



**PRELIMINARY ECOLOGICAL APPRAISAL
BAT RISK ASSESSMENT**

**WARRENS HOUSE
BRAMSHAW**

**BOM-RSC-21-06
SEPTEMBER 2021**

Bombus Ecology
20, Lawrence Drive
Arnside
Cumbria
LA5 0BJ

PRELIMINARY ECOLOGICAL APPRAISAL

BAT RISK ASSESSMENT

WARRENS HOUSE

KEWLAKELANE

BRAMSHAW

NEW FOREST

SO43 7JH

GRID REF

SU 27470 15060

REPORT FOR

HANS AND KATE BISHOP

Quality Assurance

Version	Prepared by	Date	Checked by	Date	Approved by	Date
R1	David Pollard	10/09/2021	Clare Pollard	10/09/2021	Sarah Woods	10/09/2021
R2		David Pollard			23/12/2021	

This report is intended to provide an accurate description of findings from survey work undertaken on the date shown in the report; however, it cannot fully account for any changes to site conditions following the completion of the survey work due to activities carried out on site or the dynamic nature of the natural environment. All work carried out by Bombus Ecology is subject to our Terms and Conditions.

The report has been produced in accordance with current best practice guidelines

Contents

1. Introduction	4
2. Site Context	7
3. Methodology	8
4. Results	12
5. Conclusion and Recommendations	18
6. Site Images	20
7. Bibliography and References	28

1. Introduction

1.1: Due to a series of legal protections, it is illegal to cause disturbance or harm to many species across the whole of the UK, including nesting birds, bats of all UK species, great crested newts, badgers and many others. In order to determine the possible impact that development works or other land management proposals may cause, an ecological assessment is necessary to identify the species using the site, ways in which these species may be at risk, and potential avoidance, mitigation or compensation measures required during the planned works on site. The aim of this report is to provide the above listed information and to inform future works taking place on the proposed site, in terms of habitat protection and ecological enhancement (biodiversity net gain).

LEGISLATION

- 1.2:** Within the UK, there is a suite of environmental legislative acts concerned with the protection, conservation and enhancement of the ecological and environmental factors present within our rural and built environments. The Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) is the primary legislation for protection of wildlife within the UK and refers to the treatment and management of protected species listed as Schedule 1 (birds), 5 (mammals, reptiles, fish and invertebrates) and 8 (plants). Section 9 is arguably the most important part of the legislative act, as it states 'It is an offence to intentionally kill, injure, or take a scheduled species that is living wild at the time; to possess a scheduled species; to damage, destroy or obstruct access to the place of refuge used by the protected species.'
- 1.3:** The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 is the English enactment of European legislation and provides similar but subtly different protection for species listed on Schedules 2 and 4 of those regulations. A recent change in this legislation means that the provisions of this act now complement those of the Wildlife and Countryside Act more. Species to which these provisions apply are the European Protected Species, examples of this include any of the Bat species within the UK and Great Crested Newts. Activities that might cause offences to be committed can be legitimised by obtaining a licence from the relevant statutory body.
- 1.4:** All British bat species are listed on Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and are afforded protection under Section 9 of this Act. In addition, all British bat species are listed on Schedule 2 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2019 and are protected under Regulation 39 of these Regulations. They make provision for the purpose of implementing European Union Directive on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and

Flora 1992, under which bats are included on Annex IV. The Act and Regulations makes it an offence, inter alia, to:

- Intentionally kill, injure, take (handle) or capture a bat;
- Intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy or obstruct access to any place that a bat uses for shelter or protection (this is taken to mean all bat roosts whether bats are present or not) – under the Habitats Regulations it is an offence to damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of any bat; or
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat while it is occupying a structure or place that it uses for shelter or protection – under the Habitats Regulations it is an offence to deliberately disturb a bat (this applies anywhere, not just at its roost) in such a way as to be likely to affect its ability to survive, breed, reproduce, rear or nurture its young, or hibernate.

1.5: Badgers also have their own specific piece of legislation, the Protection of Badgers Act (1992), and there are other species that also have their own specific legislation.

1.6: Other important pieces of legislation that are important to protecting and conserving the environment as a whole within the UK and in some cases Europe include the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands (1971), Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (1979), Convention on Biological Diversity (1992), The Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000) and the Plant Health Act (1967, amended 2008). This is by no means an exhaustive list, but these are the most important legislations with regards to the ecological protections of the UK countryside.

