

65 Longcroft Road, Devizes

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) Report

Final

1890a/Version V2.0

Client: Trevor Williams

Date: 3 March 2026

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Report prepared for:

Trevor Williams

Main contributors:

Katie Tamin, BSc (Hons), MSc

Consultant Ecologist

V1.0 Reviewed by:

Liz Johns BSc (Hons) MSc CEnv MCIEEM MRSB

Director

V2.0 Reviewed by:

Tessa Pepler BSc (Hons) MSc MCIEEM

Issued by:

Katie Tamin, BSc (Hons), MSc

Consultant Ecologist

Green Tree House, 11 St Margaret's St, Bradford on Avon, Wiltshire, BA15 1DA
T: 01225 723652 | E: info@johnsassociates.co.uk | W: www.johnsassociates.co.uk

DOCUMENT REVISIONS

Version	Details	Date
1.0 Draft	Draft Preliminary Ecological Appraisal issued to Client for review	27 th January 2026
1.0 Final	Final Preliminary Ecological Appraisal issued to Client for submission	6 th February 2026
2.0 Draft	Draft Revised Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Assessment issued to Client for review	2 nd March 2026
2.0 Final	Final Revised Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Roost Assessment issued to Client for submission	3 rd March 2026

Third party disclaimer

Any disclosure of this report to a third party is subject to this disclaimer. The report was prepared by Johns Associates at the instruction of, and for use by, our client named on the front of the report. It does not in any way constitute advice to any third party who is able to access it by any means. Johns Associates excludes to the fullest extent lawfully permitted all liability whatsoever for any loss or damage howsoever arising from reliance on the contents of this report. We do not however exclude our liability (if any) for personal injury or death resulting from our negligence, for fraud or any other matter in relation to which we cannot legally exclude liability.

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

Purpose of the Report	To provide the results of a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) and a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) conducted at 65 Longcroft Road, Devizes to inform the requirement for further ecological surveys and to identify the need for avoidance, mitigation, compensation and/or enhancement measures.
Surveys Undertaken	An extended UKHab survey was conducted of all areas within the red line planning boundary at the Site to provide a habitat baseline on 16 th December 2025. A PRA was conducted on the existing dwelling within the Site boundary on 23 rd February 2026.
Summary of Results	The bungalow loft void had a confirmed bat roost (droppings) on the southeast elevation and the side porch had negligible/low potential for roosting bats.
Conclusions	The Site is of low value to foraging and commuting bats.
Avoidance	The works to be conducted under a Precautionary Working Method Statement for Bats. Any rubble and brick piles (or similar) should be removed manually.
Mitigation	The works to be conducted under a Precautionary Working Method Statement for Bats. Trenches/holes should not be left open overnight during construction or access ramps should be provided to enable any trapped animals to escape.
Compensation / Enhancement	One bat box (Greenwood's Ecohabitats two crevice bat box) will be installed on the existing dwelling. Habitat refugia/hibernacula piles will be created around the edges of the grassland area to provide shelter for amphibians. Bitumen roofing recommended to be used in the proposed bungalow. Breathable Roof Membrane (BRM) should be avoided due to it causing fatality to bats which become entangled in the fibres.
Data Valid Until	February 2027

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	Summary of Proposals	1
1.3	Purpose of this Report	1
1.4	Personnel	1
1.5	Site Description and Location	2
1.6	Legislation and Policy	2
2	METHODOLOGY	4
2.1	zone of influence	4
2.2	Desk study.....	4
2.2.1	Data Search	5
2.3	field survey	5
2.3.1	UKHab Survey.....	5
2.3.2	Species.....	7
2.4	Limitations, Constraints and Assumptions.....	9
3	RESULTS	11
3.1	Zone of Influence.....	11
3.2	Desk study.....	11
3.2.1	Statutory Designated Sites.....	11
3.2.2	Non-Statutory Designated Sites	11
3.2.3	Priority Habitats	11
3.2.4	Protected and Notable Species Records.....	11
3.2.5	Granted Protected Species Licenses.....	13
3.2.6	Great Crested Newt (GCN) Pond Surveys 2017 to 2019.....	14
3.2.7	Ponds within 500 m of the Site.....	14
3.3	Field Survey Results – Habitats	14
3.4	Field Survey Results – Species	19
3.4.1	Amphibians (including great crested newt GCN)	19
3.4.2	Badgers	19
3.4.3	Dormouse	19
3.4.4	Breeding Birds.....	19
3.4.5	Reptiles	19
3.4.6	Bats.....	19
4	ECOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT, CONSTRAINTS & OPPORTUNITIES	25
4.1	Statutory Designated Sites	25
4.2	Non-Statutory Designated Sites	25
4.3	Habitats	25
4.4	Species	25
4.4.1	Bats.....	25
4.4.2	Priority Species.....	27
5	BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN (BNG)	28
5.1	BNG Exemption statement	28
6	CONCLUSIONS	29
7	REFERENCES	30

APPENDIX A – LEGISLATION AND PLANNING POLICY

APPENDIX B - POST-DEVELOPMENT UKHAB PLAN

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Trevor Williams commissioned Johns Associates Ltd to undertake a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) and Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) of the existing site at 65 Longcroft Road, Devizes to inform a planning application. The site is located at post code SN10 3AX (central Ordnance Survey (OS) grid reference SU 01372 60962). The Site consists of an existing two-bedroom semi-detached bungalow, associated gardens and hard-standing driveway.

