




<b>Building Ref. No.</b>	<b>Photograph</b>	<b>Potential Bat Features</b>	<b>Roosting Suitability</b>
<b>B19</b>		Timber framed building with metal roofing sheet. Open all sides with wooden louvre battens on walls. No areas suitable for roosting bats.	Negligible

<b>Building Ref. No.</b>	<b>Photograph</b>	<b>Potential Bat Features</b>	<b>Roosting Suitability</b>
<b>B20</b>		Small brick building with flat concrete fibre board roofing sheets. No areas suitable for roosting bats.	Negligible
<b>B21</b>		No internal access was granted for this building; therefore a precautionary suitability of Low has been given. There was also a broken window, a gap over the door, and roof vents.	Low

### **Dusk Emergence/Dawn Re-entry Surveys**

A4.42 The emergence and re-entry surveys recorded bat roosting at six different locations within buildings **B11**, **B13**, **B14**, and **B17**.

A4.43 **Table EDP A4.7** provides a summary of the roosts confirmed during the surveys and the roost locations are shown on **Plan EDP 2**.

**Table EDP A4.7:** Bat Roosts Identified Within Buildings.

<b>Building Number</b>	<b>Bat Species</b>	<b>Estimated Number</b>	<b>Roost Location/Access Point</b>	<b>Roost Status</b>
B11	<i>Myotis</i> sp.	5	Chimney stack on eastern elevation.	Day roost
B11	Common pipistrelle	1	From tiles below chimney stack on eastern elevation.	Day roost
B13	Common pipistrelle	1	Under tiles on west side of the roof near the northern gable end.	Day roost
B13	Serotine	1	Seen on two occasions, first re-entering above the window on the east side and then emerging from under an apex tile on the east side.	Day roost
B14	Common pipistrelle	1	Between bargeboard and timber cladding on western gable end.	Day roost
B17	Brown long-eared	1	Flew from the centre of the building.	Day roost

A4.44 The roosts recorded on site are considered to be day roosts of common species and as such, are considered of low conservation value. It is considered that the common pipistrelle and brown long-eared bat roosts are of Site-level importance only. Serotine roosts are more unusual in Solihull and the onsite roost is considered to still be of low conservation value but of Local-level importance.

### **Bat Activity Surveys**

A4.45 As noted above in relation to the scope/design of the bat activity surveys, the initial habitat assessment of the Site in 2019 found the Site to be of Moderate suitability for foraging and commuting bats. The suitability of the Site was reassessed in 2022 and found to be of Low suitability. This is due to the limited diversity of habitats on site, with only improved grassland fields and species-poor hedgerows. Although there are mature trees and ponds across the Site which provide good foraging opportunities, there is no woodland or species-rich hedgerows.

A4.46 The results of the transect surveys for 2022 are illustrated on **Plan EDP 5** and results of the automated detector surveys are provided, in detailed and summary form, within

**Tables EDP A4.8 to A4.11.** These results are also described below for the assemblage as a whole and on a species-by-species basis. The species accounts also draw upon information collated during the desk study and published data on national conservation status<sup>31</sup>.

### **Overall Diversity, Abundance and Distribution**

- A4.47 A total of nine bat species/species groups (*Myotis* and long-eared bat species were not identified to species level), were confirmed to be present foraging and/or commuting within the Site during the transect and/or automated detector surveys. With reference to **Tables EDP A4.8 to A4.11**, the vast majority of recorded bat calls were common pipistrelle, *Myotis* sp., soprano pipistrelle and noctule, with calls of Leisler's bat, long-eared bat, serotine, barbastelle, and Nathusius' bat making up a small minority of the total.
- A4.48 Levels of bat activity recorded during the transect surveys were generally low across all surveys in 2019 and 2022. The distribution of this activity was concentrated along hedgerows, around mature trees, the ponds and around some of the open farm buildings.
- A4.49 Levels of bat activity recorded during the automated detector surveys were generally low, with similarly moderate levels recorded in May and July and relatively lower levels recorded in September. The number of calls recorded was highest in the north location in May and September, where there are two ponds and intact-species-poor hedgerows. In July the number of calls was highest in the west and south locations.

### **Automated Detector Data Tables**

**Table EDP A4.8:** Automated Detector Survey Results May 2022.

Location	Bat Species	Number of Bat Passes Recorded per Night						Total
		25/05/22	26/05/22	27/05/22	28/05/22	29/05/22	30/05/22	
East	Common Pipistrelle	5	50	51	66	258	42	472
	<i>Myotis</i> sp.		1	1	4	3		9
	Noctule		3	1	1	1		6
	Soprano Pipistrelle				1	2		3
	Nathusius' pipistrelle			1				1
	<b>Total</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>42</b>
North	Common Pipistrelle	490	1718	965	411	215	9	3808

<sup>31</sup> <https://www.bats.org.uk/our-work/national-bat-monitoring-programme/reports/nbmp-annual-report>

Location	Bat Species	Number of Bat Passes Recorded per Night						Total
		25/05/22	26/05/22	27/05/22	28/05/22	29/05/22	30/05/22	
	<i>Myotis</i> sp.	14	11	19	12	7	3	66
	Noctule	1		3	6	3	1	14
	Soprano Pipistrelle	1	4	1	1			7
	Serotine			1	1			2
	Long-eared Bat				1	1		2
	<b>Total</b>		<b>506</b>	<b>1733</b>	<b>989</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>South</b>	Common Pipistrelle	59	101	141	266	163	14	744
	<i>Myotis</i> sp.	11	21	17	72	33		154
	Soprano Pipistrelle		3	4	3	6		16
	Noctule	3	6	1	2	2		14
	<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>928</b>
<b>West</b>	Common Pipistrelle	67	116	34	31	62	27	337
	<i>Myotis</i> sp.	34	69	3		1		107
	Soprano Pipistrelle	1	2			2		5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>449</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>686</b>	<b>2105</b>	<b>1243</b>	<b>878</b>	<b>759</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>5767</b>

**Table EDP A4.9:** Automated Detector Survey Results July 2022.

Location	Bat Species	Number of Bat Passes Recorded per Night						Total
		20/07/22	21/07/22	22/07/22	23/07/22	24/07/22	25/07/22	
<b>East</b>	Common Pipistrelle	3	145	307	119	139	73	786

Location	Bat Species	Number of Bat Passes Recorded per Night						Total
		20/07/22	21/07/22	22/07/22	23/07/22	24/07/22	25/07/22	
	<i>Myotis</i> sp.	2	8	9		15	2	36
	Soprano Pipistrelle	1	2		7		1	11
	Noctule		1	2	5	1		9
	Serotine					1	1	2
	Nathusius' pipistrelle						1	1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>845</b>
<b>North</b>	Common Pipistrelle	40	59	20	131	371	215	836
	Noctule	1	6	6	11	4	4	32
	<i>Myotis</i> sp.	2	6	6	2	9	3	28
	Soprano Pipistrelle	5	2		3	7		17
	Long-eared Bat		1			4		5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>918</b>
<b>South</b>	Common Pipistrelle	101	404	653	125	287	208	1778
	<i>Myotis</i> sp.	1	25	9	8	7	7	57
	Noctule	6	4	2	6	3	1	22
	Soprano Pipistrelle	1			2	6	5	14
	Long-eared Bat	3	2			2		7
	Leisler's bat	1	1					2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>436</b>	<b>664</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>1880</b>
<b>West</b>	Common Pipistrelle	11	87	211	400	441	404	1554
	<i>Myotis</i> sp.		3	26	132	58	13	232