BIOSECURITY

1.7: Biosecurity is important when entering any land, or other premises where there is a risk of spreading pests. Primarily, the goal of biosecurity is to prevent, control and/or manage risks to life and health. Food safety, zoonoses, the introduction of animal and plant diseases and pests, and the introduction and management of invasive alien species are all possible aspects relating to biosecurity, and it is of vital importance that measures are taken to prevent the spread of disease, loss of biodiversity and introduction of pests and pathogens.

1.8: Biosecurity measures are a series of precautionary steps designed to reduce the risk of transmission of harmful organisms. Good biosecurity practice refers to ways of working that minimise the risk of contamination and the spread of pests and invasive plants. The term pest in this case should be taken to include all invertebrate, bacterial or fungal organisms that are harmful.

BOMBUS ECOLOGY

1.9: When conducting all on site survey work, appropriate biosecurity measures are employed to prevent breaches of biosecurity and the potential spread of harmful pests and disease. A detailed brief on our biosecurity measures and qualifications is available on request.

2. Site Context

- 2.1: The site, known as Warrens House, is located Bramshaw in the New Forest SO 43 7JH at Grid Reference SU 27470 15060 (Figure 1). This can be accessed via Kewlake Lane from the village of Bramshaw. The plans for this site include the redevelopment of the barns and stables and changes to the driveway and infrastructure.
- 2.2: Bombus Ecology was commissioned to carry out a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal/Bat Risk Assessment of certain buildings at the Warrens, in order to identify the current ecological value of the site and any potential issues that will need to be mitigated or compensated for as a result of the planned works, , as well as providing the basis for a suite of ecological habitat enhancement which is a key aim of the project.



FIGURE 1. Area of Ecological Assessment as indicated by the red line.

3. Methodology

3.1: During the course of our Preliminary Ecological Assessment, we use two main methods of survey: field based and computer based. When conducting these surveys we ensure that we adhere to all guidelines set out by the appropriate expert bodies, including Natural England, the Bat Conservation Trust, The British Trust for Ornithology and the Amphibian and Reptile Conservation Trust to name a few. In accordance with best practice, levels of wildlife disturbance caused when conducting these surveys are kept to an absolute minimum and appropriate biosecurity measures are assessed and put in place.

FIELD SURVEY

3.2: The field based survey consists of an initial walkover survey conducted over the proposed site to identify the presence of any protected species or habitats, as well as to identify any invasive species that may be present and any possible detrimental impacts on site that the proposed works may cause. Any ponds and watercourses within the immediate vicinity of the site would also be assessed for their value to protected species, and if deemed necessary a habitat suitability index would be carried out. Through this initial field based survey, the need for further species specific surveys would be confirmed and it would also be determined if any alternate biosecurity methods would be necessary for future site visits.

COMPUTER BASED SURVEY

3.3: The computer based survey is carried out using data sets from open source resources such as OpenStreetMap, the Ordnance Survey OpenData, the governmental open data download portal and the Multi-Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside web portal (MAGIC) which collates datasets from a wide variety of governmental and non-governmental organisations including DEFRA, Historic England, the RSPB, the Forestry Commission and the Environment Agency to name a few. Designated areas within the near vicinity of the site are important to know in case of any impact that may be caused through the planned future use of the site and any proposed works to take place. From this information, a landscape scale map is produced using geographical information services (GIS) software to illustrate and investigate the distances and geographical barriers between the site and the designated areas, in order to determine any potential impacts.

PROTECTED SPECIES SURVEY

3.4: Based on the habitats present, the site was assessed with particular regard to determining the presence or otherwise of badgers (*Meles meles*), bats, great crested newts (GCN) (*Triturus cristatus*), nesting birds, and reptiles. An overview of the survey methods used is outlined below.

3.5: Badgers:

An assessment of the site and surrounding habitats (where access was available), with a focus on any areas of dense vegetation, was carried out in order to identify any evidence of badgers, including:

- the presence of any setts
- well-used runs/tracks
- supplementary evidence, such as hairs or prints
- badgers themselves

Any badger holes found during the survey were classified in accordance with standardised survey guidelines (Harris *et al.*, 1989), being grouped into setts, where applicable, and categorised in terms of the type of sett (in descending order of significance: main, annexe, subsidiary, outlier) and the level of use of each hole (well-used, partially-used, disused).

