

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal

Survey site:

Premier Inn Merthyr Tydfil, Duffryn, Pentrebach, Merthyr Tydfil, CF48 4BB

Client:

Premier Inn Hotels

Survey date:

1st May 2024

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application with the Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council. The proposal is described as:

The construction of an extension to the hotel for the construction of 16 additional rooms.

PEA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: [PEA Methodology and Legislation - 2024.](#)

PRA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: [PRA Methodology and Legislation - 2024.](#)

The site survey was undertaken on 14 th of May 2024 by Katy Perry, BSc (Hons), MCIEEM, Senior Consultant (Natural England Bat Licence Number: 2022-10404-CL18-BAT, NRW (S092694/1, GCN Licence 2018-35157-CLS-CLS and Dormouse Licence 2020-49929-CLS-CLS). An updated site visit was undertaken 20 th August by Alexie Jenkins BSc (Hons), MRes, AMRSB, Graduate Ecologist.					
Date of survey	Temperature (°C)	Humidity (%)	Cloud Cover (%)	Wind (km/h)	Rain
01/05/2024	12	93	100	13	None
Ecological Survey Factor	Detailed using desk study and site survey (carried out under good weather conditions). Any specific limitations noted within relevant section. This table may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.				
Conclusion, Impact or Recommendations					
Habitats and plants (see habitat map in appendix 1, location plan in appendix 2, photos in appendix 3 and proposal plan in appendix 4).					
Botanical species are described with reference to the DAFOR scale (D = Dominant; A = Abundant, F = Frequent, O = Occasional, R = Rare).					
Summary of Survey Findings		Site Context			
UKHab codes:		The site, situated at the National Grid Reference SO 06176 03795, has a site area of approximately 1.1ha. The grounds hold a large hotel, B1, and a public house/restaurant, B2. The buildings are surrounded by car parking, modified grass, introduced shrubs, scattered trees, and to the west of the site there is deciduous woodland.			
• Buildings (u1b5)					
• Hard standing (u1b)					
• Modified grass (g4)		The site is surrounded by residential buildings to the east, west and south, industrial units and warehouses to the north-west and south-east and the river Taff to the south-west in the wider landscape, west of the railway line and main roads.			
• Introduced shrubs (u1 867)		A small storm flow/tributary of the river is present along the west of the site to the south. There are no ponds within 500m.			
• Scattered trees (u1 32)		The river has priority habitat deciduous woodland along the embankments, likely a locally designated wildlife site and therefore the wider landscape has a moderate level of biodiversity. A site location map is provided in Appendix 2.			
• Woodland (w1)					
		Limitations			

	B2 and its interior was not surveyed due to no impact on this building. The whole of the site trees was not individually assessed for their suitability for roosting bats as the works is impacting the south end of B1 and hard standing car park. The trees closest to this were assessed. These limitations have been taken into account during the evaluation of the site and requirement for further surveys and mitigation. On-site habitat descriptions • Buildings (u1b5) • Hard standing (u1b) • Modified grass (g4) • Introduced shrubs (u1 867) • Scattered trees (u1 32) • Woodland (w1) <u>Buildings (u1b5)</u> There are two buildings on site. The hotel, B1, and the associated public house and restaurant, B2. B2 is not due to be impacted by the proposed works. B1 is assessed for its suitability for supporting roosting bats in the appropriate section below. The building had scaffolding at one location to enable a close-up inspection of the roof tiles. <u>Hard standing (u1b)</u> The majority of the site has tarmac car parking and access roads around the buildings. There are paved pathways around the site too. The hard standing has negligible ecological value. <u>Modified grass (g4)</u>
--	--

