

Document Control				
Project Name:		Proffitts		
Project Number:		Proof-651-003332		
Report Title:		Preliminary Roost Assessment Report		
Issue	Date	Notes	Prepared	Reviewed
V1	03/05/2023	Draft for client review	L Quarton <i>MSc</i>	C. Wood <i>MSc ACIEEM</i>

This report has been prepared in accordance with the terms and conditions of appointment for Bat Tree Inspection [on request]. Avian Ecology Ltd. (6839201) cannot accept any responsibility for any use of or reliance on the contents of this report by any third party.

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION4

1.2 Site Overview.....4

1.3 Legislation.....4

2 METHODOLOGY5

2.1 Field Surveys.....5

2.2 Limitations6

3 RESULTS8

3.1 Field Surveys.....8

4 DISCUSSION 13

FIGURES

Figure 1: Bat Activity Survey Plan

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Scientific Names

Appendix 2: Photograph Panel

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1.1 Avian Ecology Ltd. was commissioned by Proffitts to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) in relation to the proposed enhancements and landscaping of Whitehead Gardens, Tottington, Bury, BL8 4AL (henceforth referred the 'Site'),
- 1.1.2 Specifically, surveys on-Site included a preliminary ground level roost assessment (PRA) and a partial potential roost feature (PRF) inspection of accessible features, in relation to trees present within the survey area; particular attention was given to trees scheduled to be impacted by proposed works (i.e., trees marked to be felled or crowned).
- 1.1.3 The presence of protected species within a Site is a material planning consideration for developments requiring planning consent. Information is therefore required to establish the presence or likely absence of protected species within a Site, to enable an identification of effects arising from the proposed development upon them and their breeding site or resting places. If necessary, this information is also required to inform mitigation and compensation schemes to ensure that the favourable conservation status of the species is maintained.
- 1.1.4 Only common names are used within the report; with scientific names provided in **Appendix 1**.

1.2 Site Overview

- 1.2.1 The Site comprises a community park, the park contains a stream, modified grassland, a central stage area and a high density of trees. The Site is situated within the village of Tottington, Bury. Access to the Site is available via Chapel Street.
- 1.2.2 The Site is bordered by agricultural fields and woodland to the northwest, residential areas to the south, east and west. The stream within the Site extends north of the boundary.

1.3 Legislation

- 1.3.1 All species of British bat are listed under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Bats are further protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019. The Act and Regulations make it an offence to:
 - kill, injure, or take any wild bat;
 - Damage, destroy or obstruct access to any place that a wild bat uses for shelter or protection; and
 - Intentionally or recklessly disturb any wild bat while it is occupying a structure or place that it uses for shelter or protection.
- 1.3.2 Seven bat species in the UK are also listed as species of Principal Importance for the purpose of conserving biodiversity under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006 and nine bat species are listed as priority species within the Greater Manchester Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP).

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Field Surveys

- 2.1.1 The purpose of the field surveys for bats was to identify the locations of any bat roosts that could potentially be affected by the Proposed Development.
- 2.1.2 The approach to field surveys in regard to bats, in addition to the subsequent interpretation of results, has made reference to the following guidance documents:
- Collins, J. (2016). *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines* (3rd edn). The Bat Conservation Trust, London.¹
 - Mitchell-Jones, A. J. & McLeish, A. P. (2004). *Bat Workers Manual. 3rd Edition*. Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Peterborough.²
- 2.1.3 Additional pieces of guidance and peer reviewed literature have also been referred to and are referenced where relevant.
- 2.1.4 In line with the aforementioned guidance, the following field surveys and assessments have been undertaken on-Site:
- Preliminary Ground Level Roost Assessment (PRA); and,
 - Potential Roost Feature (PRF) Inspection Survey – Trees (where possible).

Preliminary Roost Assessment - Trees

- 2.1.5 A ground level preliminary roost assessment (PRA) was undertaken on-Site on the 29th of March 2023 by A. Stanley BSc (Hons) PG Dip ACIEEM (Natural England level 2 bat licence ref: 2021-51954-CLS-CLS) and assisted by L. Quarton MSc.
- 2.1.6 An external inspection of trees was undertaken using the preliminary ground-based assessment methodology outlined in current BCT guidance (Collins, 2016); so as to identify features that bats could use for roosting purposes and to assess individual trees roosting potential.
- 2.1.7 There are four categories of roost suitability, these are described in **Table 2.2** below:

Table 2.2: Bat Roost Suitability Criteria (Collins, 2016).