3.6: Bats:

An assessment of the target buildings was carried out to identify the presence of any Potential Roosting Features (PRFs) for bats, and/or evidence of roosting bats, following the guidelines provided by the Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) (Collins, 2016). An external inspection of the building was carried out, focussing on features that may provide roosting opportunities or access points to roosting features internally, such as the roofing materials, soffits, fascias, barge boards and any lead flashing if present. An internal inspection was also carried out for any evidence of bats. The target building is categorised in accordance with BCT guidelines, detailed in Table 1 below.

Features that are symptomatic of bat use include bat droppings in around or below an entrance hole, staining around an entrance hole, small scratches around an entrance hole, audible squeaking at dusk or in warm weather, smoothening of surfaces around the cavity of an entrance hole and the distinctive smell of bats. The bat risk assessment was completed using ladders, binoculars and a powerful torch. An endoscope was also available to check any small gaps/cracks for evidence of bats.

A preliminary ground level roost assessment of any trees if present within an impact zone or directly adjacent to the barns was also carried out to identify the presence of any PRFs for bats, such as split bark, woodpecker holes and other cavities for bats and/or evidence of roosting bats. All trees assessed were categorised in terms of their value in accordance with the current Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) survey guidelines (Collins, 2016), shown in Table 1.

Features that are symptomatic of bat use include bat droppings in around or below an entrance hole, staining around an entrance hole, small scratches around an entrance hole, audible squeaking at dusk or in warm weather, smoothening of surfaces around the cavity of an entrance hole and the distinctive smell of bats. The bat risk assessment was completed using ladders, binoculars and a powerful torch. An endoscope was also available to check any small gaps-cracks for evidence of bats.

Table 1. Guidelines for assessing bat roosting potential of structures and trees

Suitability	Habitat description	Further action required?
Negligible	Negligible habitat features on site likely to be used by roosting bats.	No further bat risk assessment effort or bat activity surveys are required.
Low	A tree of sufficient size and age to contain PRFs, but with none seen from the ground or features seen with only very limited roosting potential.	Trees: No further bat risk assessment effort or bat activity surveys are required.
Moderate	A structure or tree 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.	Two bat activity surveys are required to determine whether the structure or tree is being utilised by roosting bats; this should be comprised of one dusk and one dawn survey. One survey must occur between May and August.
High	A structure or tree with one or more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis and potentially for longer periods of time due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat.	Three bat activity surveys are required to determine whether the structure or tree is being utilised by roosting bats; this should be comprised of one dusk and one dawn survey, with an additional survey (either dusk or dawn). Two surveys must occur between May and August.

The activity survey followed the internal/external inspection and was completed by Director of Ecology David Pollard MRSB who is a Level 2 (2017-29217-CLS-CLS) Licensed Bat Surveyor and has over 20 years' experience in bat survey work. He was assisted in this commission by Assistant Ecologist Holly Pollard who is an experienced bat surveyor currently working towards her first bat licence.

The equipment used for survey and call analysis included: 'Echometer' Touch Detectors recording in RTE, Anabat Express recording in Frequency Division and Bat Box duets. Surveyors took up position close to the building for 30 minutes prior to and for 1.5 hours after dusk. At any one time all areas of the roof and external area of the target buildings deemed to hold risk were being observed. Visual observation of bat activity were noted and bat species were identified using bat detectors. The information recorded included

weather, timings, whether bats emerged from or entered the building, direction of travel, species and activity: foraging or commuting. The surveys were carried out under suitable conditions (mild, no rain or strong wind) in which bats would be active.

3.7: Great Crested Newts:

An assessment of the habitats present on the site was carried out in order to determine their suitability to support GCN and any natural or artificial refugia (such as logs, stones, discarded building materials etc.) present were also lifted to check for the presence of GCN.

3.8: Nesting Birds:

The habitats on site were assessed to determine their suitability for nesting, with a check carried out for the presence of any active nests or any evidence of nesting behaviour.

3.9: Reptiles:

The assessment for reptiles followed a similar methodology to that for GCN, with an assessment of the habitats present carried out to determine their suitability to support reptiles, and with any refugia lifted to check for the presence of reptiles or evidence of reptiles, such as sloughs (shed skins).

3.10: Other Wildlife:

In accordance with good practice, the site was checked for the presence of any other protected/notable species, with a regard to any other species highlighted in the desktop study.

3.11: Invasive Species: The site was also surveyed for the presence of any invasive, non-native flora or fauna.