	The site has areas of well-managed, short, mown grass around the parking and introduced shrubs. Amongst the dominant perennial rye, common daisy, yarrow, and vetch was observed. Along the site edges and hedge boundaries and introduced shrubs, there is taller vegetation including herb robert, cleaver, and nettle. <u>Introduced shrubs (u1 867)</u> There are introduced shrubs and managed shrubs and hedges around the site. There is yew, snowberry, laurel, holly, crocosmia and there are also stands of Japanese knotweed. <u>Scattered trees (u1 32) and Woodland (w1)</u> Around the site, there are birch, cherry and Scots pine planted around the site, with mature beech present on site. To the west of the site is a woodland, which comprises field maple, alder, and sycamore, and it is fenced off from the main site. <i>Following the completion of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (November 2024), a total of thirteen trees—including eleven mature ash trees (Fraxinus excelsior) (partial removal of G08), one singular ash tree (T32) cherry (T33), and one monkey puzzle (Araucaria araucana)—were removed from the site, primarily along the southern and western boundaries. These works were confirmed in the Reactive Requirement Survey (Tree Squadron Ltd, August 2024). All trees were removed solely on the grounds of health and safety, as identified in the arboricultural reports, due to structural concerns and the presence of ash dieback symptoms, and not for development purposes.</i> Local notable habitats Notable habitats are present within 2km of site, with the closest being deciduous woodland located to the west of the site, fenced off from the car park. The woodland is in close proximity to the site, but there is hard standing present. It is likely works in that area will not impact tree roots. There is a storm flow/tributary of the river Taff to the south-west of the site, near to the proposed working area.
--	---

<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	On-site habitats The proposed development will result in the loss of hard standing, but could impact some modified grass also. Trees T05-8 will need to be removed to facilitate the works. This could result in a net loss in biodiversity at the site. However, the site has areas to improve and enhance. <i>The partial removal of tree group G08, (removal comprising 11 mature ash trees and one sapling) and individual trees T30 (monkey puzzle) and T32 and T33 has resulted in a loss of canopy cover, vertical structure, and localised shading. These features previously contributed to habitat diversity and supported potential foraging opportunities for birds and invertebrates. While the trees were not assessed for roosting bats and no protected species evidence was found at the time of removal, the clearance has nonetheless reduced the site's ecological complexity. The partial removal of G08 also represents the loss of the woodland habitat previously described in the original PEA/PRA. Although this habitat was limited in extent, it may have provided occasional cover or refuge for small mammals or nesting birds.</i> Notable habitats The proposed development is unlikely to impact the notable habitats due to the surrounding barriers in the form of carparks and secure fencing. The loss of habitat on site will not have a material impact on the much larger and better-quality habitats nearby as any species utilising both sites will still have ample habitat in the surrounding area. Pollution from works could impact the woodland and the watercourses.
<i>Recommendations</i>	On-site habitats Scrub, trees and flowering species should be retained, replacing with native species where possible. <i>To compensate for the loss of structural and habitat value, a minimum 1:1 native tree replacement is recommended for all trees to be removed within the planning boundary. As Tree T32 lies outside the application boundary, it does not require compensation under this scheme. Therefore, a total of 25 native replacement trees will be required. Replacement planting should utilise locally appropriate native species and, where possible, be located within or</i>

	<i>adjacent to the original positions to maintain habitat continuity and deliver biodiversity enhancements consistent with national planning policy.</i> Notable habitats Best practice measures to minimise the possibility of pollution must be implemented during construction. Controlled working measures to prevent any diffuse pollution or waste to the deciduous woodland or canal. Suggested biodiversity enhancements The planting of native tree and shrub species would be beneficial for wildlife, through the provision of sheltering and foraging habitats.
Locality and Designated Sites	
Summary of Survey Findings	On-site designations The site is not subject to any designation, and there are no known statutory sites adjacent to the site. Statutory designated sites (within 2km) Cwm Glo a Glyndyrys Site of Special Scientific Interest – SSSI (~1.2km northwest) – is designated for species-rich neutral grassland and acid grassland, and for the association of these habitats with others including woodland and heath. It is also of special interest for its assemblage of grassland fungi, including 32 species of waxcap. Biological Records Data (LERC 0245-422) There are 14 non-statutory designated sites within a 2km radius of the site. Some of the closest non-statutory sites include: • Afon Taf (149m) – Comprises the major river within the County Borough, with bankside habitats and associated semi-natural woodland. The river is known to hold ecological value for a wide range of bird, bat and reptile species and have records of Eurasian Otters present along the rivers' length.