Suitability	Roosting Habitats
Negligible	Negligible habitat features on site not likely to be used by roosting bats.
Low	A tree or building/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 habitat to be used regularly by larger numbers of bats (i.e. unlikely to be suitable for maternity or hibernation purposes).

¹ Collins, J. (ed.) (2016) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines* (3rd edn). The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

² Mitchell-Jones, A. J. & McLeish, A. P. (2004). *Bat Workers Manual. 3rd Edition*. Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Peterborough

Suitability	Roosting Habitats
Moderate	A tree or building/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.
High	A building/structure or tree with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats due to its size, shelter, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status (with respect to roost type only – the assessments in this table are made irrespective of species conservation status, which is established after presence is confirmed).

Bat Roost Inspection Survey

- 2.1.8 A potential roost feature (PRF) inspection was also undertaken in tandem with the above PRA on the 29th of March 2023 following current BCT guidelines (Collins, 2016).
- 2.1.9 The inspection was undertaken of PRFs at lower elevations, which were accessible using available equipment at the time of survey.
- 2.1.10 PRF inspections were undertaken within legislative compliance by A. Stanley BSc (Hons) PG Dip ACIEEM (level 2 bat licence holder), and assisted by L. Quarton MSc.
- 2.1.11 PRFs at ground level were inspected using both torches and video endoscope. Where possible, additional PRFs were accessed using a telescopic ladder, where safe to do so.
- 2.1.12 PRFs were investigated for the following:
- Bats;
 - Bat droppings – within the PRF, or on the outside of the tree;
 - Smell – some bats (noctule particularly) can produce foul smelling roosting spaces;
 - Substrate – stained, waxy;
 - Slurry/ urine staining beneath PRF.
- 2.1.13 Other characteristics of the PRFs considered included, size, internal orientation, whether dry or wet and signs of other occupation (e.g., squirrels). These factors would all influence the likelihood of the PRF being utilised by bats.

2.2 Limitations

- 2.2.1 PRA and PRF inspection surveys were undertaken on the 29th of March 2023, and took place during the appropriate timeframes for each survey (e.g., December – March in regard to the former), which ensured optimum visibility of PRFs, as suggested by current guidelines (Collin, 2016).
- 2.2.2 Surveys were undertaken during good weather conditions, however there was light drizzle during short periods of time during the survey. Conditions were considered adequate in terms of visibility and safe conduct when handling and using equipment at height (e.g., ladders).
- 2.2.3 Due to limitations accessing PRFs at the higher elevations, the majority of features were inaccessible at the time of survey, and could not be inspected internally or characterised as with the accessible features. Consequently, no conclusive assessment could be made in relation to these features, and the likely presence or absence of roosting bats could not be confirmed in these instances.

- 2.2.4 Moreover, due to the seasonal ecology observed in various bat species (e.g., roost switching), in addition to inherent difficulties associated in identifying active tree roosts (e.g., the persistence of signs and indicators), survey work on individual trees, whilst capable of confirming roost status, is unlikely to conclusively confirm absence.
- 2.2.5 Consequently, even when bats are presumed absent from a PRF, a precautionary approach during development works must be upheld, even when informed by previous surveys.
- 2.2.6 Two trees were inaccessible (T79 and T93) due to location either off-site or adjacent to a stream and therefore the PRF inspection was limited for these trees.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Field Surveys

Preliminary Roost Assessment

- 3.1.1 A total of 141 trees were previously identified on-Site via an independent arboriculture survey.
- 3.1.2 Of trees on-Site, a total of seventeen trees assessed during the PRA were identified as featuring roosting suitability for bats, with roosting potential ranging from **Low** to **High** suitability, in line with descriptions outlined in current BCT guidance (Collins, 2016).
- 3.1.3 A summary of PRA results for all seventeen trees noted to have roost potential is provided in **Table 3.1** below, with supporting images included in **Appendix 2**; the locations of these trees relative to Site are also presented in **Figure 1**.