4. Results

- 4.1: The survey was carried out on the 1st of July 2021 by Director of Ecology David Pollard BSc (Hons) MRSB and was assisted in this commission by Principal Ecologist Sarah Woods BSc (Hons) MSc AMRSB MRES and Assistant Ecologist Holly Pollard.
- 4.2: The weather conditions at the time of the field survey initially were warm and sunny, with a slight breeze and a temperature of 18° C, and as such were suitable for this initial walkover survey. There were no constraints with regards to access on the site. All survey and biosecurity guidelines were adhered to. The results of the field and computer-based study are as listed below.

ECOLOGICAL FEATURES ON SITE

- 4.3: The target buildings at the Warrens House are the Courtyard (Boot Room, Art Room and Bread Oven Room), the Estate Office and the Stables.

Building




Figure 2 Target Buildings

- 4.4: The commission also looked at the sections of woodland and grassland associated with the access tracks and a proposed extension to the Menage.
- 4.5: Building 1 is the courtyard consist of four buildings: Boot Room, Art Room, Boiler House and Bread Oven. Within these rooms there are no roof voids with fully sealed internal roofs. There were no signs of bats internally and externally as the roofs were intact and the buildings well appointed.

- 4.6: Building 2 is the former Estate Office – Outside the building is well appointed and the roof has no gaps in the slates – Internally the roof void in places had been converted into a room with wood panelling. There are small roof voids which were investigated for signs of bats. The small roof voids were dominated by spider webs which would indicate no flying of bats. Mouse droppings were also noted.
- 4.7: Building 3 is the Stable Block it is a fairly modern design timber framed with intact roofs. There are no roof voids and the overall design leads to a paucity of gaps and potential roosting features for bats. There was evidence of breeding from commensal bird species i.e. swallows and wrens.
- 4.8: Adjacent to the buildings are two small area of mixed species woodland intersected by driveways. It is proposed to change the layout of the access roads and as such impact on these areas of woodland. These areas contain a few mature oak trees *Quercus sp.* with a number of very young oak trees with an understorey of rhododendron *Rhododendron ponticum* and bamboo *Poaceae sp.*
- 4.9: The menage area has areas of tall ruderal type vegetation to the north and east. The ruderal type species are represented by false oat grass *Arrhenatherum elatius*, Timothy grass *Phleum pratense*, rough meadow-grass *Poa trivialis* and cock's foot *Dactylis glomerata* were noted within the tall ruderals.; teasel *Dispaxis fullonum*, broad leaved dock *Rumex obtusifolium*, yarrow *Achillea millefolium* with spear thistle *Cirsium vulgare*, creeping thistle *Cirsium repens* (dominant), dandelion *Taraxacum sp.*, rough hawkbit *Leontodon hispidus*, common sorrel *Rumex acetosa* and rosebay willowherb *Chamerion angustifolium*.
- 4.10: On the northern and western edge of the driveways are areas of species rich grassland with mature mixed species trees. The grass species are outlined above but other species note were: common spotted and heath spotted orchids *Dactylorhiza fuchsii* and *D. maculata*, common knapweed *Centaurea nigra*, oxeye daisy *Leucanthemum vulgare*, meadow vetchling *Lathyrus pratensis*, meadow buttercup *Ranunculus acris*, silverweed *Potentilla anserina*, hop trefoil *Trifolium campestre*, lady's bedstraw *Galium verum* and tormentil *Potentilla erecta*. It was noted that this area had good invertebrate diversity particularly butterflies.

ECOLOGICAL FEATURES OFF SITE

- 4.11: Warrens House is set in a wider agricultural/parkland landscape close to the Hamlet of Bramshaw There are a number of ephemeral natural ponds and a couple of artificial fish ponds within 500m there is a small river to the north and west of site that would provide a barrier to movement of amphibians in those directions.

PROTECTED SPECIES ON SITE

4.12: Badgers

Badgers are likely to use the field surrounding the Warrens for foraging. There are no obvious setts in the close environs of the small woodlands. Thus, badgers are not considered to be of material consideration in this development of this portion of the larger landholding.

4.13: Bats

There was a lack of potential roosting features in all the buildings examined in this commission. There were no signs of bats in the form of droppings or staining.