Location	Bat Species	Number of Bat Passes Recorded per Night						Total
		20/07/22	21/07/22	22/07/22	23/07/22	24/07/22	25/07/22	
	Soprano Pipistrelle	3	1	5	28	29	15	81
	Noctule		6	5	1	6		18
	Serotine		1			1		2
	Long-eared Bat			1				1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>561</b>	<b>535</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>1888</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>764</b>	<b>1262</b>	<b>980</b>	<b>1391</b>	<b>953</b>	<b>5531</b>	

**Table EDP A4.10:** Automated Detector Survey Results September 2022.

Location	Bat Species	Number of Bat Passes Recorded per Night						Total
		21/09/22	22/09/22	23/09/22	24/09/22	25/09/22	26/09/22	
<b>East</b>	Common Pipistrelle	55	336	175	6		13	585
	<i>Myotis</i> sp.	23	40	29	10	9	2	113
	Noctule	2	5	1		2		10
	Leisler's bat					2		2
	Serotine	1						1
	Soprano Pipistrelle		1					1
	Long-eared Bat			1				1
	Barbastelle		1					1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>714</b>
<b>North</b>	Common Pipistrelle	78	514	396	52	438	302	1780
	<i>Myotis</i> sp.	17	49	31	11	119	80	307

Location	Bat Species	Number of Bat Passes Recorded per Night						Total
		21/09/22	22/09/22	23/09/22	24/09/22	25/09/22	26/09/22	
	Noctule	10	6	3	7	3		29
	Soprano Pipistrelle	3	11	4		5		23
	Leisler's bat		7	3				10
	Barbastelle		9					9
	Serotine	1	3	1				5
	Long-eared Bat		2	1				3
	Nathusius' pipistrelle		1					1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>602</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>2167</b>
<b>South</b>	Common Pipistrelle	51	45	85	82	57	17	337
	Soprano Pipistrelle	3	2	7	1	5		18
	<i>Myotis</i> sp.	2	3	2	1	2	1	11
	Leisler's bat	3	1		2	2		8
	Serotine		2	2		2		6
	Long-eared Bat				1			1
		<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>West</b>	Common Pipistrelle	55	305	36	15	5	71	487
	<i>Myotis</i> sp.	14	79	8	5	17	9	132
	Soprano Pipistrelle		16	8	1			25
	Noctule	13	6		2			21
	Serotine	1	2	3				6
	Long-eared Bat		2		1		1	4
	Leisler's bat		1	2				3



Location	Bat Species	Number of Bat Passes Recorded per Night						Total
		21/09/22	22/09/22	23/09/22	24/09/22	25/09/22	26/09/22	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>678</b>
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>1449</b>	<b>798</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>3940</b>

**Table EDP A4.11:** Summary of Automated Detector Surveys.

Survey Month	Species	Number of Passes	% of Total
<b>May</b>	Common Pipistrelle	5361	92.96%
	<i>Myotis</i> sp.	336	5.83%
	Noctule	34	0.59%
	Soprano Pipistrelle	31	0.54%
	Serotine	2	0.03%
	Long-eared Bat	2	0.03%
	Nathusius' pipistrelle	1	0.02%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>5767</b>	
<b>July</b>	Common Pipistrelle	4954	89.57%
	<i>Myotis</i> sp.	353	6.38%
	Soprano Pipistrelle	123	2.22%
	Noctule	81	1.46%
	Long-eared Bat	13	0.24%
	Serotine	4	0.07%
	Leisler's bat	2	0.04%
	Nathusius' pipistrelle	1	0.02%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>5531</b>	
<b>September</b>	Common Pipistrelle	3189	80.94%
	<i>Myotis</i> sp.	563	14.29%
	Soprano Pipistrelle	67	1.70%
	Noctule	60	1.52%
	Leisler's bat	23	0.58%
	Serotine	18	0.46%
	Barbastelle	10	0.25%
	Long-eared Bat	9	0.23%
	Nathusius' pipistrelle	1	0.03%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3940</b>	
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>15,238</b>	

### **Evaluation of Overall Bat Assemblage**

- A4.50 The 2022 surveys confirmed there are day roosts in four of the buildings for the following species: common pipistrelle, brown-long eared, serotine, and *Myotis* sp. These bat species were also recorded during the transect and automated detector surveys.
- A4.51 Whilst there is a diversity of bat species utilising the Site, including barbastelle, an Annex II species, the Site is of highest value to common species, and any species deemed to be rarer in nature have demonstrated preferences for habitats located beyond the Site's boundary given they are not frequently detected.
- A4.52 Taking into account the diversity of bat species utilising the Site and the extent of their roosting, foraging and commuting activity, the overall bat assemblage using the Site is judged to be of Local-level importance.

## Appendix EDP 5 Great Crested Newt Survey

### METHODOLOGY

#### HSI Assessment of Waterbodies

- A5.1 A Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) assessment is a standardised method<sup>32</sup>, which uses a range of criteria, such as water quality, fish/waterfowl presence and surrounding terrestrial habitat quality, to derive a suitability score or 'index'. Waterbodies with high scores are more likely to support great crested newt compared to those with lower scores. HSI scores and the associated suitability categories for great crested newts are set out within **Table EDP A5.1**.

**Table EDP A5.1:** HSI Scores and Waterbody Suitability Categories.

HSI Score	Suitability of Waterbody to Support Great Crested Newts
<0.5	Poor suitability
0.5–0.59	Below average suitability
0.6–0.69	Average suitability
0.7–0.79	Good suitability
>0.8	Excellent suitability

- A5.2 An HSI assessment was undertaken of all waterbodies on the Site, and those within 250m of the Site (but not separated from the Site by significant dispersal barriers) to which access was granted. The waterbodies assessed are **P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6** and **P7** (see **Plan EDP 8**). The shallow wet depression indicated by **TN2** on **Plan EDP 1** was not considered to be a permanent waterbody and was not assessed. The assessment was undertaken by a suitably experienced ecologist on 05 February 2019. It was not deemed necessary to update the HSI survey in 2022 as conditions were not considered to have changed significantly in the interim.

#### Limitations

- A5.3 There were no limitations, as access was granted to all ponds and the survey was not seasonally constrained.

#### Environmental DNA Sampling of Waterbodies

- A5.4 Environmental DNA (eDNA) is DNA that is collected from the environment in which an organism lives. In aquatic environments, animals including amphibians shed cellular material into the water via their saliva, urine, faeces, skin cells, etc. This eDNA may persist for several weeks, and can be collected through a water sample, and analysed to determine if the target species of interest is/has been present in the water body. eDNA sampling of waterbodies between

<sup>32</sup> Oldham R.S., Keeble J., Swan M.J.S. & Jeffcote M. (2000). Evaluating the suitability of habitat for the Great Crested Newt (*Triturus cristatus*). *Herpetological Journal* 10 (4), 143-155

15 April and 30 June (inclusive) gives a highly reliable indication of the presence or likely absence of great crested newt.