1.2 SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

The proposal is to demolish the side porch of the existing dwelling, and construct a single storey dwelling and associated parking, turning and private amenity space associated with the existing dwelling.

1.3 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The purpose of this report is to identify key ecological constraints to the proposed development and inform master-planning to allow significant ecological effects to be avoided or minimised wherever possible. The information in this report enables any further ecological surveys needed to be identified and appropriately designed. The purpose of the report is to:

- Provide an ecological baseline.
- Identify key ecological constraints to the proposed development.
- Inform master-planning to allow significant ecological effects to be avoided or minimised wherever possible.
- Provide the requirements for further surveys.
- Provide an indication (where possible) of the likely mitigation or compensation measures that will be required as part of the development proposals.

1.4 PERSONNEL

The UKHab Survey was conducted by Katie Tamin BSc (Hons) MSc, a Consultant Ecologist at Johns Associates who has worked in ecological consultancy since 2023. Katie has a BSc (Hons) in Zoology, an MSc in Global Wildlife Health and Conservation, and is a qualifying member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM).

The PRA was conducted by Ellie Hack BSc (Hons) ACIEEM, Principal Bat Ecologist at Johns Associates with seven years' experience in ecological consultancy. Ellie is particularly experienced in bat ecology, working as bat specialist within the company – she holds Level 3 and 4 bat licences, and has extensive experience in designing and implementing bat mitigation schemes for complex projects. Ellie was assisted by Katie Tamin.

The desk study was conducted by George Jones BSc (Hons), an Assistant Ecologist at Johns Associates who has worked in ecological consultancy since May 2025. George has a BSc in Conservation Biology and Ecology and is a qualifying member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM).

The V1.0 PEA Report was produced by Katie Tamin and reviewed prior to issue by Liz Johns BSc (Hons) MSc, a Director at Johns Associates Ltd with 30 years of experience as a professional ecologist. Liz has held full membership of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (MCIEEM) since 2001 and Chartered Environmentalist (CEnv) status since 2005. She is also a full member of the Royal Society of Biology (MRSB).

The V2.0 PEA and PRA Report was produced by Katie Tamin and reviewed prior to issue by Tessa Pepler BSc (Hons) MSc MCIEEM, a Principal Ecologist at Johns Associates who has worked as an ecological consultant since 2005. Tessa has a BSc (Hons) in Environmental Studies and an MSc in Ecology and Management of the Natural Environment. Tessa is a full member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (MCIEEM) and holds a Natural England Class 1 survey licence for bats (2019-40584-CLS-CLS-1), great crested newt (2015-18828-CLS-CLS), and dormice (2016-20745-CLS-CLS). Tessa is proficient in botanical identification and is certified FISC Level 3.

1.5 SITE DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

65 Longcroft Road, which hereafter is referred to as the 'Site', comprises pre-existing semi-detached bungalow, associated gardens and hard-standing driveway. The Site is located within Devizes in Wiltshire. The area of the Site is approximately 0.047 ha in size and it is situated within a residential setting bordered to the north, east, south and west by other properties. Approximately 180 m to the west of the Site is Devizes Leisure Centre and its associated grounds and approximately 260 m south of the Site is Devizes Town Football Club and its associated grounds.

At the landscape level, the Site is surrounded by other residential properties. The Kennet and Avon Canal is located approximately 700 m to the north of the Site. The A342 road runs to the southeast approximately 120 m south of the Site. The Site is located in a suburban setting; connectivity to the wider landscape is sub-optimal for mobile species; roads and fencing present a barrier to dispersal to some mobile species and there is a lack of connecting linear features.

1.6 LEGISLATION AND POLICY

The legislation and national and local planning policies which are relevant to this assessment are provided in Appendix A to this report.

Figure 1: Site Location Red Line Boundary Plan and Context of Site



2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 ZONE OF INFLUENCE

The development proposals were reviewed by an ecologist, along with notable species records from the desk study and survey results. Based on these parameters, a zone of influence was determined for the development. The key issues relating to biodiversity receptors and the proposed development are as follows:

- The effects of temporary and permanent habitat loss from land taken by construction areas;
- Damage/harm to fauna;
- The effects of pollution (construction dust and pollution from accidental spillage of fuels, lubricants etc. that may affect terrestrial habitats);
- Noise, visual or light disturbance to fauna;
- The positive effects of ecological enhancement from creation, enhancement and management of habitats within the Site boundary.

Consideration of potential disturbance to ecological receptors from noise, vibration, visual or light was extended across the application Site and adjacent habitats.

2.2 DESK STUDY

A desk study was undertaken to collate all relevant existing information relating to the Site and its surrounding area. The data was used to inform the scope of the Site survey and to enable a full assessment of the likely effects of any development at the Site on any sites, habitats, or species of conservation interest to be carried out. The Multi Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) website was used to conduct the following desk study searches on 6th January 2026:

- Records and citations to a 1 km radius for national statutory designated wildlife sites including Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Local Nature Reserves (LNR) and National Nature Reserves (NNRs).
- Records and citations to a 5 km radius for international statutory designated wildlife sites including Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Ramsar Sites.
- Records and citations to a 10 km radius for SACs designated for supporting species of bats.
- Records of European Protected Species Licenses (EPSL) to a 2 km radius for bats and dormice *Muscardinus avellanarius*.
- Records to a 1 km radius of pond surveys conducted by Natural England from 2017 to 2019 for great crested newts (GCN) *Triturus cristatus* and records of GCN EPSL to 1 km radius from Site.
- Locations of ponds within a 500 m radius of the Site.
- Records within a 250 m radius of Priority Habitats listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) Act 2006

Google Maps aerial images were used to assess habitats at a landscape level (www.maps.google.com) in proximity to the Site.