Figure 2 Observer Locations

Dusk Bat Survey Date and Conditions	Weather	Survey Start/Sunset	Survey End	Temp Start	Temp Finish
3rd August 2021	Warm, Dry with slight breeze	20:50/21:24	22:40	18°C	15°C

No bats emerged from any of the target buildings despite extensive bat activity across site from foraging bats including noctules *Nyctalus noctula*, common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* and soprano pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pygmaeus*. brown long eared bats *Plecotus auratus* foraged around the kitchen garden.

Niche type feeding took place with bats utilising the courtyard and kitchen garden for foraging where there was a lot of prey and little or no breeze.

The trees on the borders are not mature enough to offer PRFs for bats. The woodlands bordering the field and associated landscapes have the potential to be a bat flight lines/foraging routes given the optimal foraging habitat close by and thus should be maintained and protected from light spill and noise disturbance.

4.14: Birds

The buildings, surrounding vegetation, hedgerows and trees offer numerous nesting opportunities for other common passerine species.

4.15: Great Crested Newts and Other Amphibians

Common amphibians including GCN could utilise the woodlands and other habitats foraging purposes. There are a number of ephemeral ponds within 500m. There are also two artificial ornamental ponds around the house too. There is a paucity of records for GCN around the Warrens Estate probably due to the stream preventing immigration. For stage 1 development of the buildings and access tracks GCN will not be of material consequence.

4.16: Reptiles

As above common reptiles will also forage around the larger estate. But for Stage 1 development reptiles will not be of material consequence.

4.17: Invasive Species on Site

No invasive species, as listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, were recorded on-site at the time of the survey. However, grey squirrel *Sciurus carolinensis*. was noted within the woodland just off-site.

Computer-Based Study of Site

4.18: The computer-based study was carried out on a landscape wide scale, using open source GIS software to research and analyse any potential impacts to designated areas that may occur as a result of the planned works. The closest internationally designated site is the New Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protected Area (SPA) and Ramsar Site is 600m all around the site. The nearest nationally designated site is the New Forest Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) at 145m west of site.

4.19: Due to the intrinsic compact nature of the proposed development, it is not thought there will be any impact on any local protected sites.


Table 2. Statutory Designated Sites within 5km of site

Designated area type	Site Name	Reference code	Reason for designation	Size (ha)	Distance from site (km)
Special Protected Area	New Forest	UK9011031	Biol	29,254.11	0.6
Special Area of Conservation	New Forest	UK0012557		29,254.11	0.6
	River Avon	UK0013016		467.58	4.0
Ramsar Site	New Forest	UK11047		27,997.59	0.6
Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)	New Forest	1000655	Biol	28,924.5	0.145
	Landford Heath	1000800		11.69	3.0
	Landford Bog	1000591		9.12	3.8
	Lymington River	1006566		34.84	3.8
	River Avon System	1006597		475.94	4.0

Biological Records

4.20: Biological records were requested from Hampshire Environmental Records Network and received 385 records of a variety of species groups – 3 Reptiles/Amphibians, 149 Avian, 175 Higher Plants, 31 Invertebrates, 23 Mammals and one Lower Plant. The proposed work at the Warrens Estate will not impact on any of these species' groups.

BOMBUS ECOLOGY



Principal Ecologist: sarah@bombusecology.co.uk
Director of Ecology: david@bombusecology.co.uk
Working all over the UK, with our offices based in Cumbria and North Yorkshire

Figure 5 Statutory Protected sites within 5km of site

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

- 5.1: The target buildings are deemed to be of negligible potential for roosting bats and as such no further surveys will be required for the Warrens Site.
- 5.2: Based on the findings from both of the surveys carried out as part of this Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, Bombus Ecology Ltd would recommend the following:

MITIGATION

- 5.3: Ideally, any demolition/reconstruction activities should take place outside the nominal bird breeding season (March to August) If this is not achievable then the ecologist will provide advice and potentially a watching brief.
- 5.4: Any vegetation should not be removed during bird breeding season. If this is not achievable then the ecologist will provide advice and potentially a watching brief.
- 5.5: There is a strong recommendation for the use of a bitumen type felt as opposed to a breathable membrane within the roofs of the redeveloped buildings.
- 5.6: In the unlikely event, a bat is found during the redevelopment, work should cease on that section and the Ecologist at Bombus Ecology informed will provide a watching brief and method statement.
- 5.7: It is recommended that a wildlife-friendly, low-level lighting scheme should be adopted during and post-development to minimise disturbance to any nocturnal wildlife using the peripheries of site, such as bats foraging along the site boundaries. Further details can be obtained from the ecologist.

