

Reference: JRE120826

Version: R.01

Date: 12/08/2026

Report for: JonKas Real Estate 2 Ltd.



Ecology Report
Little Millfields, Rowhook
RH12 3PX

Executive Summary

A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) has been updated for the proposed redevelopment at Little Millfields, Rowhook, Horsham. The original ecological surveys were completed in June 2025 and a validation walkover was undertaken on 4 August 2026 against the current application drawings. The validation survey confirmed that the habitat types and their condition remain materially unchanged: the site is dominated by modified grassland, existing developed land/hardstanding and a cluster of former agricultural outbuildings, with individual trees and boundary vegetation. No priority habitat occurs within the current planning boundary. The ecological baseline and impact conclusions in this report therefore remain representative of the current proposals.

The mapped pond to the north of the site was specifically considered during the update. It is assessed as unsuitable for breeding great crested newt (GCN) because it does not provide sufficiently reliable aquatic habitat through the breeding season; it was dry during the original survey period and the updated appraisal confirmed that it does not represent suitable GCN breeding habitat. There are no GCN records within 1 km and terrestrial habitat within the application site is of limited suitability. No further GCN survey or mitigation is considered necessary.

Next Steps:

- Undertake a pre-commencement ecological check where works could affect buildings, trees or dense vegetation, with particular attention to bats and nesting birds.
- Schedule vegetation clearance and demolition outside the main bird nesting season (March–August inclusive) where practicable, or complete a nesting bird check immediately before works.
- Provide a short ecological toolbox talk to site operatives covering bats, nesting birds and the stop-work procedure if protected species are encountered.
- Use precautionary working methods for demolition, vegetation clearance and removal of potential refugia, as set out in this report and the PRA appendix.
- Retain the proposed new native hedgerow and the integrated bat access features shown on the current drawings as proportionate biodiversity enhancements.

Subject to these measures, the proposed development is not expected to result in significant ecological effects and can proceed in accordance with relevant wildlife legislation and planning policy.

Contents

Introduction.....	4
Background and Purpose	4
Site description	4
Proposed development.....	5
Relevant Planning Policies and Legislation	6
Methodology	9
Desk Study.....	9
Data Sources and Search Areas	9
Field Survey	10
Validation Survey – 4 August 2026	10
Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment.....	11
Quality Assurance	11
Limitations.....	11
Data validity	11
Results	12
Desk Study Results	12
Designated Sites	12
Priority Habitats and Species Records	12
Field Survey Results.....	14
Habitats.....	14
Protected and Priority Species.....	17
Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment.....	20
Ecological Constraints and Opportunities	20
Constraints	20
Opportunities	21
Mitigation Hierarchy	22
Conclusion	23
Pre-commencement Measures and Further Survey Triggers.....	23
References.....	25
Appendix 1 – Habitat Map – UKHab (Validated 4 August 2026)	26
Appendix 2 - Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment.....	27

Introduction

Background and Purpose

This Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) has been prepared on behalf of JonKas Real Estate 2 Ltd to inform the proposed redevelopment at Little Millfields, Rowhook, Horsham. The report identifies the ecological value of the site, assesses the potential for protected and notable species, considers the current development proposals and provides proportionate mitigation and enhancement recommendations to support the planning application to Horsham District Council. The original PEA surveys were completed in June 2025 and the ecological baseline was validated by an updated walkover survey on 4 August 2026.

The aims of this report are to:

Undertake a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA):

- Complete an Extended UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) survey to identify and map all habitat types present on site.
- Assess the potential for the site to support protected and notable species, using both field survey and desk-based review of local biological records.
- Carry out a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (PRA) of buildings and structures on site to evaluate their suitability for roosting bats.

Inform Planning and Design:

- Provide recommendations for any further survey, mitigation and proportionate ecological enhancement required to support the current proposal.
- Confirm that the ecological baseline remains representative of the current application boundary and drawings.

This report incorporates the original desk study, habitat survey and Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA), together with the 4 August 2026 validation walkover and a review of the current planning drawings. It is intended for use by the client, design team and planning authority in determining the current application.

This PEA has been undertaken in accordance with CIEEM Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (2nd edition, 2017).

Site description

Little Millfields is a semi-rural site located within the Horsham District, surrounded by a mix of agricultural land, hedgerows, and scattered residential properties. The immediate area is characterised by a patchwork of open fields, mature boundary vegetation, and a network of access tracks and minor roads typical of the local landscape. Existing buildings on the site comprise a collection of former agricultural structures and outbuildings, some of which have previously been subject to Class Q permitted development approvals for conversion to residential use. These structures are generally of utilitarian design, constructed from a mix of materials such as corrugated metal, timber, and brick, and are set within a relatively open plot with hardstanding and areas of rough grassland.

Surrounding land use is predominantly agricultural, with arable and pasture fields forming the principal land cover. Hedgerows and small copses provide some connectivity to wider ecological networks. Residential development in the vicinity is sparse, with individual dwellings and

farmsteads scattered along local lanes. There are no designated ecological sites or statutory nature conservation designations within the immediate vicinity of the site, but the mosaic of habitats offers potential for local biodiversity interest, particularly for birds, bats, and small mammals. The site is not located within a conservation area or subject to any listed building constraints, based on the referenced planning documents.

The current red line boundary and its relationship to the wider landscape are shown on Figure 1. The current boundary measures approximately 0.136 ha from the supplied planning drawings.



Figure 1 Current site location and red line boundary, based on Boher Architecture Drawing 1532 P 000 (Location Plan), June 2026.

Proposed development

The current proposal comprises the removal of the existing redundant agricultural and ancillary outbuildings within the application site and the erection of a single replacement dwelling at Little Millfields. The proposed dwelling is an L-shaped, single-storey building of approximately 120 m² gross internal floor area, with associated parking and permeable surfacing, bin and bicycle storage, access and landscaping. The assessment has been updated against the Boher Architecture drawing set 1532 P 000–009, dated June 2026.

The current layout retains the wider boundary vegetation and individual trees where shown, and includes a new native hedgerow along the eastern boundary. The proposed dwelling elevations also incorporate dedicated bat access features. These measures are supported as proportionate ecological enhancements and should be retained through detailed design and construction.

The development footprint is concentrated within existing modified grassland and developed land associated with the outbuildings. No priority habitat is present within the application boundary. Subject to the precautionary measures set out in this report, the development is not expected to result in significant ecological effects.

The ecological assessment should be read alongside the current location plan, topographic survey, existing and proposed plans/elevations, proposed site plan, block plan and street scene (Boher Architecture Drawings 1532 P 000–009).

For the purposes of this report, the “site” means the land within the current red line boundary shown on Drawings 1532 P 000 and 1532 P 008. The “proposed development” means the single replacement dwelling and associated access, parking, storage and landscaping shown on Drawings 1532 P 005–009.