2.2.1 Data Search

A data search was conducted with the Wiltshire and Swindon Biological Records Centre (WSBRC) on 6th January 2026 to identify the presence of legally protected and/or notable species records and non-statutory designated wildlife sites within 1 km of the proposed Site.

2.3 FIELD SURVEY

An extended UKHab survey of the Site were undertaken on 16th December 2025 by Katie Tamin BSc (Hons) MSc from Johns Associates Ltd. The weather was 7°C, dry and cloudy with good visibility. This survey was completed in accordance with Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (CIEEM, 2017) and BS42020:2013 Biodiversity - Code of practice for planning and development (British Standards Institute, 2013).

2.3.1 UKHab Survey

The on-Site and off-Site (where accessible) habitats were classified following the UK Habitat Classification (UKHab) Version 2.0 (2023) guidelines, which provides a more detailed interpretation of baseline habitat survey data than previous habitat classifications systems, such as Phase 1 Habitat Assessments. The professional edition of UKHab "UK Habitat Classification – Professional Edition 1"(UKHab-P) was used which includes Priority Habitat Types, all Annex 1 Habitats and the habitats listed in EUNIS.

The classification of primary habitats is hierarchical with five levels with a list of Secondary Codes; the latter is sub-divided into Essential codes and Additional codes. It is mandator that each recorded habitat parcel is allocated single primary Habitat Code and to record the presence of all Essential Secondary Code features associated with that habitat parcel. Additional Secondary Codes can also be associated with habitat parcels, where it is relevant to the whole parcel. Up to six Secondary Codes can be allocated to a single habitat.

UKHab v2.0 has a total of 268 Secondary Codes, sub-divided into 15 major groupings. Secondary codes are added to habitat parcels to:

- Confirm the identity of habitat mosaic and complexes.
- Add information about habitat origin and modifications.
- Add information on environmental context, management and land use in a consistent manner.

Essential Secondary Codes are identified as 2-digit numbers (10 – 90). Additional Secondary Codes (100 – 853) are 3-digit numbers and cover features including land management, land use (incorporating green infrastructure), environmental qualifiers, species features and hydrological regime descriptors. The UK Habitat Classification v2.0 Secondary Code Groupings are provided in Table 1.

Table 1: The UK Habitat Classification v2.0 Secondary Code Groupings

UKHab v2.0 Secondary Code Grouping	Description	UKHab v2.0 Codes
Secondary Essentials – Grasslands and Heathland	Habitat mosaic types and complexes that occur in the grassland, heathlands, hedgerows and scrub habitat	10 – 19
Secondary Essentials – Woodlands and Trees	Habitat complexes, origins and mosaic types that principally occur in woods associated with trees	25 – 34
Secondary Essentials – Freshwater	Habitat complexes and origins that principally occur in freshwater habitats	40 – 51
Secondary Essentials – Wetlands	Habitat complexes and environmental qualifiers that principally occur in wetlands	55 – 57
Secondary Essentials – All habitats	Habitat descriptors that can occur on any habitat	60 – 63

UKHab v2.0 Secondary Code Grouping	Description	UKHab v2.0 Codes
Secondary Essentials – Coast	Habitat complexes that principally occur on the coast	70 – 77
Secondary Essentials – Built environment	Habitat complexes, mosaics, land uses and green infrastructure principally associated with the built environment	80 – 90
Additional Secondary Codes – Grasslands and Heathlands	Habitat management, land use, environmental qualifier and species features principally associated with grassland, heathlands, hedgerows and scrub habitat	100 – 131
Additional Secondary Codes – Woodlands and Trees	Habitat management, land use, environmental qualifiers and species features principally associated with woods and trees	200 – 217
Additional Secondary Codes – Freshwater	Habitat management, land use, environmental qualifiers and species features principally associated with freshwater habitats	300 – 323
Additional Secondary Codes – Wetlands	Hydrological regime, habitat management and species features principally associated with wetlands	400 – 425
Additional Secondary Codes – All habitats	Additional habitat descriptors that can occur on any habitat	500 – 532
Additional Secondary Codes – Farming	Habitat management and land uses principally associated with farmlands	600 – 618
Additional Secondary Codes – Coast	Land use and environmental qualifiers principally associated with coastal areas	700 – 703
Additional Secondary Codes – Built environment	Land use and green infrastructure descriptors principally associated with the built environment	800 – 853

Where appropriate, maps were supplemented with target notes which provided specific information on habitats present that were too limited in extent to map at the scale at which data is presented, or the presence of species and habitats of ecological interest.