Table 3.1: Preliminary Roost Assessment Results

Tree ID	Species	Category	Suitability	Development Status	PRF Comments	Photograph
T4	Prunus sp.	C	Low	Retained	Peeling bark in some areas.	P1
T33	Horse chestnut	B	Low	Retained	Peeling bark throughout.	P2
T34	Horse chestnut	C	Low	Retained	Peeling bark mainly concentrated relatively low.	P3
T36	Sycamore	D	Low	Felled	Potential PRF not visible from ground, approximately 15m high, northern aspect.	P4-P5
T44	Sycamore	D	Moderate	Felled	Two trunks; peeling bark and knots present, potential PRFs but non-accessible - second trunk more rotted.	P6-P7
T47	Horse chestnut	B	High	Retained	Peeling bark, cracks and broken limbs (most significant at approximately 15m high, southeast aspect.	P8-P11
T49	Black poplar (hybrid)	B	High	Retained	Cracks in bark, broken limbs, most significant approximately 15m high at southeast aspect.	P12-P13

Tree ID	Species	Category	Suitability	Development Status	PRF Comments	Photograph
T78	Crack willow	C	Moderate	Felled	Crack/tear running from base of tree located on north aspect. Tear at base checked - negative for presence at time of survey, higher crack non-accessible.	P14-P15
T80	Crack willow	D	Moderate	Felled	Deep crack/wound located on trunk at elevation, present on northeast aspect.	P16-P17
T93	Hawthorn	D	Moderate	Felled	Ivy covered but inaccessible. Potential for concealed features.	P18
T114	Sycamore	D	Low	Felled	Cracked branch, located on west aspect, non-accessible.	P19
T115	Crack willow	C	Low	Crowned	Split limb approximately 18m high, but facing upward and possibly exposed to elements.	P20-P21
T117	Aspen	B	Moderate	Crowned	Butt-rots and hollow cavities at base, possible hollow trunk, multiple cracks in limbs, and present cavity on northwest aspect of trunk approximately 3m high. Cavities checked but appeared to be negative for presence, although feature appeared to extend beyond scope of equipment.	P22-P23
T125	English oak	B	Moderate	Crowned	Many broken limbs at height, non-accessible. Superficial wounds closer to base, all of which were unsuitable upon being checked.	P24-P26
T128	Crack willow	D	Low	Felled	Splitting bark throughout trunk, and split limb roughly 20m in height.	P27-P28

Tree ID	Species	Category	Suitability	Development Status	PRF Comments	Photograph
T135	Salix sp.	C	Moderate	Felled	Large cavity on northeast aspect, located approximately 4m in height. Non-accessible.	P29-P30
T138	Ulmus sp.	D	Low	Retained	A broken limb and large rot-wound present close to base, negative for presence at time of survey, but potential noted.	P31-P32

- 3.1.4 Of the seventeen trees summarised in **Table 3.1**, eleven trees are subject to planned impacts (i.e., eight trees are scheduled to be felled, and three to be crowned), whilst six trees are scheduled to be retained.
- 3.1.5 The eleven trees scheduled to be impacted included varying levels of roosting potential, with seven trees being noted as having **Moderate** roosting potential, whilst four were assessed as having **Low** roosting potential.
- 3.1.6 Likewise, of the six trees scheduled to be retained, two trees were assessed as having **High** roosting potential, and a further four noted to feature **Low** roosting suitability.
- 3.1.7 All other trees on-Site were assessed as having **Negligible** roosting potential. This included an additional eight trees discounted from **Table 3.1** which were initially considered to have **Low** roosting potential, but were later reassessed as being **Negligible** following a PRF inspection (**Table 3.2**).

Bat Roost Inspection Surveys

- 3.1.8 During the PRA survey, PRFs were identified via a systematic inspection of trees; where accessible, features were subsequently inspected as part of an additional PRF inspection, undertaken in order to confirm the presence/likely absence of bats relative to individual PRFs at the time of survey.
- 3.1.9 A total of fifteen trees were subject to PRF inspections overall. These trees included seven of the trees summarised for roosting potential in **Table 3.1**, in addition to an extra eight trees which were later discounted from the above PRA summary following a **Negligible** assessment following PRF inspections.
- 3.1.10 The results of PRF inspections in relation to accessible PRFs are summarised in **Table 3.2** below. A supporting photographic panel of PRFs is also included in **Appendix 1**.