Figure 2 Proposed site layout, Boher Architecture Drawing 1532 P 007 (Proposed Site Plan), June 2026.

Relevant Planning Policies and Legislation

The site was surveyed to assess its ecological value and to ensure the proposals were compliant with relevant planning policy and legislation. Policy guidance is provided by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2024) as well as the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015). These policies included the following which are considered relevant to ecology, biodiversity, and nature conservation:

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015)

- Policy 24: Environmental Protection – Ensures that development does not have an unacceptable impact on the environment.
- Policy 25: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character – Requires the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment and landscape character.

- Policy 26: Strategic Countryside Protection – Protects the countryside from inappropriate development.
- Policy 31: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity – Promotes the retention, protection, and enhancement of biodiversity and green infrastructure.
- Policy 37: Sustainable Construction – Encourages sustainable design and construction methods that support environmental objectives.

Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 remains the principal legislation for wildlife protection in Great Britain, providing statutory safeguards for wild animals, plants, and habitats, and underpinning the designation and protection of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). The Act also governs the management of public rights of way and the amendment of the Definitive Map and Statement in West Sussex. Recent amendments, introduced through Section 111 of the Environment Act 2021 and in force since September 2022, have expanded the licensing regime under Section 16 of the Act. Licences for activities affecting protected species can now be issued for reasons of overriding public interest, provided there is no satisfactory alternative and the action will not be detrimental to the survival of the species concerned. The maximum validity period for such licences has also been extended to five years, providing greater flexibility for long-term projects. These changes facilitate development activities while maintaining robust protection for wildlife, and all relevant works at Little Millfields will be undertaken in accordance with the latest requirements of the Act and associated guidance.

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) transpose the EU Habitats and Birds Directives into UK law, ensuring the continued protection of European Protected Species (EPS) and the designation and management of Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs) following Brexit. The Regulations set out the process for Appropriate Assessment of plans or projects that may affect these sites, and remain a key mechanism for the conservation of habitats and species of European importance across the UK. The Regulations have been updated to reflect changes in domestic policy, but the core requirements for protecting designated sites and species remain unchanged. All relevant ecological assessments and any required mitigation or licensing at Little Millfields will be undertaken in accordance with these Regulations and the latest Natural England guidance.

Statutory Biodiversity Net Gain – 0.2 ha Exemption

Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) applies to most planning permissions in England under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. From 6 August 2026, however, planning applications for development on sites of 0.2 hectares or below are exempt from the statutory biodiversity gain condition, provided the development does not negatively affect on-site priority habitat. The current red line boundary is approximately 0.136 ha and no priority habitat occurs within it. On that basis, the current proposal falls within the 0.2 ha exemption and a statutory biodiversity metric, Biodiversity Gain Plan and 30-year BNG Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan are not required for this application.

The 0.2 ha exemption applies to planning applications made on or after 6 August 2026; applications already made before that date remain subject to the BNG regime applying when they were submitted. This report therefore relies on the current application being made or re-made on or after 6 August 2026. Exemption from mandatory BNG does not remove the need to avoid and

mitigate ecological harm or to incorporate proportionate biodiversity enhancements through the planning process.

Methodology

Desk Study

A desk study was undertaken, June 2025, to provide a comprehensive overview of the ecological context of the site and its surroundings, and to inform the scope of the field survey and assessment. The desk study aimed to identify:

- Statutory and non-statutory designated sites within the zone of influence,
- Records of protected and notable species,
- Priority habitats and ecological networks relevant to the site.

Data Sources and Search Areas

Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre (SxBRC)

Ecological data were obtained from SxBRC, the principal environmental record centre for East and West Sussex, including the Horsham district and Warnham parish. SxBRC collates data from local recorders, ecological consultants, and the public, ensuring a comprehensive and up-to-date biodiversity dataset.

The data request included:

- Protected and notable species records within a 1km radius of the site boundary
- Bat records within a 1km radius
- Bird records within a 1km radius
- Invasive species records within a 1km radius
- Statutory designated sites within a 2km radius
- Non-statutory designated sites and Section 41 (Priority Habitats) or other notable habitats, within a 1km radius of the site.

Desk study data on protected and notable species will be limited to records from the last ten years to ensure relevance and accuracy for the current assessment. Other data sources included:

- **MAGIC Map (Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside)** National datasets on statutory sites, habitats, and environmental constraints were reviewed to supplement local records and provide context on landscape-scale ecological features.
- **Aerial Imagery & Ordnance Survey Mapping** Recent aerial photography and OS mapping were used to assess current land use, habitat connectivity, and the wider landscape context.
- **Planning Portal and Local Authority Records** Relevant planning history and previous ecological assessments for the site and adjacent land were reviewed where available.
- **Horsham Green Infrastructure Strategy (2024):** The site was checked against the Horsham District Green Infrastructure Strategy and associated mapping to identify whether any part of the land falls within areas of high or medium strategic significance, such as Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, river corridors, or designated green infrastructure networks.

- **Local Significance and Policy Documents:** Additional reference was made to the Wilder Horsham District Nature Recovery Network (NRN) mapping and any relevant local plans or supplementary planning documents to ensure the assessment aligns with local ecological priorities and planning requirements

The desk study ensured the appraisal was informed by the most current and comprehensive biodiversity data available, supporting robust assessment of ecological constraints and opportunities in line with CIEEM (2017) and best practice.

Field Survey

The original ecological walkover survey was undertaken on 5 June 2025 and the site was revisited on 16 June 2025 to complete the Preliminary Roost Assessment of the structures. A further validation walkover was completed on 4 August 2026 to confirm whether the habitat baseline and key protected-species constraints remained representative of the site and to review the current application boundary and design. The surveys were undertaken by suitably qualified ecologists in accordance with CIEEM (2017) guidance.

Habitats were classified using UK Habitat Classification (UKHab v2.01). The 4 August 2026 validation survey confirmed that the habitat types and condition remained materially unchanged from the June 2025 baseline.

Survey methodology included:

- Systematic mapping of all habitat types and features using GPS-enabled devices and Coreo (2025) in the field app.
- Assessment of habitat condition, structure, and species composition for each habitat parcel.
- Quadrat's were used in each habitat parcel and a DAFOR scale¹ was applied to determine the presence of each species within the quadrat..
- Identification and recording of features with potential to support protected and priority species (e.g., mature trees, hedgerows, ponds, buildings, log piles).
- Direct observation and habitat suitability assessment for protected and notable species, considering both field evidence and desk study records.
- Use of photographic records and detailed target notes to document key habitats, features, and any signs of species presence (e.g., tracks, droppings, nests).
- Assessment of habitat connectivity and potential ecological corridors within and adjacent to the site.

Where access was restricted or visibility limited, this was noted, and the potential implications for survey completeness were assessed.