	• Pentrebach Field (296m) – Strips of species-rich semi-improved natural grassland alongside a disused railway embankment dominated by fine-leaved grasses and supporting mesotrophic herbs. • Abercanaid Fields (445m) – A series of fields containing species-rich semi-improved and marshy grasslands with an area of semi-natural oak/birch woodland. The site also includes Webbler's pond, a nature reserve containing a section of Glamorganshire Canal, acid grassland and bracken slopes. • Pentrebach Tip (487m) – Comprises semi-upland acid grassland, dry heathland and bracken slopes, with some streams and areas of marshy grassland. Regionally rare and scarce invertebrate species present. • Troed-y-rhiw (666m) – Predominantly made up of dry heathland and bracken slopes with scattered trees and semi-improved grassland and some small areas of semi-natural woodland. There are two large old quarries in the south of the site. A wooded pond is also present, as well as several drainage ditches that cross the site. • Glynmil (769m) – Contains unimproved and semi-improved acid grassland, with small areas of dry acidic heath, marshy grasslands and bracken slopes. There is also an area of semi-natural oak woodland along with some localised areas of purple-moor grass pasture. Several ponds can be found distributed throughout the woodland area of the site. • Graig Gethin (786m) – An area of wooded ffridd slopes supporting a vast expanse of semi-natural woodland as well as wet heathland which extends into conifer woodland. There have been an abundance of breeding bird records.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	On-site designations None Statutory designated sites None. The SSSI is sufficiently far from the site and has considerable barriers between the two that the proposed development will not impact the designated site.
<i>Recommendations</i>	On-site designations None Statutory designated sites

	Best practice measures to minimise the possibility of pollution must be implemented during construction.
Invasive / Non-native species	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	Biological Records Data There are 14 records of invasive, non-native species within 2km of the site, over the last 10 years. These include: • Harlequin Ladybird – closest 313m east – 2 records • Japanese Knotweed – closest 751m west – 4 records • Butterfly-Bush – closest 1800m south – 1 record • Greater Periwinkle – closest 1936m northwest – 1 record • Heath Star Moss – closest 738m east – 4 records • Wall Cotoneaster – closest 2649m south – 1 record • Nuttall's Waterweed - closest 2659m southeast – 1 record Immediately adjacent to the proposed extension of the building, Japanese knotweed is present on site. Snowberry and cherry laurel were also recorded on site, whilst not schedule 9, are considered invasive.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	Any disturbance or damage to the plant or the soil could result in the spread of the plant – which is an offence. The visible stands above ground can have rhizomes underground which spread as far as 7m. <i>The works should not impact the snowberry or cherry laurel, and therefore spread of this species is unlikely.</i>
<i>Recommendations</i>	Visible stands of JPK should have secure fencing installed with a buffer of 7m from the visible stands to prevent machinery, materials or persons entering the zones and to prevent accidental spread. An invasive species management plan will be required to control and/or eradicate Japanese knotweed which will likely include the injection of strong herbicides and will require a waste permit for removal of hazardous waste from site. Specialist contractors should be contacted for treatment and removal of JPK.

	Works should avoid areas of snowberry and cherry laurel to prevent the spread of these species.
Invertebrates	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	Biological Records Data There are ~156 records of invertebrate species with Priority status within a 3km radius of the site, over the last 10 years. Several records are only allocated a date range (i.e., 20 records between 2001-2018) and as such, some of the records stated below are approximate estimates based on the data provided. • Dusky Brocade – closest 268m east - ~10 records • Garden Tiger – closest 268m east - ~10 records • Mottled Rustic – closest 268m east - ~8 records • Sallow – closest 268m east - ~8 records • Small Phoenix – closest 268m east - ~20 records • Dusky Thorn – closest 268m east - ~5 records • Rosy Rustic – closest 268m east – 1 record • Shoulder-striped Wainscot – closest 268m east - ~22 records • Brindled Beauty – closest 268m east - ~15 records • Buff Ermine – closest 268m east - ~30 records • Cinnbar – closest 268m east - ~10 records • Brown-Banded Carder Bee – closest 738m east – 1 record • Marsh Fritillary – closest 1190m northwest – 16 records No habitat for protected or notable invertebrates is found on site. The site will provide habitat value for common assemblages of invertebrates which could exploit the flowering shrubs onsite, woodland outside the fencing, watercourses, and trees.

