

AINSWORTH HALL FARM, AINSWORTH

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report

September 2022



Report Control Sheet

Project Name: Ainsworth Hall Farm, Ainsworth
Project Reference: CW20-525
Report Title: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report
Report Reference: CW20-525 RPT 001
Printing Instructions: Print at A4 Portrait, Double Sided.

Rev	Date	Description	Prepared	Reviewed	Approved
/	06/09/2022	Draft report sent to Client for comment.	OC	KB	OC
//	08/09/2022	Final version	OC	KB	OC

Collington Winter Environmental Ltd disclaims any responsibility to Mr Graham Vause 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 Mr Graham Vause 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 Mr Graham Vause 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	Ainsworth Hall Farm, Ainsworth, Bury, BL2 5QT
Grid Reference	SD75890967
Approximate Site Area	1.4 ha
Current Site Use	Currently the site forms a residential house, with garden. Dilapidated barns are present along with woodland associated with the former Ainsworth Hall.
Designated Sites within Zone of Influence	The site is located within the Impact Risk Zone for the following Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) • Tongue River Section SSSI located approximately 2.9 km west of the site and is designated for paleogeographic interest. • Ashclough SSSI located approximately 3.2 km south of the site and is designated for paleogeographic interest. • Nob End SSSI located approximately 3.2 km southwest of the site and is designated for limestone grassland which includes notable orchids.
Notable Habitat Features	Notable habitats include the mature broadleaved woodland.
Notable Species Applicable to the Assessment	• Bats (Potential roosting, foraging and commuting) • Breeding birds. • Common amphibians • Reptiles • Badger • Hedgehog
Mitigation Recommendations	Mitigation and ecological enhancements have been recommended.
Recommended Further Surveys and Assessment	Bat emergence surveys are recommended on B4, B5, B6, B7 and B8 between May – September.
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 5

2.5. BAT ACTIVITY ASSESSMENT 6

2.6. SURVEY LIMITATIONS 6

3 SURVEY RESULTS..... 8

3.1. SITE CONTEXT 8

3.2. DESIGNATED SITES 8

3.3. HABITATS 8

4.1. SPECIES 9

4 MITIGATION RECOMMENDATIONS 13

5.1. DESIGNATED SITES 13

5.2. HABITATS 13

5.3. SPECIES 13

6 FURTHER SURVEYS AND CONCLUSION 16

6.1. SUMMARY 16

6.2. CONCLUSION 16

7 BIBLIOGRAPHY 17

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1. SCOPE & PURPOSE

1.1.1. Collington Winter Environmental Ltd was commissioned by Mr Graham Vause to undertake a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) at the Ainsworth Hall Farm, Ainsworth. This report has been prepared to inform planning permission for the completion of the part-built house at B8 and a new outbuilding at B2 together with demolition of the shed at B3.

1.1.2. The author of this report is Olivia Collington BSc (Hons), MEnvSc, CEnv, Director at Collington Winter Environmental Ltd. Olivia is highly experienced managing schemes and has produced many ecological reports to inform planning applications.

1.2. LOCATION

1.2.1. Please refer to Figure 1.1 for the site location. The site is located to the south of Ainsworth, within a predominantly agricultural area.

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:
- 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.

2.2. VEGETATION AND HABITAT ASSESSMENT

- 2.2.1. An Ecological Appraisal of the site was undertaken by Olivia Collington. The survey was undertaken on the 11th August 2022. The weather on the dates was clear (2/8 oktas), with no precipitation, wind speed and 20°C.
- 2.2.2. The walkover survey was undertaken broadly in line with standard methodology as detailed in “JNCC Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey” (2010). The assessment is undertaken with consideration of methodology as per “Preliminary Ecological Appraisal” (CIEEM, 2018).
- 2.2.3. A Phase 1 Habitat Plan has been produced and is presented in the Appendix of this report. The mapping is based on the “JNCC Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey” (2010), 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

- 2.4.1. A Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) of the site was undertaken by Olivia Collington who holds a Class 1 Bat Survey Licence from Natural England.
- 2.4.2. The survey was undertaken following guidance set out in Collins (2016). 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.

2.4.3. The buildings were assessed as per categories listed in Table 4.1 Collins (2016) and reproduced in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Assessment Criteria for Bat Roosting Potential

Bat Roosting Potential	Description
Negligible	Negligible features on site likely to be used by roosting bats.
Low	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by individual bats opportunistically. However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions and/ or suitable surrounding habitats to be used on a regular basis by larger numbers of bats.
Moderate	A structure or tree with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats, but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status.
High	A structure or tree with one or more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis and for longer periods of time.