A5.5 During the 2022 survey, eDNA sampling was undertaken of **P6** as the presence of horses in the adjacent fields did not allow for population surveys to be safely conducted. The sampling was undertaken by a suitably experienced ecologist on 13 June 2022, using sampling kits obtained from SureScreen Scientifics and following a standard protocol set out by the Freshwater Habitats Trust<sup>33</sup>, which is approved by Natural England. Briefly, this protocol involves:

- Collecting 20 water samples from selected areas evenly spread around the accessible perimeter of the waterbody, including both open water and vegetated areas;
- Collecting a ladle of water at each sampling location, stirring the water column without stirring up sediment, shaking the bag thoroughly once all 20 ladles are collected; and
- Extracting 15ml of this mixed sample into six conical tubes per pond containing preserving fluid, shaken thoroughly to homogenize the sample.

A5.6 The water Samples were then sent to SureScreen Scientifics be analysed for great crested newt eDNA, using real-time Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR). The report was returned on the 24 June 2022.

#### **Limitations**

A5.7 There were no limitations, as full access was granted to the one pond that was surveyed and the survey was not seasonally constrained.

#### **Population Survey**

A5.8 The standard presence/absence (and population assessment) survey procedure is described in the good practice guidelines published by English Nature<sup>34</sup> (now Natural England). This involves a minimum of four survey visits to each waterbody to confirm the presence/likely absence of great crested newts, between mid-March and mid-June, with a minimum of two between mid-April and mid-May to coincide with the typical peak breeding season. If evidence is found of great crested newts during any of these four visits, then a further two survey visits are required to allow for an estimate of population size; six surveys in total, three of which must be between the mid-April and mid-May period.

A5.9 The assessment was initially undertaken by licensed ecologists in 2019 and these surveys were then updated in 2022. In both years the surveys were undertaken with reference to the guidelines described above.

A5.10 The 2019 and 2022 surveys were undertaken by a licensed ecologist, with reference to the guidelines described above, of all waterbodies on-site, and those within 250m of the Site (but

---

<sup>33</sup> Biggs J, Ewald N, Valentini A, Gaboriaud C, Griffiths RA, Foster J, Wilkinson J, Arnett A, Williams P and Dunn F 2014. Analytical and methodological development for improved surveillance of the Great Crested Newt. Appendix 5. Technical advice note for field and laboratory sampling of great crested newt (*Triturus cristatus*) environmental DNA. Freshwater Habitats Trust, Oxford.

<sup>34</sup> English Nature (2001). Great Crested Newt Mitigation Guidelines. English Nature, Peterborough

not separated from the Site by significant dispersal barriers) to which access was granted and which held sufficient water depth. The waterbodies surveyed are **P2, P4, P5, P6** and **P7**.

A5.11 In accordance with the guidelines, the following three preferred survey techniques were employed to determine the presence/absence and relative abundance of great crested newts within the surveyed waterbodies:

- Torching – This involves searching water bodies by torchlight between dusk and midnight and is an effective means of detecting adult newts. Each surveyor used a 1,000,000 candle power torch during this part of the survey;
- Bottle Trapping – This involves the use of funnel traps (made from 2-litre plastic bottles) that are inserted into the water along the margin of the water bodies during the evening and checked the following morning. Access permitting, the traps are spaced at roughly 2m intervals around the margins of the ponds; and
- Egg Searching – A search of any suitable aquatic vegetation to check for great crested newt eggs.

A5.12 Where no evidence of great crested newts was recorded after four visits, the species was deemed to be absent. Where evidence of great crested newts was recording during the first four visits, a further two visits were completed to enable an estimate of the population size to be made. In 2019, six visits were made to ponds **P2, P4** and **P5**. In 2022, six visits were made to these three ponds as well (based on the 2019 results), albeit evidence of great crested newts was only recorded in **P2**.

A5.13 Details of each survey visit in 2019, including pond conditions and number of bottle traps used, are provided in **Table EDP A5.2**.

**Table EDP A5.2:** Great Crested Newt Population Survey Visit Details 2019.

Visit No.	Date	Air Temp (°C)	Waterbody	No. Bottle Traps	Vegetation Cover*	Turbidity**
1	24/04/2019	8	P2	20	15	4
			P4	21	10	4
			P5	13	1	3
			P6	10	1	3
			P7	11	5	2
2	02/03/2019	8.3	P2	17	2	4
			P4	20	1	2-5
			P5	8	1	1
			P6	10	0	2-4
			P7	11	1	3
4	23/05/2019	7-18	P2	20	1	4
			P4	20	<10	3

Visit No.	Date	Air Temp (°C)	Waterbody	No. Bottle Traps	Vegetation Cover*	Turbidity**
			P5	8	1	0
			P6	10	1	2
			P7	10	3	2
5	06/06/2019	12.5-13.5	P2	20	20	4
			P4	20	30	2
			P5	8	10	1
6	13/06/2019	11-12	P2	20	20	4
			P4	20	5	2
			P5	8	10	2

A5.14 Details of each survey visit in 2022, including pond conditions and number of bottle traps used, are provided in **Table EDP A5.3**.

**Table EDP A5.3:** Great Crested Newt Population Survey Visit Details 2022.

Visit No.	Date	Air Temp (°C)	Waterbody	No. Bottle Traps	Vegetation Cover*	Turbidity**
1	21/04/2022	10-16	P2	20	10	2
			P4	17	10	1
			P5	7	80	3
			P7	10	20	2
2	10/05/2022	11-17	P2	20	15	3
			P4	20	0	2
			P5	8	0	1
			P7	10	10	3
3	17/05/2022	12-17	P2	20	20	5
			P3	1	5	4
			P4	20	10	1
			P5	8	5	0
			P7	10	50	5
4	24/05/2022	9-15	P2	20	20	3
			P4	20	20	2
			P5	8	<5	1
			P7	8	10	4
5	13/06/2022	9-15	P2	20	20	4
			P4	20	40	1
			P5	5	0	2

Visit No.	Date	Air Temp (°C)	Waterbody	No. Bottle Traps	Vegetation Cover*	Turbidity**
6	16/06/2022	18	P2	20	25	4
			P4	20	60	3
			P5	8	10	2

\*Scale of 0-5, where 0 = no vegetation obscuring survey and 5 = water completely obscured

\*\* Scale of 0-5, where 0 = completely clear and 5 = very turbid

A5.15 The population is estimated by taking the highest count ('peak count') of adults from one survey event and using this count to classify the population as either small, medium, or high in accordance with the following criteria:

- Small population: peak count up to 10;
- Medium population: peak count between 11–100; and
- High population: peak count greater than 100.

### **Limitations**

A5.16 Ponds **P1** and **P3** were dry, or the water levels were too shallow to enable population surveys in 2019 or 2022. A single bottle trap was deployed in **P3** on the third survey visit in 2022 but this cannot be deemed to be conclusive.