Table 3.2: Potential Roost Feature Inspection – Accessible Features

Tree ID	PRF Ref.	PRF Type	Signs of Use	Comments	Photo Ref. (Appendix 1)
T4	PRF 1	Peeling bark	None.	Peeling bark featured on limb, located on the east aspect of the tree. Torching indicated a negative result for presence, although Low potential remains due to suitability of crevice feature.	P1
	PRF 2	Holes	None.		P33

Tree ID	PRF Ref.	PRF Type	Signs of Use	Comments	Photo Ref. (Appendix 1)
T13	PRF 3	Holes	None.	Three rot holes/wounds located on northwest and east aspects. Shallow and considered superficial; all features considered unsuitable overall, with T13 assessed as having Negligible potential post inspection.	P34
	PRF4	Holes	None.		P35
T17	PRF 5	Butt-rot	None.	Superficial butt-rot feature at base of tree on southeast aspect; no crevice/void spaces formed by features so deemed unsuitable as roosting feature. T17 assessed as having Negligible potential overall.	P36
T37	PRF 6	Rot and crevices	None.	Superficial rot/wounds present at low elevation, all shallow and unsuitable as roosting features upon inspection. Larger feature present on east aspect which suggests potential; from ground, but revealed to be superficial (P37). P37 assessed as Negligible overall.	P37
T47	PRF 7	Various	None.	Wet, visible exposed rot where bark has broken away, some crevice potential but internal conditions appear unsuitable. Various other cracks and PRFS located at height which were non-accessible (T47 remains as High potential).	P8-P11
T52	PRF 8	Crack	None.	Tree bent, with crack in trunk forming a potential feature, although upon inspection no crevices/voids had formed considered to be suitable as roosting features. Feature also oriented upwards and exposed to elements, subsequently assessed as unsuitable, T52 considered to have Negligible potential overall.	P38
T55	PRF 9	Crack	None.	Dead trunk, primarily stripped of bark with some remains, although not considered to form suitable features. Crack at apex of trunk examined but revealed to be superficial. T55 was assessed as having Negligible potential overall.	P39
T61	PRF 10	Crevice	None.	Superficial wound present on south aspect; feature did not form any viable crevice or void spaces, and was considered unsuitable. T61 was assessed as having Negligible potential overall.	P40
T78	PRF 11	Crevice	None.	Crack/wound within trunk close to base of tree on north aspect. Internal conditions relatively wet, litter also wedged within. Endoscopy revealed feature forms numerous cracks/crevices extending in various direction, with angles/orientation making the feature difficult to inspect	P15

Tree ID	PRF Ref.	PRF Type	Signs of Use	Comments	Photo Ref. (Appendix 1)
				completely. Additional PRF present at elevation located on north aspect, appears to be a split/wound in trunk, although non-accessible. PRA remains Low potential in light of non-surveyed features.	
T117	PRF 12	Butt rot	None.	Butt-rot cavities at base on southeast aspect, appears to open into large void upwards within trunk (suggests potential hollowing, with cavity extending beyond scope of endoscope). Retains Moderate potential.	P22-P23
	PRF 13	Rot hole	None.	Rot hole features extending upwards forming cavity space; internal conditions relatively damp at time of survey. Internal space appears to branch off in multiple directions, with possibility of connecting to PRF 12 suggested. As additional PRFs (e.g., cracks and broken branches) present which were non-accessible, in conjunction with the apparent extent of PRF 13, T117 retains Moderate potential.	
T124	PRF 14	Peeling bark	None.	Peeling bark present at lower elevation on trunk, although superficial upon inspection; not considered to form viable crevice/roosting feature. T124 was assessed as having Negligible potential overall.	-
T125	PRF 15	Rot hole and crevices	None.	Superficial rot holes/wounds present at lower elevation on southwest aspect, although none formed viable cavities suitable for roosting. However, multiple cracks and broken limbs observed at height which were non-accessible. Given unknown status of outstanding features and apparent age of tree, Moderate potential retained.	P24-P26
T128	PRF 16	Peeling bark/cracked limb	None.	Large areas of broken/peeling bark present on northwest aspect, forming suitable crevice space. Appeared to be negative for the bat presence upon inspection at the time of survey. Additional crack/broken limb features present at apex, although non-accessible at elevation. Low potential for T128 retained in light of outstanding PRFs present.	P27-P28
T129	PRF 17	Small void	None.	Small superficial rot holes present on northwest elevation, upon inspection shallow and unsuitable as a roosting feature. T129 was assessed as having Negligible potential overall.	P41
T138	PRF 18	Rot cavities	None.	Large wounds/rot cavities present on two limbs present at base of tree. Both confirmed to be negative for the presence of	P43

Tree ID	PRF Ref.	PRF Type	Signs of Use	Comments	Photo Ref. (Appendix 1)
				roosting bats at the time of survey, although features considered viable. Tree retains Low roosting potential, although not scheduled to be directly impacted during proposed works.	