<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	None foreseen as the proposed works is due to impact the building and the hard standing for the works.
<i>Recommendations</i>	No further surveys. Suggested biodiversity enhancements The following habitat creation and enhancement opportunities could be incorporated into the proposed development to provide additional opportunities for invertebrates on site: • beetle banks • dead wood piles • floral borders • Bee bricks
Bats	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	EPSL data The MAGIC.gov database does not hold EPSL data in Wales. However, with the presence of the river Taff, and areas of mixed woodland in all directions within the local landscape in addition the trees present on the southern site boundary, there is moderate value for commuting and foraging bats. Biological Records Data There 83 records for bat species within a 4km radius of the site, over the last 10 years. These include: • Soprano Pipistrelle – closest 329m west – 10 records (8 activity, 2 audible) • Common Pipistrelle – closest 329m west – 9 records (7 activity, 2 audible) • Myotis bat – closest 414m south – 6 records (4 activity, 2 audible) • Noctule – closest 414m south – 3 records (3 activity) • Brown Long-Eared Bat – closest 414m south – 5 records (3 activity, 2 audible) • Greater Horseshoe Bat – closest 1689m west – 10 records (3 activity, 7 audible)

	• Lesser Horseshoe Bat – closest 3028m north – 40 records (1 confirmed roost, 1 activity, 1 droppings with DNA analysis, 37 audible) Roosting habitat – Building 1 B1, is a two-storey L-shaped hotel building. The brickwork is covered by render, which is in excellent condition, no cracks, or visible crevices. The windows and doors are UPVC and in very good condition with no gaps around at all and no means of ingress. There are two chimneys, the flashing around them is also in very good condition. The roof is pitched and has slate tiles and lead flashing at the ends, which are mostly in excellent condition. The roof tiles are all present, with no slipped, missing, raised or broken tiles. The ridge tiles are present, with one small gap which can be utilised by crevice dwelling bat species to the north of the building, unconnected from the proposed works. One loft space was accessible during the time of the survey, which was inspected for evidence of bats. The loft was located within the southern section of the building and comprised of two sections separated by a fire door and wall. The loft was approximately 14m x 40m and had two storeys within so was approximately 4-5m from ridge to ground level. Roof structures were timber, and the roof lining was plastic, with an area of breathable lining at the north end of the loft. There was a central timber walk space along the centre of the loft, with a ladder to an elevated level which contained water tanks. The remaining spaces were covered in loose wool insulation. The loft was mostly secure. There were areas of gaps within the lining, particularly near the ridge of the loft (see Appendix 1b for approximate locations). The presence of undisturbed cobwebs along this area can indicate that bats are not using this area as an access or roosting point. With the exterior roof tiles being so well sealed, it is unlikely that bats could utilise these features to access the loft for roosting. No light entered either of the spaces and there were no droppings or feeding remains seen within. In addition, there is a bright green fire safety light permanently on within the loft space, the lux level lowers the suitability for roosting bats significantly.
--	---

	Based on this information, the building is concluded to have suitably low value for supporting roosting bats, but based on the proposals, the section of the building has negligible value for roosting bats. Roosting habitat – Building 2 There is another building (B2) within the red line boundary, a two-storey multipitch restaurant bar. The brickwork is covered by render, which is in excellent condition, no cracks, or visible crevices. There are three chimneys present. The windows and doors are UPVC and in very good condition with no gaps around at all and no means of ingress. The roof is pitched and has slate tiles and lead flashing at the ends, which are mostly in excellent condition. The roof tiles are all present, although there are some raised tiles around the chimney areas which crevice dwelling species may utilise. The internal of this building could not be accessed during the survey. Based on this information, the building is considered to have “low” value to support roosting bats Roosting habitat – T2, T5 – T8 T10 - T13 There are multiple trees on site. Some which have roosting features for bats to utilise, but four are due to be removed for the proposed works (T5- T8) and some are due to be pruned (T10-13) (See Arboricultural Survey to BS5837:2012, Arbtech Consulting, 2025 for tree numbers and descriptions for the whole site) and therefore were assessed for their suitability for roosting bats. T2, an alder has split bark on its limb. This crevice is open to the elements making this feature suboptimal. There are no other features present on the tree. This tree is not due to be removed. T5 and T6 are both alder with no suitable features on this tree for supporting roosting bat species.
--	--

	T7, is a silver birch with no suitable features on this tree for supporting roosting bat species. T8 and T13 are Scott's pine. T8 has east facing stem approximately 3m up. This crevice is open to the elements making this feature suboptimal. In addition, the feature is easily inspected and therefore can be checked prior to felling. There are no other features present on the tree. This tree is rated PRF-I. T13 has no suitable features on this tree for supporting roosting bat species. T10 and T12 are common holly, with no suitable features on this tree for supporting roosting bat species. T11 is horse chestnut with no suitable features on this tree for supporting roosting bat species Associated images of the buildings and trees surveyed can be found at the end of the report, Appendix 4 <i>Since completion of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, a number of trees have been removed from the site as part of a reactive safety programme (Tree Squadron Ltd, August 2024). This included a group of 11 mature ash trees (Fraxinus excelsior) and one ash sapling, all previously forming part of Group G08 in the accompanying Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Arbtech, April 2025). This group represented the woodland habitat described in the original version of this PEA/PRA, and G08 and T32 in the original Arboriculture report. In addition, a single monkey puzzle (Araucaria araucana) tree, referenced as T30, was removed from the southern boundary. These works were undertaken after the initial ecological survey was completed. The trees were not assessed for bat roost potential at the time, and no evidence of protected species was recorded during or following removal.</i> Foraging and commuting habitat
--	---