An annotated habitat map together with descriptions of the recorded habitat types was produced, which was subsequently digitised using a geographical information system (ArcGIS). The survey also included identification of any non-native invasive plant species. Flora taxonomy follows the nomenclature detailed in New Flora of the British Isles (4th Edition) (Stace C., 2019). Flora, where appropriate, are given a descriptive score of abundance using the DAFOR scale, as follows:

- D – Dominant
- A – Abundant
- F – Frequent
- O – Occasional
- R – Rare
- L – Locally (to be used as a prefix for any of the above)
- V – Very (to be used as a prefix for any of the above)

ArcGIS Symbology

At the time of production, a complete symbology for all habitats in the UK Habitat Classification Professional Edition (UKHab-P) was not available. The UK Habitat Classification Basic Edition (UKHab-B) symbology has therefore been used, and where necessary to add in habitats not included in UKHab-B we have designed our own hatching system within the Level 2 colours for those habitats – following the guidance provided in the UK Habitat Classification Basic Edition: Suggested Symbology for Maps document (UKHab, 2020).

Minimum Mapping Units

UKHab guidance indicated that UKHab has 3 Minimal Mapping Units (MMU's):

- 25 m² and 5 m length for urban and small-scale development projects, fine scale mapping of designated sites
- 400 m² and 20 m length for landscape scale surveys
- 2500 m² for larger unenclosed upland habitats.

Large scale, simple habitats or feasibility surveys should use a larger MMU. For this project, given the size of the site and the scale of the map the 25 m² and 5 m length MMU has been applied. This will allow all habitats to be clearly visible on the map whilst enabling enough fine detail to remain to clearly show all habitats present.

2.3.2 Species

The survey was 'extended' to assess the suitability of the Site and immediately adjacent habitats to support legally protected and/or notable species, including (but not limited to) plants, badger *Meles meles*, bats, dormouse, amphibians, reptiles and breeding birds. This included recording visible signs of species presence and/or features that may indicate likely presence. Hedgerows/corridors were assessed for likely value for dormice, trees on Site were assessed for their suitability for roosting bats and waterbodies/ watercourses assessed for suitability for great crested newt, otter and water vole. A search for Invasive Non-Native Species e.g. Japanese knotweed *Reynoutria japonica* was also conducted within the Site and immediately adjacent areas.

2.3.3 Preliminary Roost Assessment

A survey of the built structure on Site was carried out on 23rd February 2026 by Ellie Hack (2025-85938-CL19/20-BAT) and Katie Tamin. The weather was dry, cloudy and 10 °C. The inspection followed the professional survey guidance as detailed in Bat Survey Guidelines for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (Bat Conservation Trust, 2023).

The survey entailed a direct search for evidence of bats on both internal and external features of the buildings. The external building inspections were carried out from the ground. Other supporting equipment included close focusing binoculars and a high-powered torch, as required. The buildings were examined externally for features that could support roosting bats and features that could lead to internal potential roost features (PRFs). The buildings were also subject to an internal inspection.

The presence of roosting bats can be observed through signs such as accumulations of moth or butterfly wings or bat droppings and staining and/or scratch marks around potential entrance and exit points. However, the absence of droppings/evidence cannot be treated as conclusive proof that bats are not present, and therefore an assessment was also made of the potential of the building to support bats based on the criteria detailed by the Bat Conservation Trust (2023) and provided in Table 2 below.

Foraging and Community Habitat for Bats

The overall suitability of the Site and adjacent habitats for foraging and commuting bats was also assessed to determine its importance within the wider local context, particularly with reference to the location of known roosts obtained through the Desk Study. The assessment was conducted using the criteria described in Table 2.

Table 2: Guidelines for Assessing the Potential Suitability of Proposed Development Sites for Bats, Based on Presence of Habitat Features within the Landscape, to be Applied using Professional Judgement (Bat Conservation Trust, 2023)

Suitability	Commuting and Foraging Habitats
None	No habitat features on site likely to be used by any commuting or foraging bats at any time of the year (i.e. no habitats that provide continuous lines of shade/protection for flight-lines or generate/shelter insect populations available to foraging bats).
Negligible ^a	No obvious habitat features on site likely to be used as flightpaths or by foraging bats; however, a small element of uncertainty remains in order to account for non-standard bat behaviour.
Low	Habitat that could be used by small numbers of bats as flightpaths such as a gappy hedgerow or unvegetated stream, but isolated, i.e. not very well connected to the surrounding landscape by other habitat. Suitable, but isolated habitat that could be used by small numbers of foraging bats such as a lone tree (not in a parkland situation) or a patch of scrub.
Moderate	Continuous habitat connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for flightpaths such as lines of trees and scrub or linked back gardens. Habitat that is connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for foraging such as trees, scrub, grassland or water.
High	Continuous, high-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by bats for flightpaths such as river valleys, streams, hedgerows, lines of trees and woodland edge. High-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by foraging bats such as broadleaved woodland, tree-lined watercourses and grazed parkland. Site is close to and connected to known roosts.
a. Negligible is defined as 'so small or unimportant as to be not worth considering, insignificant'. This category may be used where there are places that a bat could roost or forage (due to one attribute) but it is unlikely that they actually would (due to another attribute). b. For example, in terms of temperature, humidity, height above ground level, light levels or levels of disturbance. c. Evidence from the Netherlands shows mass swarming events of common pipistrelle bats in the autumn followed by mass hibernation in a diverse range of building types in urban environments (Korsten <i>et al.</i>, 2016 and Jansen <i>et al.</i>, 2022). Common pipistrelle swarming has been observed in the UK (Bell, 2022 and Tomlison, 2020) and winter hibernation of numbers of this species has been detected at Seaton Delaval Hall in Northumberland (National Trust, 2018). This phenomenon requires some research in the UK, but ecologists should be aware of the potential for larger numbers of this species to be present during the autumn and winter in prominent buildings in the landscape, urban or otherwise.	