ENHANCEMENT

- 5.8: Emerging Government policy supports the pursuit of measurable net gains for biodiversity. The Environment Bill includes a requirement of 10% for biodiversity net gain on all development sites.
- 5.9: Looking at the proposal there is the potential for measurable net gains in excess of 10%.
- 5.10: The following measures are recommended to achieve the required biodiversity gain:
- Incorporation of bird or bat boxes across site providing extra potential roosting/nesting resource for a number of common species of bat/birds, thus improving biodiversity.

- Replanting of a range of ruderal type plants and scrub that will attract pollinators along the periphery.
- Landscape planting of trees that provide nectar, fruit or nuts i.e. rowan *Sorbus acuperaria*, hornbeams *Sorbus sp.* blackthorn *Prunus spinosa*, hazel and crab apple *Malus sylvestris*.

FURTHER SURVEYS

5.11: No further survey work is required with respect to bats or barn owls at the Warrens site.

6. Site Images



Image 1 Buildings within courtyard



Image 2 Other buildings within courtyard



Image 3 Roof structure of Bread Oven



Image 4 Internal view of boiler house



Image 5 Roof structure of Boot Room



Image 6 Estate Office from Kitchen Garden




Image 7 Internal structures within Estate Office



Image 8 Small roof void in Estate Office



Image 9 External view of stables




Image 10 Internal structure of stables



Image 11 Laurel and Rhododendron around access tracks



Image 12 Young trees in centre of small woodland copse




Image 13 Outdoor Menage



Image 14 Rough grassland adjacent to Menage



Image 15 Species Rich grassland



Image 16 Marbled white butterfly on common knapweed

7. Bibliography and References

- Britain, G. The Protection of Badgers Act. *London Station. Off.* (1992).
2. Act, W. and C. Public General Acts—Elizabeth II. (1981).
 3. Bromley, M. P. *Countryside management*. (Taylor & Francis, 2013).
 4. Hobbs, R. J. *Invasive species in a changing world*. (Island Press, 2000).
 5. Beebee, T. J. C. & Griffiths, R. A. *Amphibians and Reptiles: A Natural History of the British Herpetofauna*, The New Naturalist. (2000).
 6. Corlett, R. T. Restoration, reintroduction, and rewilding in a changing world. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **31**, 453–462 (2016).
 7. Hayhow, D. B. *et al*. State of nature 2019. (2019).
 8. Committee], J. [Joint N. C. Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey—a technique for environmental audit—revised reprint. (2003).
 9. McLeod, C. R. *et al*. The Habitats Directive: selection of special areas of conservation in the UK. *Jt. Nat. Conserv. Committee, Peterbrgh.* (2005).
 10. Gilbert, G., Gibbons, D. W. & Evans, J. *Bird Monitoring Methods: a manual of techniques for key UK species*. (Published by the RSPB in association with British Trust for Ornithology, 1998).
 11. Kirby, P. *Habitat management for invertebrates: a practical handbook*. (RSPB, 1992).
 12. Batten, L. A., Bibby, C. J., Clement, P., Elliott, G. D. & Porter, R. F. *Red data birds in Britain*. (A&C Black, 2013).
 13. Edgar, P. & Bird, D. R. Action plan for the conservation of the crested newt Triturus cristatus species complex in Europe. *Counc. Eur. Union, Strassbourg, Ger.* 1–33 (2006).
 14. Nature, E. Great crested newt mitigation guidelines. *English Nature, Peterbrgh.* 55 (2001).
 15. (London), B. C. T. & Hundt, L. *Bat surveys: good practice guidelines*. (Bat Conservation Trust, 2012).
 16. Mitchell-Jones, T. *Bat mitigation guidelines*. (External Relations Team, English Nature, 2004).
 17. Subcommittee, T. P. of B. R. G., Sheffield, S. R., Shaw, J. H., Heidt, G. A. & McClenaghan, L. R. Guidelines for the protection of bat roosts. *J. Mammal.* 707–710 (1992).
 18. Poland, J. & et al (2020). Vegetative key to the British Flora. 2nd Edition (Botanical Society of the British Isles,).
 19. Oldham, R. S., Keeble, J., Swan, M. J. S. & Jeffcote, M. Evaluating the suitability of habitat for the great crested newt (Triturus cristatus). *Herpetol. J.* **10**, 143–156 (2000).
 20. HMSO. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations. (2010).