	Bats could use the woodland and watercourse for foraging along the boundaries within the local landscape for foraging and commuting and could also be used by bats dispersing from nearby roosts outside of the site and commuting around the area.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	Roosting habitat The buildings both have low value for roosting bats. B2 is not being impacted by the proposed development. The extension of B1 is not expected to impact the northern aspect of the building in which the only roosting feature was observed. Therefore, no impacts on bats are foreseen on these buildings during the proposed works. Foraging and commuting habitat Trees T5-T8 are due to be removed as part of the development in addition to pruning of T10-13. The removal of T8 could potentially destroy a roost if any bats are roosting within T8. No impacts on bats are foreseen for T2 as this tree is not being removed. No impacts are foreseen on the remaining trees. <i>The loss of the trees in G08 and T30 and T32 may have reduced foraging and commuting availability of the site however given the watercourse and remaining woodland nearby impacts are unlikely to be significant.</i> The proposed development may lead to an increase in the amount of current lighting of surrounding habitats or the retained building without mitigation. This may disturb commuting bats. Artificial lighting The proposed development may lead to an increase in the amount of current lighting of surrounding habitats or the retained buildings without mitigation. This may disturb commuting bats.
<i>Recommendations</i>	Foraging and commuting habitat No further surveys are recommended for the buildings on site.

	Roosting habitat As per Tables 6.3 and 7.1 of the Bat Survey Guidelines (2023) trees with PRF-I's only do not require further survey effort, however compensation for lost features should be installed prior to tree felling works, and works should be carried out under a precautionary working method statement (PWMS). The PWMS includes: • Prior to any PRF removal, suitable compensation should be provided onsite (i.e. bat boxes in appropriate locations) • Felling to be done under supervision by an ecologist • An inspection of any features to be carried out by the arborist under supervision of the ground-based ecologist on site • Any identified PRF-I feature(s) will be soft felled in conjunction with an experienced arborist. This will involve sections of the tree with the PRF to be cut away and lowered to the ground and inspected by a licenced ecologist • Any PRFs felled will be left in-situ on the ground within a 10m exclusion zone for 24 hours • In the unlikely event that a bat or evidence of bats is discovered during the development all work must stop and a bat licensed ecologist contacted for further advice. Artificial lighting A low impact lighting strategy will be adopted for the site during post-development which outlines the areas of the site that will be retained as dark corridors. Parameters can be found on the Bat Conservation Trust website: https://www.bats.org.uk/our-work/buildings-planning-and-development/lighting Suggested biodiversity enhancements The installation of two bat boxes at the site will provide additional roosting habitat for bats. The bat boxes will be integrated into the new building extension. Bat boxes should be positioned 3-5m above ground level facing in a south or south-westerly direction with a clear flight path to and from the entrance, away from artificial light. The bat box will be a specification suitable for crevice dwelling species such as Vivara pro building bat box, Integrated eco bat box for crevice dwellers, or a similar alternative. To compensate for the loss of tree T8, a woodstone or woodcrete bat box will be added
--	--

	to a suitable mature tree on site. The bat box should be positioned 3-5m above ground level facing in a south or south-westerly direction with a clear flight path to and from the entrance, away from artificial light
Birds	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	Biological Records Data There are ~850 records of bird species within a 2km radius of the site, over the last 10 years. Several records are only allocated a date range (i.e., 20 records between 2001-2018) and as such, some of the records stated below are approximate estimates based on the data provided. • Greenfinch – closest 270m southwest – 1 record • Lesser Redpoll – closest 270m southwest - ~30 records • House Sparrow – closest 270m southwest - ~25 records • Dunnock – closest 270m southwest - ~45 records • Willow Warbler – closest 438m southeast - ~55 records • Swallow – closest 438m southeast - ~30 records • Green Woodpecker – closest 438m southeast - ~25 records • Herring Gull – closest 438m southeast - ~23 records • Wren – closest 438m southeast - ~46 records • Lesser Black-Backed Gull – closest 438m southeast - ~40 records • Kestrel – closest 438m southeast - ~15 records • Jackdaw – closest 438m southeast - ~30 records • Song Thrush – closest 438m southeast - ~60 records • Red Kite – closest 438m southeast – 9 records • Grey Heron – closest 650m south – 10 records • Mistle Thrush – closest 739m south – ~50 records

