub 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** The site could be further enhanced via the provision of insect hotels, log piles or deadwood will further enhance the site for invertebrates. Native wildflowers or wildflower turf, which would provide foraging opportunities for invertebrates.
Bats	
Summary of Survey Findings	**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 three EPSLs within a 2km radius of site as detailed below:

EPSL reference	Bat species affected	Distance from site	Impacts allowed by licence
2016-21779-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	~1.3km north	Destruction of a resting place
2016-22910-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	~2km northeast	Destruction of a resting place
2015-17752-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	~2km north	Destruction of a resting place

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

Foraging and commuting habitat

Habitats recorded on site are assessed to provide high value foraging and commuting opportunities for bats in the form of grassland, scattered scrub, ornamental shrubs, trees and woodland. These habitats are likely to provide micro-climatic conditions that support invertebrates that will in turn provide foraging opportunities for local bat populations. Most notably, the woodland on site is mature and connects to the woodland off site to the north. This habitat extends beyond the site adding to the continuity of vegetated linear features present in the wider landscape. Bats are well known to utilise linear features to aid navigation whilst travelling between foraging resources and roost sites.

Roosting habitat

Buildings and trees to be impacted by the proposed development are assessed for their suitability to support roosting bats below. There are a total of 4 buildings on site, two of which are office blocks (B1-2), and two outbuildings (B3-4). 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 three-storey brick built and non-rendered dis-used office block. The building can be separated into two sections: the flat roof section to the west, and the gabled section to the east. The gabled portion of the building to the east is subject to conversion whilst the flat roof section of the building is subject to demolition. The gabled section of the building has habitat value for roosting bats whilst the flat roof section is negligible for roosting bats due to lack of suitable roosting features. The building has **moderate habitat value**.



B1 – northwestern elevation



B1 – northern elevation



B1 – southern elevation

Feature	*Materials*	*Condition/description/suitability*	*Photograph(s)*

Walls	Brick built	The brickwork of B1 is in good condition for the most part with minimal areas of missing mortar or damaged brickwork creating crevice's which are suitable for roosting bats. There is mortar missing from brickwork at one of the gable apexes at the northern elevation of B1. It is not possible to determine if this feature extends deep enough to be suitable to offer refuge for roosting bats.	 Walls of B1 in good condition  Wall of B1 (gable apex furthest to the right on northern elevation of B1)
Roof	Man-made slate / modified bitumen	The gabled section (to the east) of B1 is comprised of man-made slate tiles which are in decent condition. There are a low number of lifted tiles which provide suitable roosting opportunities for crevice dwelling species. At the centre of the gabled roof section there is a saltbox roof structure. At the apex of this gable there is a gap beneath the ridge tile. This feature is suitable to provide ingress for crevice and void dwelling species into the interior.	 B1 roof – lifted tiles on western elevation

		There are also lifted tiles on both sides of this gable which provide suitable roosting opportunity for crevice dwellers. There are lifted tiles at the overhanging eaves at the eastern facing gable of B1. The flat roof section of B1 comprised of flashing at the edges and modified bitumen does not offer any suitable roosting opportunities for bats.	 B1 – saltbox roof structure with gas beneath ridge tile  B1 – lifted tiles on eastern elevation gable end
Eaves	Wooden/brick	The eaves at the flat roof section are brick built and in good condition. There is one area in which there appears a slight gap between the eaves at the southeastern corner edge. This may be suitable for individual crevice dwellers to roost within on a transient basis. The gabled section has overhanging wooden eaves which appeared tightly sealed aside from the easternmost gable on the northern elevation. These eaves had damage to the apex resulting in access for bats and birds into the	 Gap in brickwork at southastern eaves of flat roof section of B1