- 3.1.11 Of the PRFs inspected, none were confirmed to be occupied by roosting bats at the time of survey; additionally, no indicative signs of use (e.g., droppings) by bats were identified during the survey.
- 3.1.12 However, five of the trees assessed in **Table 3.1** featured additional PRFs present at elevations which were non-accessible; in such instances negative PRF results (where observed) could not conclusively confirm presence/likely absence as a consequence of outstanding features. As such these trees retained their pre-PRF assessment results outlined in **Table 3.1**.
- 3.1.13 However, a total of eight trees which featured accessible PRFs were noted to be **Negligible** upon inspection, and subsequently discounted as being unsuitable for roosting bats.

4 DISCUSSION

- 4.1.1 A PRA was undertaken on the 29th of March 2023 and identified a total of seventeen trees on-Site which featured viable roosting potential, ranging from **Low** to **High** suitability (**Table 3.1**).
- 4.1.2 An additional eight trees which were initially considered to have potential when identified during the PRA, and which featured accessible PRFs, were subsequently discounted as having **Negligible** roosting potential as a consequence of PRF inspections (i.e., features were deemed unsuitable) (**Table 3.2**).
- 4.1.3 Of trees identified with bat roosting potential following both PRA and PRF inspections, eleven trees are scheduled to be impacted by proposed works. This included seven trees assessed as having **Moderate** potential (five of which are to be felled, and two to be crowned), and four as having **Low** potential (three of which are scheduled to be felled, and one to be crowned).
- 4.1.4 Furthermore, an additional six trees were identified with viable potential, although these are not currently scheduled to undergo any direct works; these trees included two individuals identified as having **High** suitability, and four trees featuring **Low** suitability (**Table 3.1**).
- 4.1.5 No evidence confirming bat roost presence (e.g., roosting bats or field signs) was observed during the PRA survey or PRF inspections of accessible features.
- 4.1.6 However, due to the number of trees identified with bat roost potential which feature outstanding PRFs not accessible during the scope of the survey, it is not possible to discount potential roost status, or to confirm the presence or likely absence of bats from trees scheduled to be impacted directly (e.g., felling or crowned) or indirectly (e.g., retained trees within proximity to proposed works).
- 4.1.7 Moreover, identifying tree roosts can be difficult, as tree roosting bats are known to exhibit roost switching behaviour and often evidence does not persist as well as it does within buildings. From what is known about the ecology of tree-roosting bats, all trees with bat roosting potential should be considered part of a resource, that will/could be used at one time or another by tree roosting bats.
- 4.1.8 However, as noted above (see 'Limitations') seasonal behaviour, roost function and inherent difficulties in identifying bat tree roosts means that it is not possible to discount general roost status, or to confirm with certainty the likely absence of roosting bats. Precautionary measures are likely to still be essential during works even where surveys have not identified occupancy.

- 4.1.9 Concerning proposed works, and in light of the varying levels of roost potential identified on-Site, potential impacts relating to bats include the possibility of either damage and/or destruction of roosts (which includes possible bat mortality) in relation to trees scheduled to be directly impacted, and disturbance of roosting bats in relation to retained trees featuring potential within close proximity).
- 4.1.10 Due to their legal protection, the possible presence of and potential effects on bats is a material consideration before any works can be undertaken. In reference to current guidance, the Bat Conservation Trust's '*Bat Surveys, Good Practice Guidelines*' (Collins, 2016) is the standard guidance adopted by local authorities and Statutory Nature Conservation Organisations. Following this guidance, survey effort must vary depending on the likelihood of bat presence and potential for works to affect bats; this guidance also provides recommendations further survey requirements.