2.5. BAT ACTIVITY ASSESSMENT

2.5.1. The commuting and foraging assessment methodology is based on information contained within the Bat Conservation Trust guidelines 3rd edition (Collins, 2016). The categorisation within this report is based on that set out in Table 5, which is used as a basis for determining the requirement for further surveys and/or mitigation.

Table 2.2 Assessment Criteria for Bat Activity Value

Suitability	Description
Negligible	No features on site suitable for use by commuting and foraging bats.
Low	Habitat that could be used by small number of commuting bats such as; defunct hedgerow, isolated features not well connected to surrounding habitat or Isolated habitat that could be used by a small number of foraging bats such as a lone tree or patch of scrub.
Moderate	Continuous habitat connected to the wider landscape that could be used by commuting bats such as lines of trees, scrub or linked back gardens. Habitat connected to wider landscape that could be used for bats for foraging such as; trees, scrub, grassland or water.
High	Continuous high-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by commuting or foraging bats such as; river valleys, streams, hedgerows, lines of trees or woodland edge. Site is close to or connected to known roosts.

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. Internal access could not be gained to B7 during the survey, this has been noted as a constraint and included in the overall assessment. B1, the main residential house, has not been included in this survey as it won't be impacted by the proposed development.

2.6.3. 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.

2.6.4. 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.

2.6.5. 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.

3 SURVEY RESULTS

3.1. SITE CONTEXT

3.1.1. The site is located off Ainsworth Hall Road in a predominantly rural agricultural area. The site is surrounded on all aspects by agricultural fields which are separated by treelines and hedgerows. The local area is anticipated to have value for a range of species such as bats, birds and terrestrial mammals.

3.2. DESIGNATED SITES

3.2.1. The site is located within the Impact Risk Zone of the following Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI):

- Tongue River Section SSSI located approximately 2.9 km west of the site and is designated for paleogeographic interest.
- Ashclough SSSI located approximately 3.2 km south of the site and is designated for paleogeographic interest.
- Nob End SSSI located approximately 3.2 km southwest of the site and is designated for limestone grassland which includes notable orchids.

3.3. HABITATS

3.3.1. Please refer to Drawing 20-525 – 001 for the Phase 1 Habitat Map for the site. Photographs of the site are presented in the Appendix.

BROADLEAVED WOODLAND

3.3.2. Much of the eastern aspect of the site was dominated by mature broadleaved woodland, with aspects protected by Tree Protection Orders. The broadleaved woodland comprised the following species: silver birch (*Betula pendula*), ash (*Fraxinus excelsior*), sycamore (*Acer pseudoplatanus*), elder (*Sambucus nigra*), hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*) and beech (*Fagus sylvatica*). The understorey was bare in places, with rhododendron (*Rhododendron ponticum*), common nettle (*Urtica dioica*) and bramble (*Rubus fruticosus* agg.).

TALL RUDERAL AND SCRUB

3.3.3. Tall ruderal vegetation was present to the east of B1, B6 and B7, as well as to the west of B3 and south of B5. The tall ruderal vegetation was similar in composition throughout and had scattered scrub areas. Species identified within these habitats included Himalayan balsam (*Impatiens glandulifera*), common nettle, elder saplings, ash saplings, bramble, false oat-grass (*Arrhenatherum elatius*), broad leaved dock (*Rumex obtusifolius*), creeping thistle (*Cirsium arvense*), ribwort plantain (*Plantago lanceolata*), field bindweed (*Convolvulus arvensis*), common hogweed (*Heracleum sphondylium*), creeping buttercup (*Ranunculus repens*), black medick (*Medicago lupulina*), rosebay willowherb (*Chamaenerion angustifolium*) and greater plantain (*Plantago major*). Throughout the habitat areas, scattered farm debris was present including grass cuttings, log piles and disused machinery. A single stand of Japanese knotweed (*Reynoutria japonica*) was identified to the south of B5 (offsite).

3.3.4. An area of poor semi-improved grassland was present to the southeast of the site, creating a mosaic with tall ruderal and woodland habitats.

BUILDINGS AND HARDSTANDING

3.3.5. Within the site, hardstanding access driveways were present, as well as a residential dwelling (B1), dilapidated barns/ outbuildings (B2 – B7) and a partially constructed new residential dwelling (B8).