		interior void. A birds nest was identified on the interior of this feature, indicating that ingress is feasible.	 Damage to apex of eaves.
Internal voids	Timber rafters, mineral wool insulation, bitumen roofing felt	Internal conditions: 6°C and 64% relative humidity. Internal dimension: Multiple loft spaces each ~ 10-13m L x 4-6m W x 3m H. The interior voids of B1 are naturally lit due to the presence of several skylights scattered throughout the gabled roof space. This reduces the suitability of the voids for void dwelling species. However, where there is bitumen roofing felt lining the tiles, crevice dwellers can roost behind this and would not be deterred by the permitting daylight. There are also crevices within the brickwork that could be suitable for crevice dwellers to roost within. The flooring is a mixture of wooden boards and mineral wool insulation. The tiles are lined with bitumen roofing felt of which is in good condition with no evidence of tearing or sagging.	 Internal void of B1 – showing daylight permitting via skylight  Internal void of B1 – showing mineral wool insulation and timber beam structure

		There is a small area of daylight permitting into the void via lifted/missing tiles. This provides suitable access into the void for roosting bats. The interior of the flat roof section is comprised of suspended ceiling tiles with no loft space. No evidence of roosting bats, such as live animals, foraging remains or droppings were identified within or on B1.	 Bitumen roof felt lining tiles of B1  Area of daylight permitting via tiles of B1  Flat roof section interior void

Cellar	Vaulted ceiling / concrete floor and walls	Internal conditions: 5°C and 68% relative humidity. Internal dimension: Multiple rooms within cellar. Full length of cellar ~25m L. The cellar of B1 extends the width and length of the gabled roof section. The cellar has vaulted ceilings and concrete walls with wooden doors separating multiple rooms. There are windows within a few of the rooms which permit natural daylight into the void reducing the suitability for hibernating/roosting bats. There is one point of access into the cellar for roosting/hibernating bats. This is situated at the northernmost point of the cellar and is a gap in brickworks. Externally, this feature is situated at ground level within the woodland. This is not considered suitable for roosting/hibernating bats as there is no clear direct flight path to the feature. Furthermore, to exit the cellar bats would have to fly into the woodland from ground level. Typically bats will drop down when exiting a roost via a feature to utilise the velocity and gain power for flight. This is not possible with this feature and thus considered unsuitable. Therefore, the cellar is not suitable for hibernating/roosting bats.	 Example of the rooms within the cellar of B1  Daylight permitting via windows of B1 cellar  Only access point for bats into cellar



External of access point- unsuitable feature.

B2 Building description	*Photographs*
Summary B2 is a two-storey, brick built and non-rendered structure of the same material and construction as the flat roof section of B1. B1 and B2 are adjoined via the northwestern aspect of B1 and the south of B2. Half of the ground floor is utilised as undercroft parking. No evidence of roosting bats, such as live animals, foraging remains or droppings were identified within or on B2. The building is subject to demolition. The building has **negligible habitat value**.	 B2 – Eastern elevation

	 Walls of B2 in good condition with no gaps at eaves  Internal space of B2 – suspended ceiling tiles and no loft space
B3 Building description	*Photographs*

Summary B3 is a single storey, brick-built storage shed with a monopitched roof comprised or metal corrugated sheeting. B3 has painted wooden doors on the northern elevation. B3 is not considered suitable for bats due to the thermal properties of the roof material. Metal will retain heat which hinders bats ability to thermoregulate and torpor daily. No evidence of roosting bats, such as live animals, foraging remains or droppings were identified within or on B3. The building is subject to demolition. The building has **negligible habitat value**.	 B3 – northern elevation
B4 Building description	***Photographs***
Summary B4 is similar to B3 in construction. B4 a single storey, brick-built storage shed with a monopitched roof comprised or metal corrugated sheeting. There is a large gap at the northwestern corner where the flashing is lifted from the brickwork. This feature is not considered suitable for bats due to the material composition and the size resulting in a rather exposed void. This feature is more suitable for nesting birds. Like B3, B4 is not considered suitable for bats due to the thermal properties of the roof material. Metal will retain heat which hinders bat's ability to thermoregulate and torpor daily. No evidence of roosting bats, such as live animals, foraging remains or droppings were identified within or on B3. The building is subject to demolition. The building has **negligible habitat value**.	 B4 – northern elevation  B4 – gap at flashing suitable for nesting birds.