Validation Survey – 4 August 2026

The current red line boundary and Boher Architecture Drawings 1532 P 000–009 were reviewed during the update. No material change was identified in the type or condition of the habitats

¹ The DAFOR scale (Dominant, Abundant, Frequent, Occasional, Rare) provides a semi-quantitative estimate of vegetation presence and distribution.

previously recorded: modified grassland remains the dominant vegetated habitat, with existing buildings/hardstanding and individual trees also present. No priority habitat occurs within the application boundary. The mapped pond to the north of the site was also reviewed and is assessed as unsuitable for GCN breeding because it does not provide sufficiently reliable aquatic habitat through the breeding season. The June 2025 habitat baseline and the ecological conclusions have therefore been validated for the current proposal.

Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment

The daytime bat walkover incorporating PRA was completed on 16 June 2025 and comprised a detailed inspection of the proposed development area through direct internal and external access affording close examination of potential bat entry/exit points, potential roosting sites and evidence of occupation (droppings, dead bats etc.). General resources for bats such as commuting and foraging habitat and wider habitat connectivity were also reviewed.

The PRA was completed in line with current best practice by a professionally competent ecologist with extensive experience in bat survey methodology, having conducted PRA assessments for over 14 years in accordance with established professional standards.

Quality Assurance

All survey work and data analysis were subject to internal quality assurance procedures, including review by a senior ecologist. The methodology was designed to meet or exceed the requirements of CIEEM, DEFRA, Natural England, and Horsham District Council.

Limitations

The PEA provides a proportionate assessment of ecological constraints based on desk study information, the June 2025 field surveys and the 4 August 2026 validation walkover. Ecological conditions can change over time; the conclusions should therefore be reviewed if there is a material change to the site, the development footprint or the condition of buildings and vegetation before works commence. The validation survey was specifically undertaken to address the age of the original habitat data and confirmed that no material habitat change had occurred.

Data validity

The habitat baseline was revalidated on 4 August 2026 and is considered current for the present planning application. If development has not commenced by August 2028, or if material habitat or building changes occur before then, an ecological review should be undertaken to confirm whether further update survey is required. The PRA is based on the detailed structure inspection undertaken on 16 June 2025 and should also be reviewed if the buildings materially deteriorate or works are substantially delayed.

Results

Desk Study Results

Designated Sites

Statutory Designations

No statutory designated sites (SSSI, SAC, SPA, NNR, LNR, Ramsar) are present within 2km of Little Millfields according to the Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre (SxBRC) and MAGIC Map data.

Non-Statutory Designations

No non-statutory designated sites, such as Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) or Local Geological Sites (LGS), are present within 1km of the site according to SxBRC and local datasets. The site does not intersect with any Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, river corridors, or mapped ecological corridors of high or medium strategic significance, as confirmed by the Horsham Green Infrastructure Strategy (2024) and Wilder Horsham District Nature Recovery Network mapping.

Priority Habitats and Species Records

The desk study findings are summarised in Table 1. Priority habitats, including deciduous woodland and ancient woodland, occur within the wider 1 km search area but not within the current application boundary. Records for a range of protected and notable species occur in the wider landscape; however, no GCN records were identified within 1 km of the site. No invasive non-native species were recorded within the application boundary, although several are known from the wider area.

Table 1 Summary of Priority Habitats, Protected Species, and Other Notable Section 41 Species Recorded Within or Adjacent to the Site and Within a 1km Radius

Category	Feature/Species	Details / Records
Priority Habitats	Deciduous woodland	Recorded within the wider 1 km search area; none occurs within the current application boundary.
	Ancient woodland	Recorded within the wider 1 km search area; none occurs within the current application boundary.
Protected Species	Birds – Schedule 1 of wildlife and countryside Act 1981 as amended.	Barn owl (<i>Tyto alba</i>), red kite (<i>Milvus milvus</i>), kingfisher (<i>Alcedo atthis</i>), little owl (<i>Athene noctua</i>), tawny owl (<i>Strix aluco</i>), sparrowhawk (<i>Accipiter nisus</i>), and hobby (<i>Falco subbuteo</i>).
	Bats (various species)	Brown Long-eared Bat, Soprano Pipistrelle, Pipistrelle sp., Myotis sp.; roosts and records within 1km
	Bluebell	Hyacinthoides non-scripta; WCA Schedule 8; multiple records within 1km
Other Notable Species	Higher Plants (Notable/Red List/Section 41)	Rye brome (<i>Bromus secalinus</i>), crosswort (<i>Cruciata laevipes</i>), wild strawberry (<i>Fragaria vesca</i>), bitter-vetch (<i>Lathyrus linifolius</i>), corn mint (<i>Mentha arvensis</i>), wood-sorrel (<i>Oxalis acetosella</i>), lesser spearwort (<i>Ranunculus flammula</i>), sanicle (<i>Sanicula europaea</i>), ragged-robin (<i>Silene flos-cuculi</i>), devil's-bit scabious (<i>Succisa</i>

Category	Feature/Species	Details / Records
		pratensis), common valerian (<i>Valeriana officinalis</i>), and heath speedwell (<i>Veronica officinalis</i>).
	Notable Lepidoptera (Butterflies & Moths)	The following notable invertebrate species have been recorded: purple emperor (<i>Apatura iris</i>), white admiral (<i>Limenitis camilla</i>), grizzled skipper (<i>Pyrgus malvae</i>), brown hairstreak (<i>Thecla betulae</i>), and black-spot case-bearer (<i>Coleophora hemerobiella</i>). All are butterflies except for the black-spot case-bearer, which is a moth, and each holds Section 41, Red List, Sussex Rare, UK BAP Priority, or WCA Schedule 5 conservation designations.
	Common Toad	Section 41 Priority species; amphibian
	Hedgehog	Section 41 Priority species; mammal
Invasive Non-Native	Various	The following notable invasive or non-native species have been recorded: Japanese knotweed (<i>Fallopia japonica</i>), Himalayan balsam (<i>Impatiens glandulifera</i>), giant hogweed (<i>Heracleum mantegazzianum</i>), montbretia (<i>Crocsmia × crocosmiiflora</i>), cherry laurel (<i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>), rhododendron (<i>Rhododendron ponticum</i>), New Zealand pigmyweed (<i>Crassula helmsii</i>), Canada goose (<i>Branta canadensis</i>), mandarin duck (<i>Aix galericulata</i>), and Egyptian goose (<i>Alopochen aegyptiaca</i>).

Field Survey Results

Habitats

Three principal habitat types were recorded across the ecological survey area: developed land/sealed surface (including the existing outbuildings and hardstanding), modified grassland and individual trees. Their distribution is shown on the indicative UKHab map in Appendix 1. The 4 August 2026 validation walkover confirmed that these habitat types and their condition remain materially unchanged. Table 2 summarises the habitats, condition and key species information recorded during the original survey.

Table 2 Summary of habitats recorded during the June 2025 survey and validated on 4 August 2026.