AMENITY HABITATS

3.3.6. An area of amenity grassland was present to the west and south of B1 associated with the residential dwelling. This space was used as a garden and an area of hardstanding patio was also present.

3.4. SPECIES

FLORA

- 3.4.1. The majority of the site comprised unmanaged habitats and woodland. No notable species of flora were identified during the survey.

INVERTEBRATES

- 3.4.2. The mature woodland areas may provide some valuable habitat for notable invertebrates by way of standing and fallen deadwood, as well as cavities in trees. The dense scrub and tall ruderal habitat will also provide value for invertebrates within the site.
- 3.4.3. Overall, notable invertebrates may utilise the site but are not thought to utilise the site in significant numbers.

AMPHIBIANS

- 3.4.4. A single Great Crested Newt Granted European Protected Species Licences was observed within 5km of the site boundary, based on a consultation with magic.gov.uk. EPSM2010-1788 was granted in 2010 and valid until 2012, located approximately 2.3 km southwest of the site.
- 3.4.5. No ponds were located onsite, however two ponds were identified within 250 m of the site. WB1 is located adjacent north of the site and is known to be stocked with fish. WB1 scored “0.43 – Poor” using the Habitat Suitability Index.
- 3.4.6. WB2 is located approximately 95 m northeast of the site and appears to comprise a fishing lake with fishing perches present. WB2 could not be accessed during the survey.
- 3.4.7. The site comprised a range of unmanaged and managed habitats, with terrestrial habitat which could provide suitable opportunities for terrestrial amphibians.
- 3.4.8. As the offsite ponds are considered to be stocked with fish, which limits the suitability for great crested newts, the species are considered unlikely present onsite, though common amphibians may occur on site.

REPTILES

- 3.4.9. The site provides some valuable habitat for reptiles, by way of the woodland, scrub and tall ruderal habitats which would provide cover for the species, as well as debris piles and basking locations. Species such as slow worm (*Anguis fragilis*) are anticipated to be present though only in low numbers.

BIRDS

- 3.4.10. The site provides potential breeding habitats for a variety of birds in association with the woodland and outbuildings. These include the extent of the suitable habitats recorded on site. Common buzzard (*Buteo buteo*) and common pigeon (*Columba livia*) were observed during the survey, with the buzzard observed circling above site.
- 3.4.11. Ground nesting birds are not anticipated to be on site due the lack of appropriate habitat as well as presence of constant activity anticipated to dissuade ground nesting birds.
- 3.4.12. Semi-mature and mature trees are present across the extent of the site, however no suitable cavities were observed for nesting barn owl (*Tyto alba*). The dilapidated barns were inspected for value for barn owl. No signs of the species were identified. The site would provide suitable foraging resources for barn owl.

BATS

- 3.4.13. A single Granted European Protected Species Licences was observed within 2km of the site boundary, based on a consultation with magic.gov.uk. EPSM2012 – 4079 was granted in 2012 for the destruction of a resting place.

3.4.14. The buildings on site were subject to a PRA and are detailed in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 PRA Summary

Building Ref	Description	Photograph
B1	Residential dwelling not subject to PRA	N/A
B2	A partially constructed stone outhouse with no roof. No crevices or opportunities for bats were present. B2 was assessed as providing negligible bat roosting potential.	
B3	A steel framed, open sided outbuilding with a corrugated roof. No opportunities for roosting bats were present. B3 was assessed as providing negligible bat roosting potential.	
B4 and B5	Shells of former outbuildings with only outer cavity walls still standing. Numerous crevices present suitable for low numbers of crevice dwelling bats. B4 and B5 were assessed as providing moderate bat roosting potential.	

B6	B6 comprised a shell of a former barn of brick construct. Much of the outer walls had crumbled, and the roof was only partially present. The walls hosted a cavity which could be suitable for roosting bats. B6 was assessed as providing moderate bat roosting potential.	
B7	Disused barn of double storey brick construction. All windows and doors were either bricked up or boarded. Several small crevices in brick work were identified. The roof was pitched and tiled, with several tiles showing to have slipped creating small crevices. B7 was assessed as providing low bat roosting potential.	
B8	Partially renovated residential dwelling with scaffolding still in situ. The stonework had been repaired with all in good condition and no crevices present. The roof was also in a good state of repair. The windows and doors were open providing internal access, however no opportunities for roosting were identified internally, in addition no droppings or signs of bats were identified. B8 was assessed as providing negligible bat roosting potential.	