Foreseen Impacts	**Roosting habitat [Buildings]** **B1** The proposed development will result in the conversion and partial demolition of this building. This could result in the destruction of any bat roosts present and could cause disturbance, death or injury to bats. **B2-4** Bats are very unlikely to be roosting within the flat roof section of B1, and B2-4 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]** The proposed works will result in the removal of areas of woodland and scattered trees. If these trees have suitable roosting features for bats, their removal could result in destruction of any bat roosts present within the feature and could cause disturbance, death or injury to bats. **Foraging and commuting habitat** The proposed development will result in the loss of small areas of grassland, woodland and scrub but given the presence of more extensive areas of foraging and commuting habitat in the locality, this is likely to be inconsequential for bats. **Artificial lighting** The proposed development may lead to an increase in the amount of current lighting of surrounding habitats or the retained building without mitigation. This may disturb commuting bats.
Recommendations	**No works to the property that may block or remove potential roosting features should be carried out until the required surveys have been completed. Undertaking such work beforehand could unlawfully affect bats if present and may compromise the validity of the surveys and hinder the planning application process.** **Roosting habitat [Buildings]** **B1** Two bat emergence/re-entry surveys are required on B1 during the active bat season (May – September) to confirm presence/likely-absence of bats roosting in or on the building. These survey visits should be completed during the optimal survey period mid-May to August inclusive. The survey visits should be at least three weeks apart.

	Five surveyors equipped with infrared cameras are required to provide full coverage of the building's elevations to look for emerging/re-entering bats. Lighting mitigation may be required based on the outcome of the night bat survey(s). If any bat roosts are confirmed from this survey schedule, a bat licence would be required to demolish the buildings as it would involve the destruction of roosts. This is applied for with the help of a class 2 licensed bat ecologist after planning permission is granted, but before commencement of works. Due to lack of suitable access point into the cellar, it is not considered suitable to support roosting or hibernating bats. As such, hibernation surveys are not required. **B2-4** 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. **Roosting habitat [Trees]** A Ground Level Tree Assessment (GLTA) will be required for all trees impacted by the proposed development. If any suitable roosting features are identified on these trees, then a close-up inspection of any features will be undertaken to determine the presence or likely absence of roosting bats. This may require a qualified climbing team or Mobile Elevated Working Platform (MEWP). **Foraging and commuting habitat** No further surveys are required. **Artificial lighting** A low impact lighting strategy will be adopted for the site during post-development which outlines the areas of the site that will be retained as dark corridors. Parameters can be found on the Bat Conservation Trust website: https://www.bats.org.uk/our-work/buildings-planning-and-development/lighting-2 **Suggested biodiversity enhancements** Enhancements are dependent on the outcome of further surveys.
Birds	
Summary of Survey Findings	**Buildings**

	A bird's nest was identified within the northeastern most gable apex of B1 (Fig.9). The external of the apex appeared to have missing soffits enabling access for birds into the building. The flat roof sections of B1-2 are suitable to support roosting by species such as gulls. B3-4 have suitable nesting opportunities for bird species such as swallows via the lifted flashing at the box ends (Fig.10). **Trees and vegetation** Bird nests were identified within T2 (Fig.11). All other scattered trees and woodland are considered suitable nesting and nest resource building opportunities for 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	**Buildings/trees** Any building works or tree removal should be undertaken outside the period 1st March to 31st August. If this timeframe cannot be avoided, a close inspection of the buildings and 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 or until an ecologist has determined the nest is no longer active. 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 or until an ecologist has determined the nest is no longer active. **Barn owls** None required. **Overwintering birds** None required. **Suggested biodiversity enhancements** The installation of a minimum of ten bird boxes on mature trees around the site boundaries or on newly created buildings will provide additional nesting habitat for birds e.g. Schwegler No 17 Swift Nest Box (buildings) Schwegler 1SP Sparrow Terrace (buildings) 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. Swift and sparrow boxes should be positioned at the eaves of a building and can be incorporated into the fabric of the building during construction.
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** Habitats recorded on site are assessed to provide foraging, commuting, basking and refuge opportunities for reptiles. The scrub and woodland provide elevated value for reptiles as these habitats provide a suitable structure for refuge, whilst also providing foraging and commuting opportunities. The tussocky grassland on site provides sheltered commuting opportunities for amphibians. However, it is important to note that the site is dominated by