	• Mallard – closest 739m south - ~13 records • Bullfinch – closest 739m south - ~20 records • Goldcrest – closest 739m south - ~30 records • Dipper – closest 739m south - ~13 records • Starling – closest 739m south - ~10 records • Redstart – closest 775m east - ~20 records • Spotted Flycatcher – closest 775m east – 4 records • Cuckoo – closest 775m east - ~20 records • Wood Warbler – closest 838m west – 10 records • Barn Owl – closest 839m south - ~11 records • Hobby – closest 841m east – 1 record • Long-tailed Tit – closest 977m north - ~12 records • Goshawk – closest 977m north – 4 records • Tree Pipit – closest 1076m west - ~25 records • Peregrine – closest 1145m southeast – 5 records • Linnet – closest 1145m southeast - ~20 records • Meadow Pipit – closest 1356m east - ~55 records • Swift – closest 1356m east - ~8 records • Skylark – closest 1356m east - ~52 records • Redwing – closest 1819m northwest - ~3 records Habitats on site
--	---

	No evidence of nesting birds was identified on the building or hard standing; however, birds could use the trees and hedges for nesting or foraging. No habitat for schedule 1 birds was observed. Magpies, wood pigeon, blackbird, and carrion crows were observed on or flying over site. Barn owls The site does not provide any suitable nesting sites for barn owls.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	The proposed development could result in the destruction or the disturbance and subsequent abandonment of active bird nests adjacent to the building. The development will also involve the felling of 4 trees and pruning of 4 trees and 3 hedgerows.
<i>Recommendations</i>	Vegetation removal should be undertaken outside of March – August. If this can't be avoided, then a pre commencement check for nesting birds should be undertaken by a suitably licenced ecologist. Precautions should be taken with machinery and noise levels when working close to any retained nests so as not to disturb any nearby nesting birds during construction works. At least a 3-5m buffer should be created between any machinery and active nests until the young have fledged. Suggested biodiversity enhancements The installation of two bird boxes at the site will provide additional nesting habitat for birds. The boxes will be incorporated into the new build. Species-specific bird boxes should be installed in line with manufacturers specifications. Sparrow terraces or swift cups are advised to be installed. Recommended boxes include the Habitat Sparrow terrace, Bird Brick Houses nest box, or a similar alternative.
Reptiles	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	EPSL data A review of the MAGIC database returns no granted EPSL records for protected reptiles within 3km of the site within Wales.

	Biological Records Data There are 6 records of reptile species within 3km of the site, over the last 10 years. These include: • Slow-worm - closest 475m east – 2 records • Grass Snake – closest 583m northwest – 1 record • Common Lizard – closest 838m southwest – 3 records On-site habitats The proposed development site overall does not present high suitability for reptiles due to a lack of suitable habitat, in particular as the working area is only due to impact the hard standing and the existing building. The woodland and watercourse offer suitability for supporting reptiles, but not the habitats due to be worked within.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	Buildings and hard standing will be impacted during construction. The loss of such habitats is likely to be inconsequential to local reptile populations owing to their low value and the presence of more extensive habitat locally.
<i>Recommendations</i>	None. Suggested biodiversity enhancements The following habitat creation and enhancement opportunities could be incorporated into the proposed development which would be beneficial for reptiles but also small animals within the landscape such as hedgehogs: • Creation of reptile refugia and hibernacula using debris and brash from site clearance. • Planting of native scrub and grassland to increase foraging opportunities.
Amphibians	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	EPSL data The MAGIC database does not show granted EPSL, class licence or pond survey records for great crested newts within 2km of the site due to being located within Wales. Biological Records Data