3.4.15. The habitats on site are anticipated to provide value for foraging bats through the woodland and tall ruderal habitats. The site is well connected to the wider landscape via treelines.

3.4.16. The site has the potential to support roosting bats whilst the habitats were assessed as having moderate value for foraging and commuting bats.

BADGER

3.4.17. 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 and the local area provides suitable habitats for the species. Badger are anticipated to be present locally.

OTHER TERRESTRIAL MAMMALS

3.4.18. Given the habitats present within the site including hedgerows and improved grassland and neighbouring residential gardens it is anticipated that hedgehog could be present within the site.

NON-NATIVE INVASIVE SPECIES

- 3.4.19. Himalayan Balsam and Japanese knotweed were identified within the site which is listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Rhododendron was also identified within the woodland habitat.

SPECIES DISCOUNTED FROM ASSESSMENT

- 3.4.20. Water vole, otter and white-clawed crayfish have been discounted from assessment as no aquatic habitats are located on site.
- 3.4.21. 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 Ainsworth 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
- 3.4.22. Red squirrel have 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 Ainsworth 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 several SSSIs within the local area. 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.

4.2. HABITATS

BROADLEAVED WOODLAND

- 4.2.1. It is understood that the many of the trees within the woodland have Tree Protection Orders (TPOs). It is understood that the proposals are to retain the woodland habitat, and provide enhancements through selective tree thinning, and replanting of new trees. The area was the former formal garden of Ainsworth Hall, and the historic tree lines and vistas are to be reinstated. Additional enhancements could include the removal of rhododendron.
- 4.2.2. Generally, the protection measures of retained trees will be through used of temporary protective demarcation fencing to protect the trees and shrubs. The fencing must extend outside the canopy of the retained trees and must remain in position until all plots have been developed to ensure protection is provided throughout the construction phase.
- 4.2.3. The fencing will be in accordance with BS 5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction: Recommendations.
- 4.2.4. It is recommended that any new landscape planting comprises native species and species known to be of value for the attraction of wildlife. This will include fruiting and flowering species.

NEUTRAL GRASSLAND AND TALL RUDERAL

- 4.2.5. The tall ruderal and scrub habitats could be enhanced through the eradication of Himalayan balsam and Japanese knotweed. Additional thinning of common nettle and bramble would be beneficial for the habitat and encourage other flowering species to grow.
- 4.2.6. The landowner could turn these areas into wildflower meadows with rough grassland and some scattered scrub, which would be visually more attractive and provide valuable habitats for wildlife.

4.3. SPECIES

AMPHIBIANS

- 4.3.1. 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.
- 4.3.2. It is recommended that consideration of amphibian presence during habitat removal 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

- 4.3.3. The majority of vegetation is to be retained and enhanced, and therefore the proposals are not anticipated to have any significant negative impact on the local bird population.
- 4.3.4. Notably trees and buildings within the site may provide opportunities for nesting birds. As such vegetation removal and building works should be undertaken with consideration to nesting birds. A general recommendation for nesting birds is to provide more sheltered areas of dense vegetation.

4.3.5. Any vegetation removal and building works 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

4.3.6. B4, B5, B6, B7 and B8 were assessed as providing bat roosting potential, and therefore further survey is required as detailed in Section 5.1.

4.3.7. The trees within the site were not subject to a PRA due to their number and it being unknown exactly which trees are to be cleared. Therefore, if any trees do require removal, they should be first inspected by a suitably qualified ecologist for their potential to support roosting bats. A climbed level inspection or nocturnal emergence surveys may be required.

4.3.8. The habitats of highest potential value for bats include the woodland and associated habitats which are to be retained. Therefore, no significant impact on bats locally is anticipated.

4.3.9. Slow-flying species such as brown long-eared, which are known to be in the local area, are sensitive to lighting and may be impacted by the proposed development, should no mitigation for lighting be considered.

4.3.10. 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 in the UK" (2018).

4.3.11. 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

4.3.12. The following Precautionary Working Methods will be adhered to during construction phase to ensure that no badgers are impacted by the proposed development:

- All site operatives will be inducted to the potential presence of the species and the species legal protection.
- All site operatives will be inducted as to identifying potential badger setts and should be vigilant if they suspect they locate a new sett during works and inform the site manager immediately. A minimum 20m buffer will be maintained from the potential sett until an ecologist has been to site.
- All excavations will be battened at a 45 degree angle or ramps to be positioned to allow escape should animals become trapped.
- All site machinery and materials will be appropriately stored to avoid harm to the species, notably between July and November each year when extra care is needed to avoid potential impacts on

pregnant females.