2.4 LIMITATIONS, CONSTRAINTS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The findings of this report are considered valid at the time of survey (16th December 2025 and 23rd February 2026). Should there be delays to the project timetable and/or implementation of the proposed development, updated desk study and/or survey work may be required. In this instance, advice should be sought to ensure the data, recommendations and conclusions set out in this report remain valid.

It has been assumed that the development proposals are as described in this document and that all proposed mitigation and enhancement measures will be implemented in full.

The habitat survey was undertaken in December, which is outside of the optimum field survey season to identify flora (from May to August for grassland and March to May for woodland flora), wherein the most accurate picture of the vegetation communities present can be gained. However, due to the Site comprising of mainly urban habitats and low habitat diversity it is not considered a significant limitation and does not affect the validity of the assessment.

During the PRA survey, it was observed that recent work had previously been carried out within the loft space. If the insulation was disturbed or moved during these works, any bat dropping present on the surface of the insulation may have subsequently fallen through.

No other limitations or constraints with regard to the field survey or desk study were encountered and therefore the assessment is considered valid.

3 RESULTS

3.1 ZONE OF INFLUENCE

The proposed development design was reviewed by an ecologist and a zone of influence for species scoped into the assessment was determined. The zone of influence was assessed as being 20 m from all construction activities. This will include potential foraging habitats for badgers, hedgehogs, bats, amphibians and reptiles and potential nest sites for breeding birds.

3.2 DESK STUDY

3.2.1 Statutory Designated Sites

One local nature reserve (LNR) was identified within 1 km of the Site. No internationally designated sites were highlighted within 5 km of the site and no SACs for bats were identified within 10 km of the site. A summary is provided in Table 3.

Table 3: Statutory Designated Local Wildlife Sites within 1 km

LNR Name	Reason for Designation	Location from the Site
Drews Pond Wood (LNR)	Drews Pond Woods (LNR) is 5.54 ha in size and is designated for its woodland and meadow. The woodlands contain 29 ancient woodland indicator species, including field rose <i>Rosa arvensis</i> , wood sorrel <i>Oxalis acetosella</i> , and Solomon's seal <i>Polygonatum</i> . The site is home to a host of mammal and bird species, including four species of bat <i>Chiroptera</i> , Eurasian badgers <i>Meles meles</i> and long eared owls <i>Asia otus</i> .	Approximately 970 m southwest from the Site boundary

3.2.2 Non-Statutory Designated Sites

A total of two non-statutory Local Wildlife Sites were identified within 1 km of the Site, described in Table 4.

Table 4: Non-Statutory Designated Local Wildlife Sites within 1 km

LWS Name	Reason for Designation	Location from the Site
Drews Pond Wood (LWS)	Drews Pond Woods (LWS) is 5.54 ha in size and is designated for its woodland and meadow. The woodlands contain 29 ancient woodland indicator species, including field rose <i>Rosa arvensis</i> , wood sorrel <i>Oxalis acetosella</i> , and Solomon's seal <i>Polygonatum</i> . The site is home to a host of mammal and bird species, including four species of bat <i>Chiroptera</i> , Eurasian badgers <i>Meles meles</i> and long eared owls <i>Asia otus</i> .	Approximately 970 m southwest from the Site boundary
Kennet & Avon Canal (LWS)	Kennet & Avon Canal (LWS) is 230.87 ha in size and is a restored canal used for recreation.	Approximately 700 m north from the Site boundary

3.2.3 Priority Habitats

No priority habitats were identified within 250 m of the Site boundary.

3.2.4 Protected and Notable Species Records

Wiltshire and Swindon Biological Records Centre (WSBRC) provided protected and notable species records and a summary of species that could be supported by the habitats within and adjacent to the proposed Site.

A summary of records provided by the WSBRC is provided in Table 5. Note that only records from the last 10 years are included owing to the size of the data set, unless the record is considered to be significant (such as a bat maternity or hibernation roost).