Habitat Type (UKHab Code)	Area (ha)	Condition	Habitat Photo	Description/ Justification	Plant Species (combined list of quadrats)
Developed Land Sealed Surface (u1b5/6) – including buildings	0.068	N/A		The site contains five separate wooden buildings, each with distinct construction details and materials. Buildings 1 and 2 are both wood-clad structures with roofs made of asbestos or concrete corrugated sheets. Access to Building 1 for birds and bats, is partially blocked by paper, while Building 2 is similar in design and materials to Building 1. Building 3 is also wood-clad but incorporates plastic sheeting in its construction. Like the first two, it has a roof of asbestos or concrete corrugated sheets. Building 4 serves as a shed and is clad in wood, featuring a tin roof and a lower section lined with paper. The fifth building is again wood-clad and is notable for its mostly concrete roof. Together, these buildings form a cluster, as depicted in the site layout. Their construction reflects a mix of traditional and improvised materials, with variations in roof type and additional features such as paper linings and plastic sheeting. The combination of these elements gives the buildings a utilitarian character, suited to their likely former agricultural or storage uses. More information is provided in Appendix 2.	N/A

Habitat Type (UKHab Code)	Area (ha)	Condition	Habitat Photo	Description/ Justification	Plant Species (combined list of quadrats)
Modified Grassland (g4) Secondary code: Scattered scrub (10)	0.287	Moderate		The grassland habitat depicted is a modified grassland with a sward dominated by yorkshire fog, accompanied by abundant rough meadow grass and perennial ryegrass. The vegetation structure is varied, with areas of taller, tussocky grasses interspersed with lower, more open patches. Crested dog's-tail and red fescue are frequent throughout, contributing to the diversity of the grass layer. The forb component is present but less prominent, with frequent white clover scattered across the sward, occasional creeping buttercup and lesser stitchwort, and rare occurrences of bugle, bulbous buttercup, vetch species, and ground elder. Yarrow is also present, adding further botanical interest. The habitat is bordered by mature trees and hedgerows, providing some enclosure and shelter, while individual trees and occasional shrubs are scattered within the grassland. The overall appearance is that of a semi-improved or modified grassland, reflecting past management or disturbance but retaining a moderate diversity of grasses and forbs. The structure and species composition suggest a grassland that is not intensively managed, allowing for a mix of species typical of lowland neutral grassland with elements of improvement. The recent lack of management to the grassland areas has limited the forb diversity, with competing grass species dominating. Species composition and structure align with modified grassland habitat.	Species present across the entire grassland: Yorkshire fog (<i>Holcus lanatus</i>) – Dominant Rough meadow grass (<i>Poa trivialis</i>) – Abundant Perennial ryegrass (<i>Lolium perenne</i>) – Abundant Crested dog's-tail (<i>Cynosurus cristatus</i>) – Frequent Red fescue (<i>Festuca rubra</i>) – Frequent White clover (<i>Trifolium repens</i>) – Frequent Creeping buttercup (<i>Ranunculus repens</i>) – Occasional Lesser stitchwort (<i>Stellaria graminea</i>) – Occasional Yarrow (<i>Achillea millefolium</i>) – Present Vetch species (<i>Vicia</i> spp.) – Present Bugle (<i>Ajuga reptans</i>) – Rare Bulbous buttercup (<i>Ranunculus bulbosus</i>) – Rare Ground elder (<i>Aegopodium podagraria</i>) – Rare

Habitat Type (UKHab Code)	Area (ha)	Condition	Habitat Photo	Description/ Justification	Plant Species (combined list of quadrats)
Rural Trees	0.0651	Moderate		Within the red line boundary, there are three individual trees, each representing a different species and contributing to the ecological and landscape value of the site. All three trees are of medium age and moderate condition. The first tree is a crab apple (<i>Malus sylvestris</i>), positioned in open grassland. It displays a broad, rounded crown with dense foliage, typical of the species, and provides seasonal interest with blossom and fruit. Adjacent to this, a cherry species (<i>Prunus</i> sp.) stands with a similarly rounded form and moderate canopy density, offering both spring flowers and summer shade. A willow-leaf pear (<i>Pyrus salicifolia</i>) is also present, easily distinguished by its slender, silvery leaves and gracefully arching branches. This tree adds structural diversity and a distinctive texture to the area. Collectively, these trees are well-established and in moderate condition, with no major structural defects observed. They enhance the site's character, offering a mix of native and ornamental species, and contribute to both biodiversity and visual appeal within the enclosed area.	

Protected and Priority Species

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Bats

Desk-based data indicate that five bat species have been recorded within 1km of the site, with records spanning from 1987 to 2009. No bat records exist from the past ten years, with the most recent records date to 2009, making them 16 years old. The species recorded include brown long-eared bat (most significant presence with 30 individuals recorded at Fern Cottage in 2009), Pipistrellus species, Soprano Pipistrelle and Myotis species. No records of serotine bats were found in the biological data search.

A preliminary roost assessment was conducted on the structures within the site. The buildings demonstrate negligible to low suitability for roosting bats due to weathered timber cladding with multiple access gaps, stable construction, and favourable surrounding habitat. However, comprehensive internal and external physical inspection revealed no evidence of current or historic bat use, including no droppings, staining, feeding remains, or other occupation signs. Given the moderate structural suitability despite absence of current occupation evidence, precautionary working methods are recommended for any development work.

The site boundaries, including scrub and hedgerows, provide potential foraging and commuting habitat for bats.

Trees within the proposed development area offer negligible suitability for bat roosting, comprising primarily ornamental garden species that lack the maturity and features necessary for bat roost sites.

Further details on the site PRA are provided in Appendix 2.

Trees along the access road and outside of the site bounds are likely to be suitable for roosting bats and are to be avoided throughout the proposed development.

Birds

Desk-based records from the past ten years (2015–2025) confirm a diverse assemblage of notable bird species in the local area, including several species of conservation concern. Notable raptors such as sparrowhawk, buzzard, red kite, and kestrel have all been recorded, alongside regular

records of barn owl, with confirmed breeding at multiple sites nearby. Waterfowl including mandarin duck, Egyptian goose, mallard, and pochard are present, and waders such as lapwing and woodcock have been recorded within 1km. The data search also confirms the presence of a wide range of woodland and farmland passerines, including skylark, meadow pipit, house sparrow, linnet, yellowhammer, robin, blue tit, great tit, and marsh tit, many of which are listed as Red or Amber under the UK Birds of Conservation Concern or as Section 41 NERC priority species.

On site, the mosaic of modified grassland, trees, and outbuildings provides suitable nesting and foraging habitats for a range of bird species. During the field survey, a small bird box suitable for tit species (e.g., blue tit, great tit) was observed mounted under the eaves on the north side of Structure 1. The box is of a standard design with a round entrance hole, appropriate for small cavity-nesting birds. No active nests were recorded in buildings or trees during the survey period, but the structural diversity and quality of habitats present indicate the site's potential value for breeding, foraging, and sheltering birds throughout the year.