A5.17 In 2022, the water levels in pond **P5** were quite low, with only 50% of the pond being accessible, by the last survey conducted on 16 June 2022. This is most likely as a result of the heatwave.

### **RESULTS**

A5.18 The results of the surveys of waterbodies are set out in **Table EDP A5.3** (for those on-site) and in **Table EDP A5.4** (for those off-site).

A5.19 In summary for 2019, evidence of breeding (eggs) were found in **P2**, **P4**, and **P5**, and great crested newt adults were found in **P4**. The peak count for **P4** and the entire survey event was three great crested newts, which means the population size for the site in 2019 was small.

A5.20 In summary for 2022, individuals and evidence of breeding, in the form of eggs, were only recorded in **P2**. The peak count for **P2** and the entire survey event was three great crested newts, which means the population size for the site in 2022 is small. The eDNA result for **P6** was negative.

A5.21 In terms of terrestrial habitats, the Site contains intact species-poor hedgerows and two small areas of dense continuous scrub, which are of moderate suitability to support great crested newts in the terrestrial phase of their annual life cycle, and which are therefore likely to be used for foraging and dispersal or refuge and hibernation.

### **Evaluation of Population**

- A5.22 There are two onsite ponds, **P4** and **P5**, which are suitable for great crested newts whereas the other three were dry throughout the breeding season. There are limited terrestrial habitats on-site, namely species-poor hedgerows and dense scrub, and the Site lacks any woodland or rich, tussocky grassland. In terms of other ponds within 250m, only **P2** supports great crested newts but due to its proximity to the Site, the species could occasionally disperse and seek refuge within the Site.
- A5.23 Regarding the potential population in the surrounding area, in 2019 12 records were returned for great crested newts within 1km of the Site. However, only two of these records were great crested newts that were not separated from the Site by significant dispersal barriers. Both records related to off-site ponds, one was approximately 378m to the west and the other approximately 738m to the west. The 2022 desk study returned 22 records for great crested newts, with 5 records not separated from the Site by significant dispersal barriers. One related to an on-site pond, **P4**, and the other four were to the east of the Site.
- A5.24 Based on the survey results summarised above, the population of great crested newt using the Site is considered to be of Site-level importance.



**Table EDP A5.4:** Great Crested Newt Survey Results (On-site Waterbodies).

Waterbody	Description	HSI Score (pond suitability)	Population Survey 2019		Population Survey 2022	
			Peak Count	Pop/n Size	Peak Count	Pop/n Size
<b>P1</b>	A pond in the corner of a field along the eastern boundary. Wet ditches feed into it. This pond was too shallow to undertake population surveys in 2019 or 2022.	0.61 (average)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>P3</b>	A small garden pond in the south of the Site. This pond was too shallow to undertake population surveys in 2019 or 2022.	0.49 (poor)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>P4</b>	Medium sized field pond fenced off from surrounding grassland fields. Linked to <b>P5</b> to the south by a wet ditch.	0.8 (excellent)	3	Small	0	N/A
<b>P5</b>	Slightly smaller than <b>P4</b> , a medium sized field pond fenced off from surrounding grassland fields. Linked to <b>P4</b> to the north by a wet ditch.	0.73 (good)	0	N/A	0	N/A

**Table EDP A5.5:** Great Crested Newt Survey Results (Off-site Waterbodies).

Waterbody	Distance (m) and Connectivity to the Site	Description	HSI Score (pond suitability)	eDNA	Population Survey 2019		Population Survey 2022	
					Peak Count	Pop/n Size	Peak Count	Pop/n Size
<b>P2</b>	5m from the southern boundary, only garden grassland between the pond and the Site.	A large garden pond surrounded by lawns.	0.59 (below average)	Not surveyed	0 (eggs found)	N/A	3	Small
<b>P6</b>	145m east of site boundary, with one field in between.	Pond within grassland field adjacent to a public footpath.	0.80 (excellent)	Surveyed in 2022 only - Negative result	0	N/A	0	N/A

Waterbody	Distance (m) and Connectivity to the Site	Description	HSI Score (pond suitability)	eDNA	Population Survey 2019		Population Survey 2022	
					Peak Count	Pop/n Size	Peak Count	Pop/n Size
<b>P7</b>	153m east of the Site boundary, with Pool House Farm and fields in between.	Large pond adjacent to Pool House Farm.	0.82 (excellent)	Not surveyed	0	N/A	0	N/A

## Appendix EDP 6

### Details of Non-statutory Designations within 2km

Designation	Site Reference	Approx Distance from the Site	Interest Feature(s)
Fields East of Balsall - ecosite	143/27	42m North-west	Semi-improved grassland roughly divided into two halves, the north east being damper and more acidic than the south west. Over the whole site Yorkshire fog and red fescue ( <i>Festuca rubra</i> ) are abundant with sweet vernal-grass ( <i>Anthoxanthum odoratum</i> ) and tufted hair grass ( <i>Deschampsia cespitosa</i> ) frequent in the north-west corner. Meadow foxtail ( <i>Alopecurus pratensis</i> ) and crested dog's tail ( <i>Cynosurus cristatus</i> ) frequent towards the south-west.
Little Beanit Farm and Beanit Farm Hedge LWSs and ecosite	39/27	0.2km East	One of the meadows on this site is designated 'Little Beanit Farm Meadow' LWS. An old hedgerow is designated as 'Beanit Farm Hedge' LWS. Two hay meadows with a variety of grasses, including meadow foxtail, sweet vernal-grass, crested dogs tail and red fescue. Yellow rattle ( <i>Rhinanthus minor</i> ), great burnet ( <i>Sanguisorba officinalis</i> ) and selfheal ( <i>Prunella vulgaris</i> ) represent some of the more interesting herb species. The adjacent Beanit Farm Ponds are mostly shaded, whilst the old hedgerow contains a wide variety of species.
Meadow at Catchems Corner - ecosite	39/27	0.4km East	Rejected as an LWS, this site is recognised as an ecosite.
Kenilworth Greenway LWS and ecosite	31/27S, T, N	0.4km North-east	Designated as 'Kenilworth Greenway' LWS. A disused railway line mostly within a cutting or embankment, the vegetation grades from grass, tall herb, to scrub and in places secondary woodland. There are also damp areas with ferns, mosses and lichens and a well-managed pond. Much of the line provides very good habitat for birds and butterflies and grass snake ( <i>Natrix Helvetica</i> ) has been noted along the site.
Barratts Green Lane pLWS	-	0.5km North-east	No information available.
Beanit Wood - ecosite	77/27	0.6km East	Rejected LWS. Unmanaged woodland of silver birch ( <i>Betula pendula</i> ), ash ( <i>Fraxinus excelsior</i> ), oak and beech. Coppiced hazel, holly ( <i>Ilex aquifolium</i> ) and hawthorn can be found in the understorey, with bluebell ( <i>Hyacinthoides non-scripta</i> ), red campion ( <i>Silene dioica</i> ) and foxglove ( <i>Digitalis purpurea</i> ) in the ground flora.