Recommendations

- 4.1.11 In line with BCT guidance, trees identified as having **Negligible** or **Low** roosting potential do not typically require further surveys. However, given the ecology of tree roosting bats, it is recommended that for trees with low potential, both felling and crowning activities should be undertaken using a soft felling approach. The methods include which lowering limbs and sections of the tree gently, in a controlled manner to ground level.
- 4.1.12 Each section will be laid on the ground with holes and cracks facing upward to give bats a chance to vacate the tree overnight. The following measures should also be followed:
- Site operatives (including appointed tree contractors) will be informed by 'tool box' talk of the potential for protected species to occur on-site, what to look out for and what to do in the event that animal is found.
 - The trees with low bat suitability will be shown to the contractors by the supervising ecologist on Site with explanation of the roost assessment and proposed working methods.
 - Pruning works should where possible avoid potential bat roost features. Prior to tree works commencing, the appointed tree contractors should climb and inspect the tree for potential roost features, not previously detected and for evidence of roost bats, where safe to do so.
- 4.1.13 However, for trees scheduled to be impacted which were identified as having **Moderate** roosting potential, it is necessary that further surveys take place in order to confirm the likely presence or absence of roosting bats in association with each individual tree.
- 4.1.14 The development plans indicate that the trees with **high** bat roosting potential will not be affected by the proposed development. If the development plans change and any of these trees are affected, further surveys will be required and fees can be provided.
- 4.1.15 Tree Climbing Inspection surveys or Presence/likely absence surveys can be implemented following methodology outlined in BCT guidance. Presence/likely absence surveys would require a minimum of two/three surveys, comprising at least one dusk emergence survey, and a separate dawn re-entry survey scheduled between May to September (with at least one/two surveys taking place between May and August).
- 4.1.16 Should the presence of roosting bats be confirmed during any of these surveys, additional surveys may be required to aid in the design of appropriate mitigation measures for a license application necessary for works to proceed within legislative compliance.
- 4.1.17 If bats are found to be absent following the additional surveys, the mitigation provided for the Low potential trees should be implemented. Any changes to plans that involve works of any form to additional trees should be discussed with a suitably qualified ecologist before proceeding.

FIGURE 1: PRA Site Plan



APPENDIX 1: SCIENTIFIC NAMES

Table A1.1: A summary of scientific names mentioned within the report relating to bat species.

Common Name	Scientific Name
Common pipistrelle	<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>
Soprano pipistrelle	<i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>
Nathusius' pipistrelle	<i>Pipistrellus nathusii</i>
Noctule	<i>Nyctalus noctula</i>
Brown long-eared bat	<i>Plecotus auritus</i>
Whiskered bat	<i>Myotis mystacinus</i>
Natterer's bat	<i>Myotis nattererii</i>
Brandt's bat	<i>Myotis brandtii</i>
Daubenton's bat	<i>Myotis daubentonii</i>

Table A1.2: A summary of scientific names mentioned within the report relating to tree species.

Common Name	Scientific Name
Prunus species	<i>Prunus</i> sp.
Horse chestnut	<i>Aesculus hippocastanum</i>
Sycamore	<i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i>
Black poplar (hybrid)	<i>Populus x canadensis</i>
Crack willow	<i>Salix fragilis</i>
Hawthorn	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>
Aspen	<i>Populus tremula</i>
English oak	<i>Quercus robur</i>
Willow species	<i>Salix</i> sp.
Elm species	<i>Ulmus</i> sp.

APPENDIX 2: PHOTOGRAPH PANEL

Table A2: Photograph panel presenting notable PRA survey results.

	
P1: T4	P2: T33
	
P3: T34	P4: T36



P5: T36



P6: T44



P7: T44



P8: T47



P9: T47



P10: T47



P11: T47



P12: T49



P13: T49



P14: T78



P15: T78



P16: T80



P17: T80



P18: T93



P19: T114



P20: T115



P21: T115



P22: T117



P23: T117



P24: T125



P25: T125



P26: T125



P27: T128



P28: T128



P29: T135



P30: T135



P31: T138



P32: T138



P33: PRF 2; T13



P34: PRF 3; T13



P35: PRF 4; T13



P36: PRF 5; T17



P37: PRF 6; T37



P38: PRF 8; T52



P39: PRF 9; T55



P40: PRF 10; T61



P41: PRF 17; T129



P42: PRF 18; T138