Dormice

A review of desk-based records from the SxBRC indicates that there are no recent records of hazel dormouse (*Muscardinus avellanarius*) within 1km of the site from the past ten years. The wider area is not known as a stronghold for the species, and there are no statutory or non-statutory designated sites for dormouse conservation within the search radius.

On-site habitat assessment found that the site consists primarily of modified grassland, scattered trees, and a cluster of wooden outbuildings. The woody habitat present is fragmented and limited in extent, with no continuous, well-developed native hedgerows, species-rich scrub, or extensive broadleaved woodland, features typically associated with suitable dormouse habitat. The three individual trees on site (crab apple, cherry, and willow-leaf pear) and the scattered scrub do not provide the dense, interconnected canopy or understorey structure required for dormouse movement, nesting, or foraging.

No field signs of dormouse (such as characteristically nibbled hazel nuts, nests, or droppings) were recorded during the survey. No dormouse tubes or nest boxes were present on site, and the bird box observed on Structure 1 is of a type suitable for small cavity-nesting birds (such as tits), not for dormice.

Great crested newt (GCN)

A review of desk-based records from the Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre (SxBRC) confirms that there are no records of great crested newt (*Triturus cristatus*) within 1km of the site from the past ten years, and no historical records in the wider area. The data search did not identify any amphibian records of conservation concern for the site or its immediate surroundings.

The site is dominated by modified grassland, hardstanding, scattered trees and wooden outbuildings and contains no aquatic habitat suitable for GCN breeding. A mapped pond lies to the north of the application site. This pond was dry during the original survey period and, following review during the 4 August 2026 validation survey, is assessed as unsuitable for GCN breeding because it does not provide sufficiently reliable aquatic habitat through the breeding season.

Accordingly, the pond should not be treated as a potential GCN breeding pond for the purposes of this development assessment.

Terrestrial habitat within the application site is also of limited suitability for GCN. In combination with the absence of suitable breeding habitat and the absence of GCN records within 1 km, the

likelihood of GCN occurring within the site is considered negligible to very low. No further GCN survey, licensing or specific mitigation is required.

Invertebrates

A review of desk-based records from the SxBRC confirms the presence of several notable invertebrate species within 1km of the site, including species of conservation concern.

Despite these records in the wider landscape, no notable invertebrate species or evidence of significant invertebrate activity was observed on site during the field survey. The site's habitats, provide some foraging and sheltering opportunities for common invertebrates, but lack the structural diversity, host plants, or extensive nectar sources required for specialist or priority species. No deadwood, standing water, or species-rich swards were present to support a high diversity of invertebrates.

Reptiles

There are no desk-based records of reptiles within 1 km of the site from the past ten years, and no historical records of protected or notable reptile species were identified in the immediate area. On-site habitats are dominated by modified grassland, hardstanding and clusters of wooden outbuildings, with areas of overgrown garden vegetation, bramble and scrub. Rubble piles and other accumulated materials also provide potential refuging and basking opportunities. Collectively, these features provide suitable, although relatively limited, habitat for widespread reptile species such as slow-worm and common lizard.

No reptiles were observed incidentally during the site visits. The areas of suitable habitat are relatively small and occur within a site subject to regular residential and land-management disturbance. The site is therefore considered unlikely to support a significant reptile population, although occasional individuals could be present within areas of longer vegetation, scrub or beneath rubble and other potential refugia.

Given the small scale of the proposed development, absence of recent local records and limited extent of suitable habitat, targeted reptile surveys are not considered proportionate or necessary. However, precautionary clearance measures should be adopted, including progressive cutting of longer vegetation and careful removal of rubble and other potential refugia.

Invasive Non-native species

The SxBRC data search identified 14 invasive non-native species (INNS) records within 1km of the site.

No invasive non-native plant species were recorded on site during the field survey, and no evidence of INNS was observed in any habitat parcel. Routine vigilance for INNS is recommended as part of ongoing site management, particularly if ground disturbance or habitat creation is planned.

Other Notable species

The only protected terrestrial mammal recorded within 1km is the hedgehog (NERC S41, UK BAP Priority, Red List Vulnerable), with a single record from 2005. No hedgehogs or field signs (such as tracks or droppings) were observed during the site visit, and the current site structure offers only limited foraging or nesting opportunities for this species.

No records of other notable terrestrial mammals, amphibians, or other protected fauna were returned from the data search, and no evidence of their presence was found during the survey.

Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment

The results of the PRA are provided in Appendix 2.

Ecological Constraints and Opportunities

Constraints

Bats

The site's five timber outbuildings were assessed as having negligible to low (occasionally moderate) suitability for roosting bats. No evidence of current or historic bat use (droppings, staining, feeding remains, or scratch marks) was recorded during comprehensive internal and external inspections. Desk-based records confirm five bat species within 1km, but all records are over 15 years old, with the most recent being a brown long-eared bat roost in 2009. The current use and structure of the buildings, as well as regular disturbance, further limit suitability. Trees on site are ornamental and lack features suitable for roosting bats. However, the site boundaries, including scrub and hedgerows, provide some foraging and commuting potential. Precautionary working methods are recommended for any works affecting buildings or trees.

Birds

The site supports a mosaic of modified grassland, scattered trees, and outbuildings, providing suitable nesting and foraging habitat for a range of bird species. Desk-based records confirm a diverse assemblage of notable species in the local area, including raptors, waterfowl, waders, and woodland/farmland passerines, many of which are of conservation concern. A bird box suitable for tit species is present on Structure 1. No active nests were recorded during the survey, but the site's habitat diversity indicates potential for breeding and foraging throughout the year. Vegetation clearance and building works during the nesting season (March–August) risk disturbing breeding birds and should be scheduled outside this period or preceded by a nesting bird check.

Reptiles

No desk-study records of reptiles were identified within 1 km of the site during the preceding ten years, and no reptiles were observed incidentally during either site visit. However, the site contains areas of suitable habitat for widespread reptile species, including overgrown garden vegetation, rough/long grassland, bramble and scrub, together with rubble and other accumulated materials that provide potential basking, shelter and refuge opportunities. These features could support low numbers of species such as slow-worm, grass snake or common lizard.

The extent of suitable habitat is relatively limited and occurs within a small residential/garden setting subject to historic and ongoing disturbance. Taking account of the limited habitat resource, the absence of recent local records and the nature and scale of the proposed development, the site is considered unlikely to support a reptile population of more than local importance. Targeted reptile presence/absence surveys are therefore not considered proportionate or necessary to inform the planning application.