	There are 11 records of amphibious species within 3km of the site, over the last 10 years. These include: • Common Frog – closest 1158m west – 3 records • Common Toad – closest 1718m northeast – 1 record • Great Crested Newt – closest 1718m northeast – 7 records On-site habitats A review of aerial imagery indicates the absence of ponds within 500m. The river and tributary are close to site, but flowing water can act as a barrier to dispersal of amphibians. The hard standing and building are suboptimal for great crested newts and common amphibians due to a lack of refuge from predation, and lack of connectivity. However, the woodland and watercourse offer suitability.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	Hard standing and the building will be impacted during construction. When completing the rapid risk assessment published by Natural England (Natural England 2015), the proposed development produces a Green risk score, which states: Offence Highly Unlikely.
<i>Recommendations</i>	No further surveys are required. Suggested biodiversity enhancements The site could be enhanced for amphibians' post-development through creation of amphibian hibernacula using rubble and logs from site clearance. Information on how to construct a hibernaculum can be found here: https://www.wiltshirewildlife.org/hibernaculum
Badger	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	Biological Records Data There are 3 records of Eurasian Badgers within 3km of the site, over the last 10 years. The nearest of these records is located 879m to the west of the site.

	No evidence of badgers (e.g. latrines, snuffle holes, hairs) or badger setts were identified on or within influencing distance (30m radius) of the site. Furthermore, the topography of site (and surrounding area as viewed by google earth) is broadly level. Furthermore, the site itself is predominately hard standing which is suboptimal for badgers.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	Modified grass and hard standing will be removed during the works. The loss of such habitats is likely to be inconsequential to local badger populations owing to their low value and the presence of more extensive habitat locally. However, with the canal and woodland, badgers may be present in the habitats adjacent to site.
<i>Recommendations</i>	A basic precautionary mitigation during works is recommended: - Any excavations will be covered overnight, or a ramp will be installed to enable any trapped animals to escape. - The use of night-time lighting will be avoided, or sensitive lighting design will be implemented to avoid light spill on to habitats which badgers could use. South and west boundaries. - Any chemicals or pollutants used or created by the development should be stored and disposed of correctly according to COSHH regulations. - In the unlikely event that a badger sett is identified within 30m, works must cease and advice must be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist. Suggested biodiversity enhancements The following habitat creation and enhancement opportunities could be incorporated into the proposed development which would be beneficial for badgers: - Planting fruit bearing trees and species-rich grassland to increase foraging opportunities.
Riparian animals	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	Biological Records Data There are 4 records of Eurasian Otters within 3km of the site, over the last 10 years. The nearest of these is located 1595m to the southeast.

	The river tributary or storm flow to the south and west of the site has heavily shaded banks due to the woodland and has reduced suitability for water voles. However, the watercourse could be used for commuting otter, but as this is a branch off the main river and therefore reduced suitability for otters in the landscape being located next to the main road and landscaped adjacent to the development as likely urban drainage run-off channels.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	No impacts are anticipated on riparian animals as a result of the proposed development as the works is impacting hard standing and B1.
<i>Recommendations</i>	Precautionary measures for pollution are required during construction.
Hazel dormouse	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	EPSL data MAGIC does not return EPSLs within Wales. On-site and surrounding habitats No evidence of dormice was found within the site. It is not anticipated that dormice are present on the site due to the lack of suitable habitats present. For isolated habitats in the UK, research indicates that dormice require 20ha of woodland habitat to support a viable population (Bright et al. 1994). There are no areas of woodland on the site that are big enough (20ha) to support a dormouse population.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	No impacts are anticipated on hazel dormice as a result of the proposed development.
<i>Recommendations</i>	None.
Other e.g. hedgehog	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	Biological Records Data There are 9 records of other terrestrial mammals within 3km of the site, over the last 10 years. These include: • Polecat – closest 182m west – 1 record • West European Hedgehog – closest 704m southwest – 8 records