TERRESTRIAL MAMMALS

- 4.3.13. 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 vets.

REPTILES

- 4.3.14. Reptiles may be present onsite, within the woodland habitats, however only low numbers are anticipated to be present. Due to the size of the site and limited habitats of suitability, which are to be retained, it is deemed appropriate that Reasonable Avoidance Measures are to be followed during vegetation clearance, to minimise potential impacts on the species:
- An experienced Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) shall be appointed to ensure RAM's are enforced;
 - A copy of this method statement must be kept on site (we suggest having a laminated copy in the site office/ compound);
 - 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 works;
 - 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 and breeding birds will be provided for display within the site office.
 - Suitable vegetation is to be strimmed under ECoW to approximately 15cm in a northern to southern direction. It is to be checked by the ECoW following strimming to identify individuals. If discovered, they will be removed from the working area and covered. Once the areas are deemed reptile free, they are to be strimmed to ground level and maintained at this length for the remaining works.
 - Any excavations will be back-filled on the same day as excavation, or checked by the ECoW 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 are to be created during works – all material will be kept on hardstanding, stored on pallets, removed immediately from the site or checked by an ECoW prior to being removed;
 - In the event reptiles are discovered, 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.
- 4.3.15. The precautionary destructive search work will be undertaken during the summer at a time of year when reptiles are active. The ecologist will be present during the strimming works. Any reptiles found during the destructive search will be relocated to the retained grassland to the south of the site.
- 4.3.16. During the construction period, the development zone will be maintained clear of vegetation in order to remove the likelihood of any reptiles re-colonising the site.

5 FURTHER SURVEYS AND CONCLUSION

5.1. SUMMARY

Bat Emergence Surveys

- 5.1.1. Several buildings on site were found to provide bat roosting potential, and therefore, in accordance with Best Practice guidance (Collins, 2016) it is recommended further emergence/ re- entry surveys is undertaken between May to August.

Table 5.1 Further survey summary

Building Reference	Bat Roosting Suitability	Minimum Number of Further Surveys
B4	Moderate	Two dusk/ dawn emergence surveys
B5	Moderate	Two dusk/ dawn emergence surveys
B6	Moderate	Two dusk/ dawn emergence surveys
B7	Low	One dusk/ dawn emergence surveys
B8	Low	One dusk/ dawn emergence surveys

- 5.1.2. The results of the further surveys will determine if any mitigation is required for roosting bats. If roosting bats are located within any of the buildings, a Natural England Mitigation Licence may be required for development to proceed. The Licence can only be obtained once planning permission has been granted and all wildlife conditions discharged. However, the bat emergence surveys must be undertaken prior to planning permission being applied for as they are a material consideration.

- 5.1.3. Table 5.2 summarises the surveys recommended to inform relevant mitigation and to inform relevant planning applications

Table 5.2 Further survey summary

Survey	Survey Timeframes
Nocturnal Bat Surveys	May to August
Inspection of trees for bats	Any time of year

5.2. CONCLUSION

- 5.2.1. The site was found to predominantly comprise habitats of value bats, birds, reptiles, amphibians and terrestrial mammals.

- 5.2.2. 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.
- Enhancement of the woodland features.

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>
- Bat Conservation Trust and Institute of Lighting Professionals (2018). Bats and artificial lighting in the UK – Bats and the Built Environment Series.
- 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.
- Rivers Ecology Series No. 10. English Nature, Peterborough.
- Collins (2016). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (Third Edition). The Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- 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>. Last accessed 26/08/2022.
- 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.

- 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.

Feature	Photograph
Broadleaved woodland to east of the site, with historic vista and treelines.	
Grassland, tall ruderal and woodland habitat to south east of the site. Wood piles present.	
Dense tall ruderal to south of B5 with scattered debris present	

Western view of Broadleaved Woodland, with historic wall associated with the former Ainsworth Hall.





Drawing Title: CW20-525 HM01
Date: 05/09/2022

-  Red Line Boundary
-  Tall Ruderal
-  Building
-  Hardstanding
-  Amenity Grassland
-  Broadleaved Woodland
-  Poor Semi-Improved Grassland
-  J2.5 Wall

Scale: 1:2,000

Drawn By: AB

Checked By: OC

Approved By: KB



Client: Mr Graham Vause

Site: Ainsworth Hall Farm, Ainsworth

Project Number: 20-525 Rev: 1.0

© Collington Winter Environmental 2021

THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