Nevertheless, reptiles could occur within suitable vegetation or beneath rubble and other potential refugia. A precautionary approach should therefore be adopted during site clearance. Long vegetation should be reduced progressively and rubble, stored materials and other potential refugia should be dismantled or removed carefully, preferably by hand where practicable. If a reptile is encountered, works in the immediate area should stop temporarily and the animal should be allowed to move into retained suitable habitat of its own accord. These measures should be incorporated into the ecological working method for the development.

Great crested newt

There are no records of great crested newt within 1 km of the site. The mapped pond to the north was dry during the original survey period and, following the 4 August 2026 validation appraisal, is assessed as unsuitable for GCN breeding because it does not provide sufficiently reliable aquatic habitat through the breeding season. Terrestrial habitat within the application site is of limited suitability. GCN are therefore highly unlikely to occur and no further GCN survey, licensing or specific mitigation is required.

Dormouse

There are no recent or historical records of hazel dormouse within 1km. On-site woody habitat is fragmented and limited, lacking the dense, interconnected canopy or understorey required by dormice. No field signs were observed, and the site is considered highly unlikely to support dormouse. No further survey or mitigation is required. Habitats outside of the redline boundary are more likely to support dormice and should be avoided throughout construction.

Invertebrates

Desk-based records confirm several notable invertebrate species within 1km, including brown hairstreak, white admiral, purple emperor, and grizzled skipper. However, no notable invertebrate species or significant invertebrate activity was observed on site. The site's habitats provide only basic resources for common invertebrates, lacking the structural diversity, host plants, or nectar sources required for specialist species. No further survey is required, but habitat enhancement could increase invertebrate value.

Invasive Non-Native Species

Fourteen INNS have been recorded locally, including Japanese knotweed, giant hogweed, Himalayan balsam, and others. No invasive non-native species were recorded on site during the survey, but ongoing vigilance is recommended, especially if ground disturbance is planned.

Designated Habitats and Priority Habitats and Species

There are no statutory or non-statutory designated sites within the site boundary. Priority habitats in the wider landscape include traditional orchards, deciduous woodland, and ancient woodland. The site itself does not contain priority habitats but is adjacent to features of local ecological significance.

Opportunities

The proposed development provides proportionate opportunities to enhance the site for wildlife. Where the 0.2 ha statutory exemption applies, these enhancements can be incorporated through the design and landscaping without a statutory biodiversity metric or 30-year BNG management obligation.

Deliver proportionate biodiversity enhancements consistent with the rural setting.

Enhancement of site boundaries is a key opportunity. Planting new native hedgerows using species such as blackthorn (*Prunus spinosa*) and hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*) will support local invertebrate communities and provide increased foraging and commuting opportunities for birds and bats. These hedgerows will also improve habitat connectivity, reinforce green corridors, and contribute to the structural diversity of the site.

Enhance boundaries with native hedgerow species (e.g., blackthorn, hawthorn) to support invertebrates, birds, and bats.

Repurposing on-site rubble and natural debris around the site boundaries can add further complexity to the habitat structure. These features will create valuable refuges for reptiles and small mammals, increase microhabitat diversity, and provide basking and sheltering sites that are often limited in more managed landscapes.

Use rubble and debris to create habitat piles and refugia for reptiles and small mammals.

Integrating wildlife features into the new building design is another important measure. Installing bird and bat boxes on new buildings and retained mature trees will provide durable and discreet nesting and roosting opportunities, supporting local populations and linking built and natural habitats.

Incorporate bird and bat boxes into new buildings and trees to enhance breeding and roosting opportunities.

Where practical, retained grassland margins should be managed less intensively and can be overseeded with an appropriate native wildflower mix to improve floristic diversity and provide additional foraging resources for invertebrates and birds.

Enhance retained grassland margins where practicable using a native wildflower mix and reduced mowing.

Collectively, the proposed native hedgerow, integrated bat access, additional bird/bat boxes, habitat piles and less intensive grassland management would strengthen local habitat connectivity and provide a clear ecological enhancement to the scheme.

Retain and maintain the ecological enhancements as part of the completed landscape and building design.

Mitigation Hierarchy

Avoidance

- Trees: All trees within the site boundary have been retained wherever possible, preserving essential roosting and nesting sites for birds and bats, as well as valuable foraging habitat for invertebrates and small mammals.

Minimisation

- Sensitive Lighting Design: Use low-intensity, directional external lighting and avoid light spill onto retained boundary vegetation and the new native hedgerow, to minimise disturbance to commuting and foraging bats.
- Timing of Works: Vegetation clearance should be scheduled outside the main bird nesting season (March–August inclusive) where possible. If clearance during this period is unavoidable, a pre-works nesting bird check should be completed by a suitably competent ecologist. Structural works should follow the precautionary bat working methods set out in Appendix 2.
- Precautionary Methods: Use precautionary methods for vegetation and rubble removal to protect reptiles and amphibians. This includes hand-searching and careful dismantling of potential refugia to avoid harming these species.

Compensation and enhancement: Replace vegetation lost to the development with the native hedgerow and other landscaping shown on the current drawings, and incorporate the proposed integrated bat access features.

Enhancement: Provide proportionate habitat and species enhancements through native planting, less intensive management of retained grassland margins and integrated bat/bird features.

Conclusion

The June 2025 PEA baseline was revalidated on 4 August 2026 and the habitats were confirmed to remain materially unchanged. The current proposals for a single replacement dwelling affect predominantly modified grassland and existing developed land, with no priority habitat within the application boundary. The mapped pond to the north is unsuitable for GCN breeding and no further GCN survey is required. Subject to the precautionary measures for bats and nesting birds and retention of the proposed native hedgerow and integrated bat access features, no significant ecological effects are anticipated. The current red line is approximately 0.136 ha. Where the planning application is made or re-made on or after 6 August 2026, the proposal falls within the statutory exemption for development sites of 0.2 ha or less, provided no on-site priority habitat is negatively affected.

Pre-commencement Measures and Further Survey Triggers

The 4 August 2026 validation walkover confirmed that no additional species-specific survey is required to determine the current application. The following proportionate pre-commencement measures are recommended to maintain legal compliance during works:

Pre-commencement Ecological Checks:

Immediately prior to any site clearance or construction, a pre-commencement check by a suitably qualified ecologist should be undertaken. This must include updated inspection of all buildings and trees to be affected for evidence of bats, nesting birds, [REDACTED] reptiles, and any other protected or notable species that may have colonised the site since the original survey.

Nesting Bird Checks:

If vegetation clearance, building demolition, or works to structures are scheduled during the bird nesting season (March–August), a nesting bird check must be completed within 48 hours of works commencing. If active nests are found, an appropriate buffer must be maintained until the young have fledged.

Toolbox Talk and Site Induction:

All contractors and site operatives should receive a toolbox talk from an ecologist prior to commencement, covering recognition and legal protection of bats, nesting birds, reptiles, and other relevant species, as well as the procedures to follow if any are encountered during works.