	The habitat recorded onsite provides a small area of suitable, albeit limited commuting and foraging opportunities for hedgehogs in the form of shrubs and a more optimal habitats with the fenced off woodland. However, this habitat is surrounded by main roads and residential housing with secure fencing. Although no evidence indicating the presence of hedgehogs was recorded, access to on-site habitats is available for hedgehogs. The future presence of foraging and commuting hedgehogs for transient periods cannot be discounted.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	The proposed development will result in the loss hard standing. The loss of such habitats is likely to be inconsequential to local hedgehog populations owing to their low value. However, construction activities could result in the death or injury of hedgehogs, if present.
<i>Recommendations</i>	Similar to the badgers, a precautionary working method will be implemented during construction, including the following measures: • Any excavations will be covered overnight, or a ramp will be installed to enable any trapped animals to escape. • The use of night-time lighting will be avoided, or sensitive lighting design will be implemented to avoid light spill on to retained habitats which hedgehogs could use. • Any chemicals or pollutants used or created by the development should be stored and disposed of correctly according to COSHH regulations. • If any hedgehogs are found in the working area these should be allowed to disperse of their own accord or, if at immediate risk, should be moved by hand to a sheltered, vegetated area away from disturbance. Suggested biodiversity enhancements The following habitat creation and enhancement opportunities could be incorporated into the proposed development which would be beneficial for hedgehogs: • Creation of brash piles or installation of hedgehog houses in shady areas. • Installation of gaps under new boundary fencing to enable hedgehogs to move freely through the site.


Appendix 1: Survey/Habitat map




Appendix 2: Location map



Appendix 3: Proposed plan





Appendix 4: Photos

	< Image 1: North elevation of B1 with rendered brickwork and secure slate roof tiles.	
	< Image 3: A close up of the field tiles on the east elevation of B1. They are in excellent condition.	

	< Image 5: Looking northwest at the field tiles on the L of the building. > Image 6: A close up of the minor, narrow, ridge gap on this northern elevation.	
	< Image 7: South elevation of B1 and T2 in front of it, which has no features present. > Image 8: The exterior of B2. The west facing elevation.	

	< Image 9: South and east elevations of B2. > Image 10: The loft space of B1. There are undisturbed cobwebs along the ridge.	
	< Image 11: Close-up of some gaps along the ridge internally, but with no connection to the exterior of the building. > Image 12: Green fire exit light on permanently within the loft space.	

	< Image 13: internal walls were secure with no external light entering, no evidence of bats or droppings found inside. > Image 14: The limb feature on T8 which can be inspected prior to felling.	
	< Image 15: T2, an alder, is further south of T1 and T2 and not due to be impacted by the works but has some features present. > Image 16: The limb feature on T2 close-up.	

	< Image 17: Mature beech trees, willow trees and short modified grass on site. > Image 18: A large stand of JPK adjacent to the south-west corner of the building to be developed.	
	< Image 19: T8 > Image 20: T5 and T6	

	<Image 21: T7 >image 22: T30 which has now been removed (Tree Squadron Ltd, August 2024)	
	< Image 23: Tree group G08 in which some trees have been removed (Tree Squadron Ltd, August 2024)	

Appendix 5: Tree Removal Plan (Tree Squadron Ltd, August 2024)



Legal

Arbtech Consulting Limited has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named client or their agents in accordance with our General Terms and Conditions, under which our services are performed. It is expressly stated that no other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Limited. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by third parties. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Limited.

© This report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

Version control			
Status	Issue	Name	Date
Draft	0.1	Katy Perry, BSc (Hons), MCIEEM, Senior Consultant (Natural England Bat Licence Number: 2022-10404-CL18-BAT, NRW (S092694/1, GCN Licence 2018-35157-CLS-CLS and Dormouse Licence 2020-49929-CLS-CLS	17/05/2024
Final	1.0	Katy Perry, BSc (Hons), MCIEEM, Senior Consultant (Natural England Bat Licence Number: 2022-10404-CL18-BAT, NRW (S092694/1, GCN Licence 2018-35157-CLS-CLS and Dormouse Licence 2020-49929-CLS-CLS	17/05/2024
Amended	2.0	Alexie Jenkins, BSc (Hons), MRes, AMRSB, Graduate Ecologist	02/09/2024
Reviewed	2.1	Mel Reid BSc (Hons) MRes MRSB, Senior Consultant	02/09/2024
Amended	2.2	Leah Cook, Consultant Ecologist	10/09/2024
Updated with new plans	3.0	Alexie Jenkins, BSc (Hons), MRes, AMRSB, Graduate Ecologist	02/10/2024
Updated	4.0	Alexie Jenkins, BSc (Hons), MRes, AMRSB, Graduate Ecologist	22/11/2024
Updated	5.0	Alexie Jenkins BSc (Hons), MRes, AMRSB, Consultant Ecologist	16/06/2025
Updated	6.0	Alexie Jenkins BSc (Hons), MRes, AMRSB, Consultant Ecologist	27/08/2025
Updated	7.0	Alexie Jenkins BSc (Hons), MRes, AMRSB, Consultant Ecologist	14/10/2025