Designation	Site Reference	Approx Distance from the Site	Interest Feature(s)
Beanit Farm Hedge East LWS and ecosite	17/27	0.6km South-east	A dense hedge which acts as a wildlife corridor.
Beanit Green Lane LWS and ecosite	145/27	0.7km East	A green lane now used as a footpath, the ground flora includes greater stitchwort ( <i>Stellaria holostea</i> ), herb Robert ( <i>Geranium robertianum</i> ), wood avens ( <i>Geum urbanum</i> ) and hedge woundwort ( <i>Stachys sylvatica</i> ). There is a ditch and hedgerow on both sides, supporting oak, ash, elm, hazel, dog rose ( <i>Rosa canina</i> ) and hawthorn.
Blackholes Farm Meadow pLWS (Marshy Grassland at Black Hales Farm ecosite)	129/27	0.7km South-west-south	The site was found to comprise poor semi-improved and semi-improved grasslands in 2012 by HBA.
Pond at Beech Wood Farm Berkswell - ecosite	99/27	0.8km North-east	A small artificial pond, which provides a good habitat for various damselflies and dragonflies. The surrounding vegetation includes branched bur-reed ( <i>Sparganium erectum</i> ), rushes and great willowherb ( <i>Epilobium hirsutum</i> ).
Blackholes Farm Pond pLWS and ecosite	154/27	0.8km South-east	Identified as 'Blackholes Farm Pond' pLWS. The larger pond has very little open water and is much poached by cattle. Dominant species are water mint ( <i>Mentha aquatica</i> ), water horsetail ( <i>Equisetum fluviatile</i> ) and water forget-me-not ( <i>Myosotis scorpioides</i> ). There is also occasional soft rush and water plantain ( <i>Alisma plantago-aquatica</i> ). The smaller pond has surrounding marshy vegetation of hard rush ( <i>Juncus inflexus</i> ), small sweet-grass ( <i>Glyceria declinate</i> ), branched bur-reed, fool's watercress ( <i>Helosciadium nodiflorum</i> ) and yellow flag iris ( <i>Iris pseudacorus</i> ).
Hodgett's Lane Plantation pLWS and ecosite	25/27	0.9km East-north-east	Identified as 'Hodgett's Lane Plantation' pLWS. This broad-leaved plantation sits between Hodgett's Lane and improved grassland. Dominant tree species includes oak sp. The plantation is mature and sits adjacent to a hedgerow. This creates a useful wildlife corridor for a variety of species.
Main London to Birmingham Railway Line - ecosite	47/27J, N, T	0.9km North	A deep well-wooded cutting, the sides are dominated by hawthorn scrub in the southern half and a mixture of rank grasses, bramble and tall herbs in the north.
Balsall Common, St. Philomena Churchyard - ecosite	98/27	0.9km North-west	Although species-poor, the flora includes ivy, cleavers ( <i>Galium aparine</i> ) and holly.

Designation	Site Reference	Approx Distance from the Site	Interest Feature(s)
Big Poores Wood LWS, ecosite and ASNW	80/27	1.2km East	Designated as 'Big Poores wood and Little Poores wood' LWS. A mature larch ( <i>Larix decidua</i> ) plantation with hawthorn, holly, hazel and elder ( <i>Sambucus nigra</i> ) in the understorey. The ground flora includes bracken ( <i>Pteridium aquilinum</i> ) and bluebell. The site is bordered by old, coppiced limes, blackthorn and occasional birch ( <i>Betula</i> sp.).
Small Copse on Arnold Farm pLWS and Arnold Farm, Nailcote Farm, Hodgett Lane Footpath Meadow and Ornamental Pond - ecosite	81/27	1.3km North-east	'Small copse on Arnold Farm' is identified as a pLWS. A large site, which includes Arnold Farm, Nailcote Farm, Hodgett's Lane Footpath Meadow and Nailcote Hall pond. Arnold Farm comprises nine fields of improved grassland for cattle grazing with a small copse and two ponds. The copse is mainly oak and ash. The ground flora contains wood avens, hedge woundwort, red campion and hairy brome ( <i>Bromus ramosus</i> ). (HBA, 1996) Some hedgerows are species-rich containing oak, ash, hawthorn, blackthorn, elder, holly and English elm ( <i>Ulmus procera</i> ). (HBA, 2015) Nailcote Farm is a large farm, mainly improved grassland for grazing with some arable. Several of the hedgerows have woodland indicator species present such as yellow archangel ( <i>Lamium galeobdolon</i> ), dog's mercury ( <i>Mercurialis perennis</i> ) and cuckoopint ( <i>Arum maculatum</i> ). Hodgett's Lane Footpath Meadow is surrounded by tall hedges including hawthorn. Nailcote Hall pond is an ornamental pond in the grounds of a hotel.
Lavender Hall Park LWS and ecosite	167/27	1.3km North-east	Also designated as an LNR. The site consists primarily of amenity grassland and broad-leaved plantation, with areas of dense scrub and semi-improved grassland. The hedgerows consist of pendunculate oak, hawthorn, elder and ivy. The semi-improved grassland features occasional knapweed ( <i>Centaurea nigra</i> ), common cat's-ear ( <i>Hypochaeris radicata</i> ), common bird's-foot trefoil ( <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> ), common ragwort ( <i>Senecio jacobea</i> ), black medick ( <i>Medicago lupulina</i> ), bush vetch ( <i>Vicia sepium</i> ), common centaury ( <i>Centaureum erythraea</i> ) and wild carrot ( <i>Daucus carota</i> ). Some invertebrates such as grasshoppers and bush crickets ( <i>Orthoptera</i> sp.) have been observed. The broad-leaved plantation features wild cherry ( <i>Prunus avium</i> ), holly, wild service tree ( <i>Sorbus torminalis</i> ), guelder rose ( <i>Viburnum opulus</i> ), rowan ( <i>Sorbus aucuparia</i> ) and field maple ( <i>Acer campestre</i> ). Data source: HBA, 2012 survey.