Table 5: Summary of WSBRC Data

Species/Groups	Details
Bats	Records returned included 11 species of bat within a 1 km radius of the Site. Four Annex II species were included within this data: Barbastelle <i>Barbastella barbastellus</i> , Bechstein's <i>Myotis bechsteinii</i> , lesser horseshoe <i>Rhinolophus hipposideros</i> and greater horseshoe <i>Rhinolophus ferrumequinum</i> . All four of these species returned results within the last 10 years, with the most recent being greater horseshoe (2022), followed by lesser horseshoe and barbastelle (2019), and Bechstein (2015). The closest bat record was 150m east of the Site dating from 2016 identified as Soprano pipistrelle <i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i> .
Dormouse	No records of hazel dormouse <i>Muscardinus avellanarius</i> were returned for the area within 1 km of the Site.
GCN	No records of great crested newt <i>Triturus cristatus</i> were returned for the area within 1 km of the Site.
Otter	11 records of Eurasian otter <i>Lutra lutra</i> were returned for the area within 1 km of the Site. The most recent of these was from 2020 and the closest record was 33m south of the Site.
Water vole	Two records of water vole <i>Arvicola amphibius</i> were returned within 1 km of the site. The most recent of these was from 2014 and the closest record was 800m northwest of the Site.
Beaver	No records of beaver <i>Castor fiber</i> were returned for the area within 1 km of the Site.
Amphibians	One species of amphibian was recorded within 1 km of the Site: common toad <i>Bufo bufo</i> . The most recent record for this species was from 2012, located 800m northwest of the Site.
Badger	14 records of Eurasian badger <i>Meles meles</i> were returned by the data search within 1 km of the Site. These records include local badger setts with the most recent record being from 2023. The nearest record was 630m south of the Site. The locations of the badger setts are confidential.
Birds	The data search returned 43 species of bird within a 1 km radius of the Site. S41 birds of note include swift <i>Apus apus</i> , lesser black backed gull <i>Larus fuscus</i> , sparrowhawk <i>Accipitriformes nisus</i> , kittiwake <i>Rissa tridactyl</i> , woodpigeon <i>Columba palumbus</i> , and greater black backed gull <i>Larus marinus</i> .
Reptiles	Two species of reptile within 1 km were returned by the data search. These species were adder <i>Vipera berus</i> (760m from Site) and slow worm <i>Anguis fragilis</i> (660m from Site). The records were returned in 2011 and 2021 respectively.
Other mammals	Aside from the aforementioned species, two other species of mammal were identified within 1 km of the Site boundary. These species were Eurasian hedgehog <i>Erinaceus europaeus</i> , and European rabbit <i>Oryctolagus cuniculus</i> .
Plants	Records returned 13 species of plant recorded within the 1 km Site. No invasive species records were returned. None of these species' records were for plants included in the Wiltshire BAP or listed on S41 of the NERC Act 2006.
Invertebrates	Records of 16 invertebrate species were provided by WSBRC for the area within 1 km of the Site. 14 of these were listed on S41 of the NERC Act 2006, and/or the local biodiversity action plan (BAP). Species included: Rove beetle <i>Deleaster dichrous</i> , grey dagger moth <i>Acronicta psi</i> , knot grass moth <i>Acronicta rumicis</i> , garden tiger moth <i>Arctia caja</i> , rustic moth <i>Hoplodrina blanda</i> and common darter dragonfly <i>Sympetrum striolatum</i> .

3.2.5 Granted Protected Species Licenses

Seven European Protected Species (EPS) licenses issued by Natural England were identified within 2 km of the Site. The species covered, license number, data and reason for issue are detailed in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Granted EPS licences within 2 km of the Site

Species covered	License number	Dates covered	Reason for issue	Distance from Site
Common pipistrelle <i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>	2017-30665-EPS-MIT	06/09/2017 - 06/06/2022	Destruction of a non-breeding roost	1.3 km northeast
Serotine <i>Eptesicus serotinus</i> , soprano pipistrelle <i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>	2018-37551-EPS-MIT	05/11/2018 - 02/11/2023	Destruction of a non-breeding roost.	1.5 km northwest
Brown long eared <i>Plecotus auritus</i> , natterers bat <i>Myotis natterii</i> , serotine and soprano	2015-7620-EPSMIT-1	21/03/2017 - 01/05/2020	Affecting breeding roost, damaging a breeding roost and damaging a non-	1.7 km northwest

Species covered	License number	Dates covered	Reason for issue	Distance from Site
pipistrelle <i>Pipistrellus pygmaeus</i>			breeding roost.	
Brown long eared, natterers bat, serotine, soprano pipistrelle	2015-7620-EPS-MIT	05/05/2015-01/05/2020	Destruction of a non-breeding roost. Damaging of a breeding roost.	1.7 km northwest
Daubentons bat <i>Myotis daubentonii</i>	EPSM2013-6682	22/11/2013-30/09/2013	Affecting breeding roost, destruction of a breeding roost and destruction of a non-breeding roost.	1.7 km northwest
Brown long eared, common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle.	2018-38458-EPS-MIT	01/01/2019 - 31/12/2024	Destruction of a non-breeding roost.	1.7 km northwest
Brown long eared, common pipistrelle, serotine	2017-27444-EPS-MIT	21/03/2017-21/03/2017	Destruction of a non-breeding roost.	1.9 km northwest

3.2.6 Great Crested Newt (GCN) Pond Surveys 2017 to 2019

No ponds located within 1 km of the Site were surveyed between 2017 and 2019.

3.2.7 Ponds within 500 m of the Site

No ponds or waterbodies were identified within 500 m of the Site.

3.3 FIELD SURVEY RESULTS – HABITATS

The Existing UKHab Plan (Figure 2) should be referred to throughout this section. No Schedule 9 non-native invasive species were encountered during the survey.