Precautionary Working Methods (from PRA Appendix 2):

- Any works involving the removal of cladding or roof structures should proceed with care, using hand tools where feasible to minimise disturbance.
- A soft-strip approach should be used, especially around identified access gaps.
- Progressive working from one end of the building should be adopted to allow potential escape routes.
- Should bats be found during works, activity must cease immediately and advice sought from a licensed bat ecologist.

Monitoring and Adaptive Management:

Ecological advice should remain available during construction if unexpected protected species or ecological constraints are encountered. Where the 0.2 ha exemption applies, no statutory biodiversity metric, Biodiversity Gain Plan or 30-year BNG Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan is required.

Trigger for Additional Survey:

If evidence of protected species not identified by the assessment is discovered during works, activity in the affected area must cease and advice should be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist. The mapped pond is unsuitable for GCN and no GCN-specific pre-construction survey is required.

These measures, together with the PRA recommendations in Appendix 2, are considered sufficient to address the ecological risks associated with the current development proposal.

References

- British Trust for Ornithology (BTO). (2021). Birds of Conservation Concern 5.
- Collins J (ed) (2023) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edition). The Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- CIEEM. (2025). Health & Safety Guidance for Field Surveys.
- CIEEM (2019). Advice Note. On the lifespan of ecological reports and surveys.
- Coreo (2025). Coreo ecological data collection app [Mobile application software]. Natural Apptitude Ltd. Available from: <https://coreo.io/>
- Froglife. (2021). Reptile Survey Guidelines.
- GOV.UK. (2025). Protected species and development: advice for local planning authorities.
- JNCC. (2024). UK BAP Priority Species and Habitats List.
- Natural England. (2025). Dormouse Conservation Handbook (latest edition).
- Natural England. (2025). Species Survey and Mitigation Guidelines.
- CIEEM. (2017). Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (2nd Edition). Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- CIEEM. (2018, updated 2024). Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine, Version 1.3. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- GOV.UK. (2026). Biodiversity net gain: exempt developments. Updated 6 August 2026; accessed 11 August 2026.
- UK Habitat Classification Working Group. (2024). UKHab Technical Handbook.

Appendix 1 – Habitat Map – UKHab (Validated 4 August 2026)



Appendix 2 - Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment

Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) – Agricultural Outbuildings

A Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was carried out on 16 June 2025 for five agricultural outbuildings located at the entrance to the site. These structures consist of two larger buildings (Buildings 1 and 2) and a cluster of three smaller sheds (Buildings 3, 4, and 5). All buildings are currently used for storage, with Building 1 and sections of Building 2 experiencing more frequent human activity. Building 1, situated to the north of the group, is used for storage of building materials and as a temporary office shelter for site workers, and lighting remains in regular use within this structure. Building 2, located on the western side of the site, is also partitioned and accessed regularly for storage. The three smaller sheds, positioned near the site entrance, are used for general storage and are less frequently accessed. The buildings are all set on hardstanding, with parking areas surrounding them, further contributing to regular disturbance and reducing the likelihood of undetected bat activity.

Survey Methodology

The assessment was conducted in accordance with the Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) Bat Surveys: Good Practice Guidelines (4th Edition) for Preliminary Roost Assessments. The methodology combined a photographic review of both external and internal features with detailed physical inspections of all accessible areas.

External inspections focused on identifying potential access points, such as gaps at roof edges, between cladding boards, and around doors and windows. Internally, all roof spaces, wall cavities, and structural junctions were visually inspected without the need for torches, as the single-skin roof construction and open layouts ensured full visibility.

Special attention was paid to the presence of bat droppings, staining, feeding remains, scratch marks, and other signs of occupation. The surrounding habitat was also assessed for its suitability to support foraging and commuting bats, with particular consideration given to the presence of hedgerows and scrub at the site boundaries.

The PRA was completed in line with current best practice by a professionally competent ecologist with extensive experience in bat survey methodology, having conducted PRA assessments for over 14 years in accordance with established professional standards.

Building Assessment for Bat Roosting Potential

Construction and Use

Buildings 1 and 2 are both substantial, single-storey timber-clad structures, each measuring approximately 15 metres in length by 5 metres in depth, with a ceiling height of 2 metres. Building 1 is divided into four separate partitions, each with its own access door, while Building 2 is split into two sections. Both buildings are actively used, with Building 1 subject to regular lighting and human presence due to its function as a temporary office and storage area. Buildings 3, 4, and 5 are smaller (approximately 5 by 3 metres each), with Buildings 3 and 4 constructed as wood sheds with plastic inner linings, and Building 4 featuring a tin roof. Building 5 is wooden-clad with an asbestos/concrete corrugated roof. All buildings are located on hardstanding, surrounded by parking and vehicle movements, which further reduces their attractiveness to bats due to disturbance and lack of vegetative cover.

Further structure descriptions are shown in the Photos section below.

Roosting Feature Assessment

All five outbuildings were found to have limited potential roosting features. The single-skin roofs and absence of internal cavities meant that all internal spaces were fully visible during inspection. Potential crevice features at rooflines, cladding, and internal junctions were examined closely and photographed.

The plastic inner shells in Buildings 3 and 4, as well as the tin and asbestos/concrete roofs in Buildings 4 and 5, further reduced the suitability of these structures for bats by eliminating potential roosting niches and maintaining fluctuating internal temperatures. No hidden voids or inaccessible spaces were identified in any of the buildings.

Evidence of Bat Presence

Despite a thorough and systematic inspection of all five buildings, no evidence of bat presence was recorded. There were no bat droppings, staining, scratch marks, feeding remains, or other occupation signs observed internally or externally in any structure. The presence of undisturbed cobwebs and accumulated dust throughout the interiors, particularly in crevices and at potential access points, indicated a lack of recent activity by bats or other wildlife.

No audible signs of bats, such as chittering, were detected during the inspections, and no dead bats or remains were found around the building perimeters. The absence of any such evidence, even in less disturbed areas, strongly suggests that none of the buildings currently support bat roosts or have done so in the recent past.

External Inspection Findings

- No bat droppings observed around potential access points or beneath roosting areas
- No staining visible on timber cladding around gaps or entry points
- No scratch marks detected on wooden surfaces around potential roost sites
- No dead bats or bat remains found around the building perimeter

Internal Inspection Findings

- No accumulations of droppings found in internal spaces, beam junctions, or wall cavities
- No staining observed on internal timber surfaces
- No feeding remains (moth wings, insect fragments) detected
- No strong ammonia odour associated with bat roosts
- No audible evidence of bat presence during daylight inspection

Environmental context

The buildings are positioned in a relatively open and disturbed part of the site, with hardstanding and parking areas dominating the immediate surroundings. Some regular human activity, infrequent lighting, and occasional vehicle movements are likely to reduce the suitability of the structures for bat roosting. However, the site boundaries, which include areas of scrub and hedgerow, may still provide some potential foraging and commuting habitat for bats, particularly for common species such as pipistrelles. The central areas of hardstanding and the buildings themselves are considered less suitable for these activities due to the lack of cover and a degree of disturbance.