Designation	Site Reference	Approx Distance from the Site	Interest Feature(s)
Red Fern Manor Meadows pLWS and ecosite	170/27	1.3km South-east	The majority of the site was recorded as semi-improved grassland with ponds by HBA in 2012.
Finham Brook and Lakes pLWS and ecosite	159/27	1.3km South-east	Identified as 'River Sowe and Finham Brook and lakes' pLWS. Finham Brook runs through various habitats including improved and semi-improved grasslands, tall herb and urban areas. The brook is an important wildlife corridor. Marginal vegetation recorded includes fool's watercress, water mint, meadow sweet ( <i>Filipendula ulmaria</i> ), great willowherb and hawthorn. (HBA, 1997 survey) Several veteran trees are present on the brook bank.
Fen End Pasture LWS and ecosite	38/27	1.3km South-west	Wet meadows with a rich flora characteristic of old unimproved grasslands. The less common plants of interest recorded include pepper saxifrage ( <i>Silaum silaus</i> ), meadow thistle ( <i>Cirsium dissectum</i> ), devil's-bit scabious ( <i>Succisa pratensis</i> ), common fleabane ( <i>Pulicaria dysenterica</i> ), ragged-robin ( <i>Lychnis flos-cuculi</i> ), lady's mantle ( <i>Alchemilla vulgaris</i> ), quaking grass ( <i>Briza media</i> ), common spotted-orchid ( <i>Dactylorhiza fuchsia</i> ) and brown sedge ( <i>Carex disticha</i> ). The adjacent stream banks are lined with frequent alder ( <i>Alnus glutinosa</i> ), with occasional ash and blackthorn scrub. The remainder of the site is improved grassland and arable land.
Poors Wood LWS, ecosite and ASNW	27/27	1.4km East	Designated as 'Big Poors and Little Poors Wood' LWS. This site is on English Nature's Inventory of Ancient Woodlands. Mature mixed woodland. 'Black Hill Wood' is the only one remaining intact, and this is mainly composed of oak, birch and hazel. 'Poors Wood' has little sign of regeneration, although narrow strips of the original woodland flora have been left along bridleways and rides within the woodland complex. Little Poors Wood: Canopy with abundant oak, locally abundant larch ( <i>Larix</i> sp.), occasional silver birch, rare rowan, and crab apple ( <i>Malus sylvestris</i> ). Understorey of occasional hazel, holly, with rare elder, hawthorn, blackthorn, and goat willow ( <i>Salix caprea</i> ). There is a small pond in the north-west of the wood, dry at the time of survey. Some cultivated species such as daffodil ( <i>Narcissus</i> sp.) and snowdrop ( <i>Galanthus nivalis</i> ) were recorded at the eastern boundary, likely introduced through dumping of garden waste. HBA Survey March 2005.

Designation	Site Reference	Approx Distance from the Site	Interest Feature(s)
Pond North of Balsall Common – ecosite	144/27	1.6km North-west	Eutrophic pond shaded by mature oak, ash and cherry on two sides. The north-east bank is clothed in tall ruderal, with greater spearwort near the water's edge.
Black Waste Wood LWS, ecosite and ASNW	18/27	1.7km East	The majority of site is designated as 'Black Waste Wood' LWS. A small area in the west is not of LWS quality and has been rejected by the panel. Deciduous oak woodland with birch and hazel coppice and a dense sycamore ( <i>Acer pseudoplatanus</i> ) understory. The ground flora contains a variety of herbs including bluebell.
Grassland near railway – ecosite	146/27	1.7km North-east	The site comprises scrub and semi-improved grassland. The grassland dominated by creeping cinquefoil ( <i>Potentilla reptans</i> ) with abundant smooth tare ( <i>Ervum tetraspermum</i> ), bee orchid ( <i>Ophrys apifera</i> ), occasional meadow buttercup ( <i>Ranunculus acris</i> ) and rare pyramidal orchid ( <i>Anacamptis pyramidalis</i> ). Marbled white ( <i>Melanargia galathea</i> ), meadow brown ( <i>Maniola jurtina</i> ), large skipper ( <i>Ochlodes sylvanus</i> ) and ringlet butterflies ( <i>Aphantopus hyperantus</i> ) were observed. Surveyed in June 2019.
Lavender Hall Park pLWS	-	1.7km NE	This is additional land to the north of the already designated LWS.
Stonemoor Wood and Long Meadow Wood – ecosite	15/27	1.7km South-east	Long Meadow Wood in the south is identified as a pLWS. Stonemoor Wood in the north is ungraded. Long Meadow Wood pLWS: Remnant woodland of oak, birch and hazel lying in a shallow valley. The ground flora includes bracken, bramble and many herbs. There is also a small pond with little vegetation.
Pond at Holly Grange Farm – ecosite	130/27	1.7km South-west	Rejected as an LWS, this site is recognised as an ecosite. A large pond surrounded on most sides by mature oak, with blackthorn, hawthorn, elder and hazel. From the south-east, where the bank is more open and shallow, yellow flag Iris is invading the water. Common duckweed ( <i>Lemna minor</i> ), water mint, water horsetail, water forget-me-not and woody nightshade ( <i>Solanum dulcamara</i> ) can be found along the edge of the water. Surveyed in 1997.
Marshy Grassland at Holly Lane Farm – ecosite	131/27	1.7km West	Rejected as an LWS, this site is recognised as an ecosite. Marshy grassland, whilst along the hedge line to the south there is almost permanent standing water, supporting common duckweed, fool's watercress and reed canary-grass ( <i>Phalaris arundinacea</i> ). Surveyed in 1997.

Designation	Site Reference	Approx Distance from the Site	Interest Feature(s)
Needlers End Meadow LWS and ecosite	136/27	1.8km West-north-west	Meadow supporting common knapweed, great burnet, cat's-ear and sneezewort ( <i>Achillea ptarmica</i> ). Other habitats present within the area include a stream, a pond and some hedgerows.
Balsall Common Woodland – ecosite	137/27	1.9km North-west	Rejected as an LWS, this site is recognised as an ecosite. Broadleaved semi-natural woodland with three ponds. All of the ponds are overshadowed and two of them have no aquatic plants. The remaining pond supports abundant water starwort ( <i>Callitriche stagnalis</i> ), frequent fool's watercress and occasional branched bur-reed and soft rush. The woodland has a canopy of crack willow, ash, oak, field maple and sycamore, with an understorey of elder, dog rose, honeysuckle ( <i>Lonicera periclymenum</i> ) and holly. The open glades support a good range of herbs, including meadowsweet, great burnet, foxglove, common sorrel, ragged robin, smooth sow-thistle ( <i>Sonchus oleraceus</i> ) and lesser stitchwort ( <i>Stellaria graminea</i> ).
Copse Field off Lavender Hall Road – ecosite	134/27	1.9km North-west	The site comprises broad-leaved semi-natural woodland, broad-leaved plantation and amenity grassland with an area of scrub to the south-east. Barn owl ( <i>Tyto alba</i> ) may be present in the vicinity.
Pond at North Chase pLWS and ecosite	153/27	1.9km South	Identified as Pond at North Chase pLWS. A pond totally covered in vegetation and dominated by plicate sweetgrass ( <i>Glyceria notata</i> ), with abundant soft rush and hard rush. Also present is branched bur-reed, occasional pendulous sedge ( <i>Carex pendula</i> ) and fen bedstraw ( <i>Galium uliginosum</i> ).
Frogmore Wood – LWS, ecosite and ASNW	10/27	1.9km South-west	This woodland contains mainly birch, although oak, alder and aspen ( <i>Populus tremulooides</i> ) are locally abundant, with occasional hazel, holly, ash, honeysuckle and dog rose. The ground flora includes bluebell, bramble and bracken.
Hawkhurst Moor Farm – ecosite	82/27	2.0km North	The site is mainly agricultural land with a couple of heavily shaded pools. Barnacles Farm is also included within the site and consists of a group of small, grazed meadows with all hedges remaining. The meadows that are present are unimproved with quaking grass, bird's foot trefoil ( <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> ), hop trefoil ( <i>Trifolium campestre</i> ) and lady's smock ( <i>Cardamine pratensis</i> ).