Modified Grassland - g4

The habitat to the front (see Plate 1) and rear (see Plate 2) of the main building (dwelling) comprised modified grassland – vegetated garden that underwent regular mowing. Species composition was characteristic of the classification, and the sward was dominated by common bent *Agrostis capillaris*. Other species included red fescue *Festuca rubra*, Yorkshire-fog *Holcus lanatus*, cock's foot *Dactylis glomerata*, white clover *Trifolium repens*, dandelion *Taraxacum* spp., red dead-nettle *Lamium purpureum*, Geranium spp., smooth cat's ear *Hypochaeris glabra*, ground ivy *Glechoma hederacea* and groundsel *Senecio vulgaris*.

Plate 1: Modified Grassland habitat to front of property



Plate 2: Modified Grassland habitat to rear of property



Sparsely Vegetated Urban Land - u1f

The northwestern area of the Site comprised rubble, gravel, and bricks with scattered vegetation growing throughout. Species included Yorkshire-fog, common bent, common ragwort *Jacobaea vulgaris*, smooth cat's ear, dandelion and creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens*. The area of sparsely vegetated urban land in the rear garden (U3 – see Plate 3) had more vegetation than the front of the property (U1 – Plate 4 and U5 – Plate 5), where butterfly-bush *Buddleja davidii* was found.

Plate 3: Sparsely vegetated urban land – U3



Plate 4: Sparsely vegetated urban land – U1



Plate 5: Sparsely vegetated urban land – U2



Buildings - u1b5

The Site comprised one main building (B1 – Plate 6) and two small garden shed structures (B2 and B3 – Plate 7 and 8).

Plate 6: Main building – B1



Plate 7: B2 small garden shed structure



Plate 8: B3 small garden shed structure



Other developed land - u1b6

The remainder of the developed land classification comprised a driveway (Plate 9), pathway (Plate 10) and garden patio (Plate 11).

Plate 9: Driveway



Plate 10: Pathway



Plate 11: Garden patio



Built linear features - u1e

A wooden fence bordered the Site to the northwest and northeast. There was a wooden fence between the driveway and the rear garden (Plates 12 and 13).

Plate 12: Wooden fence



Plate 13: Wooden fence



Figure 2: Existing Baseline UKHab Habitat Plan & Target Notes



3.4 FIELD SURVEY RESULTS – SPECIES

3.4.1 Amphibians (including Great Crested Newt GCN)

The Site comprised hard standing, buildings and modified grassland habitat. The short sward height of the grassland was unsuitable for amphibians as it would not provide adequate cover for individuals. GCN is therefore considered to be absent from the Site and is not considered further in this report.

A common toad *Bufo bufo* was observed during the UKhab survey in Sparsely vegetated urban land (U1 – Plate 4). Common toad is listed as a Species of Principle Importance under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 and potential impacts will need to be avoided during site preparation and construction phases of the proposed development.

3.4.2 Badger

No evidence of badger was noted at the time of survey, although the front and rear gardens are suitable for foraging if this species is present in the local area. Currently, badgers are considered to be absent from the Site.

3.4.3 Dormouse

The semi-natural habitats present within the area surveyed were not suitable for dormouse. The habitats lack the species diversity and physical structure required by this species. Dormouse is therefore considered to be absent from the Site.

3.4.4 Breeding Birds

No birds were observed during the field survey. The limited areas of semi-natural habitat present within the area surveyed were not suitable to support breeding birds due to the lack of physical structure and associated vegetation cover required by these species. In addition, the building was not considered suitable for bird nesting, and no old nests were observed at the time of survey. Breeding birds are therefore considered to be absent from the Site.

3.4.5 Reptiles

The Site was not considered suitable to support reptiles due to the lack of areas of longer vegetation required by these species. Reptiles are therefore scoped out of further assessment.

3.4.6 Bats

Following the Bat Survey Guidelines provided in Table 2, the main building and adjoining side porch on Site was assessed as having negligible/low suitability for roosting bats.

The Site had low suitability for foraging and commuting bats due to the sub-optimal habitat within the Site and the surrounding landscape with nearest optimal green space approximately 600m east of the Site.

3.5 PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT (PRA)

3.5.1 Overview of the Buildings

At the time of survey, the building was occupied and in active residential use. The bungalow had a dual-pitch gable roof lined with double roman roof tiles and the building was constructed from red bricks. All the windows and doors across the building were uPVC and were well sealed with no obvious access points. The loft void was used for storage and insulated with fibre wool throughout with the gable ends constructed with breeze blocks. The building had a traditional cut roof with a single king post truss beam and was configured as an open loft void. The building had negligible/low suitability for roosting bats, results of the PRA are presented in Table 7.

The two shed structures in the rear garden were assessed as having negligible suitability for roosting bats owing to their construction.

Table 7: PRA results

Elevation of building	Notes	Photograph of bat feature(s)
Southwest elevation 	External: - The gable end had gaps in the mortar under the tiles allowing for potential bat access (Plate 14). - There were several gaps under the tiles allowing for access underneath. - There were two gaps in the mortar under ridge tiles which has potential to go further in (Plate 15). - The soffits were well sealed. Internal: - The roof felt was breathable roofing membrane which was in good condition. - Two old brown long-eared droppings were found at the southeast gable end (Plate 16 – TN1). - There were cobwebs along the ridge beam, at the southeast gable end and the southwest gable end indicating no recent use by bats. - There was a gap above the wall plate and between the wall and beams at southeast gable end (Plate 17 – TN1).	Plate 14: Gaps in mortar under tiles  Plate 15: Two gaps in mortar under ridge  Plate 16: Old brown long-eared droppings  Plate 17: Gap above wall plate 

Northwest elevation



External:

- Green moss and algae observed on roof tiles, indicating dampness which does not provide suitable roosting conditions.
- There was a gap under the lead flashing at the base of the chimney and at the side – potential bat access point (Plate 18).
- The roof tiles are double roman, made from a type of clay which provides gaps underneath the tiles, creating access for roosting bats. There were numerous gaps below tiles allowing access underneath.
- The side porch tiles were in low condition, and some tiles have been replaced. Low/negligible potential due to unsuitable roosting conditions and disturbance (Plate 19).
- The soffits were well sealed.