	buildings, and hardstanding of limited value to reptiles. These habitats are suboptimal due to an absence of notable habitat structure and diversity, which significantly limits refuge, foraging, and commuting opportunities, albeit they do provide some basking opportunities when located adjacent to suitable refugia. The site has good connectivity to further suitable reptile habitat in the wider landscape via woodland to the north. Hibernation opportunities were identified onsite within the woodland in the form of rubble piles (Fig.12).
Foreseen Impacts	Grassland, woodland and scrub will be removed during construction. The loss of such habitats is likely to be inconsequential to local reptile populations owing to their low value and the presence of more extensive habitat locally. However, site clearance could result in the death or injury of reptiles, if present.
Recommendations	A precautionary working method will be implemented for widespread reptiles during construction, including the following measures: • Vegetation will be maintained at a short sward (5cm) to discourage reptiles. • Site clearance will be undertaken outside of the reptile hibernation season (November to February) insofar as is possible. • Any excavations will be covered overnight, or a ramp will be installed to enable any trapped animals to escape. • Best practice pollution prevention measures will be implemented to minimise impacts to nearby habitats. • Any chemicals or pollutants used or created by the development should be stored and disposed of correctly according to COSHH regulations. • If any reptiles are found in the working area these should be allowed to disperse of their own accord or, if at immediate risk, should be moved by hand to a sheltered, vegetated area away from disturbance. • In the unlikely event that a reptile is identified, works must cease and advise must be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist. **Suggested biodiversity enhancements** The site could be enhanced for reptiles post-development with the inclusion of log piles (created from felled materials) and planting of areas of native shrubs, to provide sheltering opportunities.
Amphibians	
Summary of Survey Findings	**EPSL and survey data** A review of the MAGIC database returned no granted EPSL records for great crested newts within 2km of the site. Further, no positive class survey licence return or DLL historic survey data (2017 – 2019) were present within 2km of the site.

	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). There are no ponds on the site, but a review of aerial imagery (MAGIC and OS Maps) indicates the presence of a singular pond within 500m; the pond (P1) is located ~370m west of the site and is situated within Platt Fields park. The pond is likely a fishing pond due to evidence of fishing platforms around the perimeter. The surrounding habitat is suboptimal comprising of hardstanding walkways for pedestrian use. There is likely a presence of waterfowl utilising the watercourse. This reduces the suitability of the habitat for great crested newts. **Terrestrial habitat suitability** The grassland, woodland, and shrubs may provide foraging and sheltering opportunities for amphibians. Hibernation opportunities were identified on-site in the form of rubble piles within the woodland and the woodland understorey (Fig.12). The urban nature of the surrounding landscape to the south and east (dominated by roads and hard standing which are sub-optimal for amphibians) is unlikely to support protected amphibians. However, the parkland to the north likely provides optimal habitats for amphibians and as such it is possible that amphibians would migrate on to site.
Foreseen Impacts	When georeferencing the proposed development plans over scaled mapping of the site, it is noted that the development area is likely to result in the loss or significant disturbance of 0.17ha of suitable terrestrial habitat. If great crested newts are present within the pond ~370m to the west of the site, when completing the rapid risk assessment published by Natural England (Natural England 2015), the proposed development produces a **Green risk score**, which states: **Offence Highly Unlikely.**
Recommendations	Owing to the nature of the proposed development and the low potential for impacts to great crested newts, further surveys are considered to be disproportionate. A precautionary working method will be implemented for common amphibians during construction, including the following measures: • Site clearance will be undertaken outside of the amphibian hibernation season (November to February) insofar as is possible. • A staged approach will be adopted for vegetation clearance, whereby the vegetation will be strimmed to 15cm and left overnight to allow any amphibians to disperse. The vegetation can then be cleared to ground