## **Appendix EDP 7 Biodiversity Net Gain Calculations**

Headline Results
Scroll down for final results <a href="#">▲</a>

Return to results menu

On-site baseline	Habitat units	23.45	
	Hedgerow units	13.81	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
On-site post-intervention <small>(Including habitat retention, creation &amp; enhancement)</small>	Habitat units	32.05	
	Hedgerow units	19.15	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
On-site net change <small>(units &amp; percentage)</small>	Habitat units	8.59	36.63%
	Hedgerow units	5.34	38.67%
	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%

Off-site baseline	Habitat units	0.00	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Off-site post-intervention <small>(Including habitat retention, creation &amp; enhancement)</small>	Habitat units	0.00	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Off-site net change <small>(units &amp; percentage)</small>	Habitat units	0.00	0.00%
	Hedgerow units	0.00	0.00%
	Watercourse units	0.00	0.00%

Combined net unit change <small>(Including all on-site &amp; off-site habitat retention, creation &amp; enhancement)</small>	Habitat units	8.59	
	Hedgerow units	5.34	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Spatial risk multiplier (SRM) deductions	Habitat units	0.00	
	Hedgerow units	0.00	
	Watercourse units	0.00	

**FINAL RESULTS**

Total net unit change <small>(Including all on-site &amp; off-site habitat retention, creation &amp; enhancement)</small>	Habitat units	8.59	
	Hedgerow units	5.34	
	Watercourse units	0.00	
Total net % change <small>(Including all on-site &amp; off-site habitat retention, creation &amp; enhancement)</small>	Habitat units	36.63%	
	Hedgerow units	38.67%	
	Watercourse units	0.00%	
Trading rules satisfied?	Yes ✓		

Unit Type	Target	Baseline Units	Units Required	Unit Deficit
Habitat units	10.00%	23.45	25.80	0.00
Hedgerow units	10.00%	13.81	15.19	0.00
Watercourse units	10.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00

Unit requirement met or surpassed ✓  
 Unit requirement met or surpassed ✓  
 Unit requirement met or surpassed ✓

Project Name: Map Reference:  
A-1 On-Site Habitat Baseline

Area habitat summary	
Total Net Unit Change	8.59
Total Net % Change	38.63%
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓

Condense / Show Columns      Condense / Show Rows

Main Menu      Instructions

Ref	Existing area habitats			Distinctiveness		Condition		Strategic significance			Required Action to Meet Trading Rules	Ecological baseline Total habitat units
	Broad Habitat	Habitat Type	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness	Score	Condition	Score	Strategic significance	Strategic significance	Strategic Significance multiplier		
1	Grassland	Modified grassland	7.2967	Low	2	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	14.59
2	Grassland	Modified grassland	1.1549	Low	2	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	2.31
3	Grassland	Modified grassland	0.7765	Low	2	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	1.55
4	Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.0722	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	0.58
5	Lakes	Ponds (non-priority habitat)	0.0214	Medium	4	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same broad habitat or a higher distinctiveness habitat required	0.17
6	Lakes	Ponds (priority habitat)	0.0226	High	6	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same habitat required =	0.27
7	Sparsely vegetated land	Ruderal/Ephemeral	0.6637	Low	2	Moderate	2	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	2.65
8	Urban	Bare ground	0.001	Low	2	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	0.00
9	Urban	Bare ground	0.6604	Low	2	Poor	1	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Same distinctiveness or better habitat required ≥	1.32
10	Urban	Developed land, sealed surface	1.9786	V Low	0	N/A - Other	0	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Low Strategic Significance	1	Compensation Not Required	0.00
11												
12												
13												
14												
15												
			<b>Total habitat area</b>									23.45
			<b>Site Area (Excluding area of individual trees and Green walls)</b>									

Retention category biodiversity value						Bespoke compensation agreed for unacceptable losses	Comments		
Area retained	Area enhanced	Baseline units retained	Baseline units enhanced	Area habitat lost	Units lost		User comments	Consenting body comments	GIS reference number
0	0	0.00	0.00	7.30	14.59				
0	1.1549	0.00	2.31	0.00	0.00				
0	0	0.00	0.00	0.78	1.55				
0	0	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.58				
0	0	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.17				
0	0.0226	0.00	0.27	0.00	0.00				
0	0	0.00	0.00	0.66	2.65				
0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00				
0	0	0.00	0.00	0.66	1.32				
0	0	0.00	0.00	1.98	0.00				
0.00	1.18	0.00	2.58	11.47	20.87				

**Total area lost (excluding area of individual trees and Green walls)**      11.47

M² to hectares conversion tool:      Select a unit      Hectares      M²

Project Name:  Map Reference:   
**A-2 On-Site Habitat Creation**

Condense / Show Columns

Condense / Show Rows

Main Menu

Instructions

Area habitat summary	
Total Net Unit Change	8.59
Total Net % Change	36.63%
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓
Area Check (excluding individual trees and green walls)	Area Acceptable ✓

Broad Habitat	Proposed habitat	Area (hectares)	Distinctiveness		Condition		Post development/ post intervention habitats			Habitat units delivered	Comments		GIS reference number
			Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier	Final time to target condition (years)	Final difficulty of creation	User comments		Consenting body comments		
Grassland	Modified grassland	3.4193	Low	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	4	Low	11.86	grassland areas located to the center of the site along roads and paths where likely to obtain greater footfall.			
Grassland	Other neutral grassland	0.0017	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	0.01	Large area in the north of the site			
Heathland and shrub	Mixed scrub	0.1114	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	0.75	creation of scrub within the greenspaces on site and along site boundaries as buffers.			
Lakes	Ponds (non-priority habitat)	0.0518	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	3	Low	0.37	creation of ponds to support the network of ponds on site.			
Urban	Allotments	0.1203	Low	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	0.46	created allotment.			
Urban	Allotments	0.0283	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	0.05	created native fruiting species orchard			
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	0.0005	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Medium	0.00	roads and paths			
Urban	Developed land; sealed surface	2.2187	V.Low	N/A - Other	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	0	Medium	0.00	40% residential dwellings.			
Urban	Sustainable drainage system	0.7804	Low	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	3	Medium	1.88	Areas of seasonally wet SUDs which will be grassland for most of the year.			
Urban	Vegetated garden	4.7381	Low	Condition Assessment N/A	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	1	Low	9.14	40% residential dwellings.			
Total habitat area		11.47							24.53				

Site Area (Excluding area of Individual trees and Green walls) 11.47

M² to hectares conversion tool:  Select a unit:  Hectares  M²



Project Name: Map Reference:  
**B-1 On-Site Hedge Baseline**

Hedgerow summary	
Total Net Unit Change	5.34
Total Net % Change	38.67%
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓

Condense / Show Columns    Condense / Show Rows  
 Main Menu    Instructions

Baseline ref	Existing hedgerow habitats			Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Required Action to Meet Trading Rules	Ecological baseline Total hedgerow units	Retention category biodiversity value						Comments		GIS reference number
	Hedge number	Hedgerow type	Length (km)						Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Length retained	Length enhanced	Units retained	Units enhanced	Length lost	
1		Native hedgerow with trees	0.784	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness band or better	6.27	0.758	0	6.06	0.00	0.03	0.21			
2		Native hedgerow with trees	0.185	Medium	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness band or better	0.74	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.74			
3		Native hedgerow with trees	0.081	Medium	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness band or better	0.32	0	0.081	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.00			
4		Native hedgerow with trees	0.136	Medium	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness band or better	0.54	0	0.136	0.00	0.54	0.00	0.00			
5		Native hedgerow	0.402	Low	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness band or better	1.61	0.193	0	0.77	0.00	0.21	0.84			
6		Native hedgerow	0.022	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness band or better	0.04	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.04			
7		Native hedgerow	0.092	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness band or better	0.18	0	0.092	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.00			
8		Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	0.034	High	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Like for like or better	0.20	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.20			
9		Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	0.359	High	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Like for like or better	2.15	0	0.359	0.00	2.15	0.00	0.00			
10		Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	0.065	High	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Like for like or better	0.39	0	0.065	0.00	0.39	0.00	0.00			
11		Species-rich native hedgerow	0.116	Medium	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness band or better	0.93	0.016	0	0.13	0.00	0.10	0.80			
12		Native hedgerow	0.058	Low	Poor	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness band or better	0.12	0.019	0	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.08			
13		Native hedgerow	0.075	Low	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Same distinctiveness band or better	0.30	0.075	0	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.00			
14																	
15																	
16			2.41					13.81	1.06	0.73	7.30	3.60	0.62	2.91			

Project Name:  Map Reference:   
**B-2 On-Site Hedge Creation**

Hedgerow summary	
Total Net Unit Change	5.34
Total Net % Change	38.67%
Trading Rules Satisfied	Yes ✓

Condense / Show Columns

Condense / Show Rows

Main Menu

Instructions

Baseline ref	New hedge number	Proposed habitats		Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance	Temporal multiplier			Difficulty risk multipliers	Hedge units delivered	Comments		GIS reference number
		Habitat type	Length (km)				Distinctiveness	Condition	Strategic significance			Standard or adjusted time to target condition	Final time to target condition (years)	
1		Native hedgerow	0.549	Low	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	5	Low	1.84				
2		Species-rich native hedgerow with trees	0.456	High	Moderate	Area/compensation not in local strategy/ no local strategy	Standard time to target condition applied	10	Low	3.83				
3														
4														
5														
6														
7			1.01							5.67				





## Plans

**Plan EDP 1:** Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey Update 2022

(edp5006\_d020a 21 July 2023 GYo/OKe)

**Plan EDP 2:** Location of Bat Roosts (Buildings) 2022

(edp5006\_d018a 21 July 2023 DJo/SJM)

**Plan EDP 3:** Pilot Breeding Bird Survey May 2022

(edp5006\_d022a 21 July 2023 GYo/OKe)

**Plan EDP 4:** Bat Transect Survey Results and Static Detector Positions May 2022

(edp5006\_d015a 21 July 2023 DJo/SJM)

**Plan EDP 5:** Bat Transect Survey Results and Static Detector Positions July 2022

(edp5006\_d016a 21 July 2023 DJo/SJM)

**Plan EDP 6:** Bat Transect Survey Results and Static Detector Positions September 2022

(edp5006\_d017a 21 July 2023 DJo/SJM)

**Plan EDP 7:** Badger Survey 2022

(edp5006\_d023a 21 July 2023 GYo/OKe)

**Plan EDP 8:** Pond Locations and Great Crested Newt Survey Results

(edp5006\_d019a 21 July 2023 DJo/SJM)

**Plan EDP 9:** BNG Assessment – Pre-Development Habitats

(edp5006\_d013a 21 July 2023 GYo/OKe)

**Plan EDP 10:** BNG Assessment – Post-Development Habitats

(edp5006\_d014a 21 July 2023 GYo/OKe)



- Site Boundary
- Dense Continuous Scrub
- Tall Ruderal
- A Amenity Grassland
- I Improved Grassland
- SI Poor Semi-improved Grassland
- Standing Water (Pond)
- Building
- Hardstanding
- Bare Ground
- Mammal Path
- Intact Species-poor Hedgerow and Trees
- Intact Species-poor Hedgerow
- Defunct Species-rich Hedgerow and Trees
- Defunct Species-rich Hedgerow
- Defunct Species-poor Hedgerow and Trees
- Defunct Species-poor Hedgerow
- Coniferous Hedgerow
- Line of Trees
- Wet Ditch
- Dry Ditch
- Earth Bank
- Fence
- Wall
- Scattered Trees (Broadleaved)
- Scattered Trees (Coniferous)
- X Scattered Scrub
- ⊙ Target Note
- ★ Potential Hibernacula

client  
**Barwood Development Securities Ltd.**

project title  
**Land off Hob Lane and Pheasant Oak Farm, Balsall Common**

drawing title  
**Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey Update 2022**

date	<b>21 JULY 2023</b>	drawn by	<b>GYo</b>
drawing number	<b>edp5006_d020a</b>	checked	<b>OKe</b>
scale	<b>1:2,000 @ A3</b>	QA	<b>RBa</b>



Registered office: 01285 740427 - www.edp-uk.co.uk - info@edp-uk.co.uk





- Site Boundary
- Red Listed Bird
- Amber Listed Bird
- Green Listed Bird
- ◆ Priority Species

Species

R.	Robin (Erithacus rubecula)
HS	House Sparrow (Passer domesticus)
C.	Carrion Crow (Corvus corone)
CD	Collared Dove (Streptopelia decaocto)
GT	Great Tit (Parus major)
B.	Blackbird (Turdus merula)
WP	Woodpigeon (Columba palumbus)
D.	Dunnock (Prunella modularis)
WR	Wren (Troglodytes troglodytes)
BT	Blue Tit (Cyanistes caeruleus)
GO	Goldfinch (Carduelis carduelis)
BC	Blackcap (Sylvia atricapilla)
CC	Chiffchaff (Phylloscopus collybita)
MG	Magpie (Pica pica)
WH	Whitethroat (Sylvia communis)
RO	Rook (Corvus frugilegus)
CH	Chaffinch (Fringilla coelebs)
JD	Jackdaw (Corvus monedula)
MH	Moorhen (Gallinula chloropus)
SD	Stock Dove (Columba oenas)
MA	Mallard (Anas platyrhynchos)
RN	Raven (Corvus corax)
SL	Swallow (Hirundo rustica)
GR	Greenfinch (Chloris chloris)
PW	Pied Wagtail (Motacilla alba)
SG	Starling (Sturnus vulgaris)

client  
**Barwood Development Securities Ltd.**

project title  
**Land off Hob Lane and Pheasant Oak Farm, Balsall Common**

drawing title  
**Pilot Breeding Bird Survey May 2022**

date	<b>21 JULY 2023</b>	drawn by	<b>Gyo</b>
drawing number	<b>edp5006_d022a</b>	checked	<b>Oke</b>
scale	<b>1:2,000 @ A3</b>	QA	<b>RBa</b>