Suitability assessment

Based on the construction, current use, and detailed inspection of all five buildings, they are assessed as having negligible to low/moderate suitability for roosting bats. The lack of or limited suitable internal features or cavities, combined with regular disturbance, lighting, and the absence of any evidence of bat occupation, significantly reduces the likelihood that bats would use these structures for roosting. While some potential access points exist, these are not associated with features that would typically support bat use, and all were found to be free from signs of occupation. The assessment reflects the current situation and acknowledges that, while the structures are technically accessible to bats, their suitability is limited under present conditions.

Recommendations

Given the negligible to low/moderate suitability of the buildings and the absence of evidence for bat use, full emergence or re-entry surveys are not considered proportionate or necessary at this time.

However, as a precaution, it is recommended that if any works are proposed that could alter the structures, such as demolition, significant refurbishment, or removal of cladding, a pre-commencement check by a suitably experienced ecologist should be undertaken.

Site operatives should be briefed on the legal protection afforded to bats and the procedures to follow if bats are unexpectedly discovered during works.

Any works involving the removal of cladding or roof structures should proceed with care, using hand tools where feasible to minimise disturbance. Should bats be found during works, activity must cease immediately and advice sought from a licensed bat ecologist.

The recommendations are summarised as follows:

Pre-commencement Measures

- Pre-commencement inspection by a suitably experienced ecologist before structural works where the building condition has materially changed or works are substantially delayed
- Toolbox talk for all site personnel regarding bat protection and procedures if bats are discovered
- Contact details for ecological advice to be available during structural works

During Construction

- Soft strip approach when removing or disturbing cladding, especially around identified access gaps
- Hand removal of loose cladding boards before machinery use
- Progressive working from one end of building to allow potential escape routes
- Immediate work cessation if any bats are discovered, with licensed surveyor consultation

Legal Compliance

All bat species and their roosts are legally protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. The precautionary measures outlined above are designed to ensure compliance with this legislation, even in the absence of

confirmed bat presence. Adhering to these protocols will help prevent accidental harm to bats or their roosts and avoid potential legal consequences for the project.

Enhancement Opportunities

Although the current buildings are of low/moderate suitability for bats, there are opportunities to enhance the site for local bat populations. The installation of bat boxes on retained structures or mature trees at the site boundaries could provide additional roosting opportunities. Maintaining dark corridors along hedgerows and limiting external lighting, especially near potential foraging habitats, would further benefit bats. These measures would contribute positively to local biodiversity and demonstrate a proactive approach to ecological enhancement.

Consider **bat-friendly design features** in any development:

- **Maintain access gaps** of 15-20mm where new cladding meets roof structure
- **Install bat boxes** on retained structures or mature trees nearby
- **Avoid external lighting** directed at potential roosting areas or foraging areas, such as the adjacent woodland and trees.
- **Preserve habitat connectivity** to surrounding woodland and hedgerow features

Future Survey Considerations

Emergence/re-entry surveys would not be proportionate given the absence of evidence from thorough physical inspection. However, if significant structural changes occur or if evidence of bat presence is discovered during works, additional survey may be required.

Conclusion

In summary, comprehensive internal and external inspections of all five agricultural outbuildings found no evidence of current or historic bat use, and the structures are assessed as having negligible to low/moderate suitability for roosting bats. The combination of regular use, lighting, disturbance, and lack of suitable roost features means that the risk of impacting bats through future works is low. Nonetheless, precautionary working methods are recommended in line with best practice and legal requirements, ensuring adequate protection for bats should they be encountered during any future site activities. These recommendations strike a balance between conservation obligations and practical development needs.

References

Collins J (ed)(2023) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edition). The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

Photos

	Structure 1 – access to internal space present however blocked with paper in some gaps. Building is of a stable design with gaps to internal space present above the entrance doors to each partitioned section.
	Structure 1 – Door opens on second visit to site (16 June) indicating current use of the buildings.
	Storage present in Structure 1 and in part of Structure 2. Lighting also fitted internally.



Structure 2 – Slightly older structure that 1 and of a different wooden clad design. Access is present to internal space from gaps in access doors to the three partitioned internal areas. Cladding is weathered however there are minimal gaps between each horizontal wooden piece. Access to the structure for bats would be from the eastern side of the building as flight lines to the western side are restricted by vegetation.



Structure 2 – The image shows the interior of a single-storey timber outbuilding with exposed wooden beams and horizontal plank walls. The roof is constructed from corrugated sheeting supported by timber rafters, with no internal lining or ceiling voids. Natural light enters through a single window with corrugated cladding, highlighting the rough, weathered surfaces throughout. The floor is bare concrete, with scattered leaf litter and debris along the edges. The internal partition divides the space but does not reach the roof, and there are no concealed cavities or hidden voids. The walls and roof junctions are clearly visible, with no evidence of staining, droppings, feeding remains, or scratch marks. The overall condition and openness of the structure, combined with regular disturbance, indicate very limited suitability for bat roosting.



Structure 3 - A small, single-storey timber shed with horizontally laid wooden cladding and a shallow, corrugated roof. The structure features a simple double-door entrance and a small window, both tightly fitted. The timber is weathered but intact, with no visible gaps or significant defects. The shed is set on hardstanding and surrounded by unmanaged vegetation and mature trees, with a pile of rubble in the foreground indicating recent or ongoing site activity. The immediate setting is open and subject to disturbance, and no external features such as soffits or bargeboards are present.



Structure 4 is a small, single-storey timber outbuilding with a shallow, dual-pitched corrugated roof. The exterior is clad in horizontally laid weathered wooden planks, showing signs of age and some green staining at the base, particularly around the central timber door. The door and adjacent panels are simple in design, with no visible gaps or significant defects that would provide access for bats. There is a small, low-level wooden hatch on the left side of the building. The shed sits on a hardstanding surface, with unmanaged woodland visible in the background and another timber outbuilding adjacent to the right. The immediate area is open and partially shaded by mature trees, and the structure is subject to regular disturbance from nearby site activity and vehicle access. No external features such as soffits, bargeboards, or eaves are present, and the overall condition and construction offer limited potential for bat access or roosting.



Structure 5 is a small, single-storey timber outbuilding with horizontally laid wooden cladding showing signs of weathering and age. The roof is a shallow-pitched corrugated material, likely asbestos or fibre cement, extending slightly beyond the walls to form modest eaves. The timber fascia and soffit boards appear aged with some moss or algae growth visible. The building features a boarded-up entrance secured with metal hinges and a small multi-pane window with white framing on the side. The structure is situated adjacent to other outbuildings and partially shaded by mature trees. The overall condition suggests limited structural complexity and no obvious crevices or access points suitable for bat roosting.