	level and must be maintained at this level for the duration of construction to deter amphibians from the working area. • 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 advise must be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist. **Suggested biodiversity enhancements** The site could be enhanced for amphibians post-development through creation of amphibian hibernacula using rubble and logs from site clearance. Information on how to construct a hibernaculum can be found here: https://www.wiltshirewildlife.org/hibernaculum
Badger	
Summary of Survey Findings	No badger setts were noted on site or within a 30m radius of the site. Further, no evidence of foraging badgers was noted within the development area. The site was considered suitable for badger sett excavation and foraging habitat. However, the site is surrounded by built linear features which significantly limit commuting opportunities for local badger onto the site. The sounding landscape is predominantly urban residential land though the northern and western site boundaries back onto parkland, of optimal value to badgers.
Foreseen Impacts	No works will be undertaken within 30m of a badger sett. Grassland, scrub and woodland will be removed during construction. The loss of such habitats is likely to be inconsequential to local badger 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 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. • 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 advise must be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist. **Suggested biodiversity enhancements** Planting fruit bearing trees and species-rich grassland to increase foraging opportunities for badgers.
Riparian animals	
Summary of Survey Findings	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.
Foreseen Impacts	No impacts are anticipated on riparian animals as a result of the proposed development.
Recommendations	None required.
Hazel dormouse	
Summary of Survey Findings	**EPSL data** A review of the MAGIC database returned no granted EPSL records for hazel dormice within 2km of the site. **Habitat suitability** The site lies outside of the know current range for hazel dormice and there are no suitable habitats within the development area. As such it is considered likely that hazel dormice are absent from 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 grassland and woodland onsite provides foraging and commuting opportunities for hedgehogs, with addition woodland habitat adjacent to the north.
Foreseen Impacts	Grassland, woodland and scrub 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 areas of scrub or dense vegetation should be first searched by hand before clearing. • 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 1a: Habitat map



Appendix 1b: PRA map



Appendix 2: Location map



Appendix 3: Proposed plan



Appendix 4: Habitat Photos

Developed, sealed surface	
Photograph	**Description**
	Figure 1: Hardstanding on site.
Introduced shrubs	
Photograph	**Description**
	Figure 2: An example of introduced shrubs on site.
Scattered tree	
Photograph	**Description**

	Figure 3: Example of scattered trees at eastern site boundary.
Modified grassland	
Photograph	**Description**
	Figure 4: Modified grassland.
Other broadleaved woodland	
Photograph	**Description**
	Figure 5: Woodland on site.

	Figure 6: Deadwood within woodland.
Scrub	
Photograph	**Description**
	Figure 7: Rhododendron scrub

	Figure 8: Willow scrub.
Birds	
Photograph	**Description**
	Figure 9: Birds nest within B1

	Figure 10: Suitability for birds nest within B3.
	Figure 11: Birds nest within onsite tree (T2).
Hibernacula	
Photograph	**Description**
	Figure 12: Suitable hibernacula for amphibians and reptiles

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.

© 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	Amber Williams BSc (Hons) MSc MPhil Consultant Ecologist	24/11/2025
Final	1.0	Amber Williams BSc (Hons) MSc MPhil Consultant Ecologist	25/11/2025
Updated	2.0	Amber Williams BSc (Hons) MSc MPhil Consultant Ecologist	26/02/2026