Internal:

- Chimney was dry and cobwebbed indicating no recent use by bats (Plate 20).
- The roof felt was bitumen.
- There is no access from the main building loft void to the side porch and a build-up of insulation. No access for bats to get into the loft through the side porch (Plate 21).
- There was an internal light making the void well-lit and storage around the loft hatch making it less likely to be used by bats due to potential disturbance.

Plate 18: Gap under lead flashing and at side of chimney



Plate 19: Low condition side porch tiles



Plate 20: Chimney



Plate 21: Build up of insulation at adjoining side porch



Northeast elevation



External

- There were numerous gaps under tiles which were clean of debris. However, the tiles are on a northeast elevation providing unsuitable roosting condition for bats (Plate 22).
- There is a gap under the ridge tiles. Potential access point (Plate 23).
- The soffits were well sealed.
- There were two pipe holes in the gable wall which provides direct bat access to loft void (Plate 24).
- The gable end had gaps in the mortar under the tiles allowing for potential bat access

Internal

- Overall, the loft void was well sealed with no light ingress.
- There was bitumen roof felt in poor condition.
- Roof felt tear – potential access to roof tiles for bats (Plate 25 – TN2).
- Patched up roof felt tear, no direct access for bats (Plate 26 – TN3).
- Rip in roof felt exposed to roof tiles, provides direct access for bats (Plate 27- TN4).

Plate 22: Gaps under tiles



Plate 23: Gap under ridge



Plate 24: Pipe holes



Plate 25: Roof felt tear



Plate 26: Patched roof felt



3.5.2 Bat Habitat Suitability Assessment

Overall, the Site had low suitability for foraging and commuting bats. The on-Site habitats were not well connected to the wider landscape, gappy hedgerows and linked back gardens could be used by a small number of bats as flightpaths.

One streetlight was located outside the southwestern elevation of the bungalow (Plate 28), creating suboptimal conditions for roosting bats.

Plate 28: Streetlight located opposite bungalow



3.5.3 Bat DNA Analysis

Bat DNA analysis results were provided by Swift Ecology & Ecotype Genetics on 26th February 2026, as follows:

- Brown long-eared bat *Plecotus auritus*.

Figure 3: Bat Preliminary Roost Assessment Results



4 ECOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT, CONSTRAINTS & OPPORTUNITIES

4.1 STATUTORY DESIGNATED SITES

Owing to the scale and nature of the proposed works and the distance between the Site and Drews Pond Wood LNR, impacts to this statutory designated site as a result of the proposed development are not considered likely.

4.2 NON-STATUTORY DESIGNATED SITES

Effects on the two non-statutory sites are not anticipated due to the scale and nature of the proposals and the distance of these sites from the proposed development.

4.3 HABITATS

No habitats of ecological value are present within the Site boundary, and no Schedule 9 invasive species were recorded at the time of survey. The proposed development is exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) - further details are provided in Section 5.

4.4 SPECIES

On the basis of the habitats present and the results of the desk study, the Site is considered to offer suitable habitat for a limited range of legally protected/notable species, as described in the following sections.

4.4.1 Bats

The main bungalow had a confirmed bat roost on the southeast elevation of the property, and the side porch had low/negligible suitability for roosting bats with several access points and roosting opportunities both internally and externally of the whole property identified during the PRA. The works area of the side porch demolition is highly unlikely to support roosting bats. The northwest elevation is unsuitable due to the dampness shown by the moss/algae on the roof tiles. No evidence of use by bats was recorded in the loft void on the northwest elevation; thick cobwebs were present in the chimney and no droppings were present. There is no access from the main building loft void to the side porch. The low condition of the roof tiles on the side porch and previous change in tiles creating disturbance degrades the potential for roosting bats. Potential access for bats around the side porch is not subject to proposed works and therefore there are no roost modifications and only potential temporary disturbance.

The data search confirmed the presence of a minimum of eleven bat species within 1 km of the Site. The Site and the surrounding area provide low suitability for foraging and commuting bats.

Impact of Proposals

The proposals include the demolition of the side porch which will include the removal of two rows of tiles from the main roof followed by the re-alignment and replacement of tiles and the construction of a new bungalow 2 m from the existing dwelling. The works are anticipated to result in temporary impact only.

Without appropriate avoidance measures, the works have the potential to harm bats or damage, destroy, or otherwise interfere with a bat roost, which constitutes a legal offence.

Subject to the implementation of suitable avoidance measures, the roost will not be damaged, destroyed or permanently modified and therefore the works would not constitute an offence under Regulation 43 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended).

Precautionary Working Method Statement

Due to the low-level nature of the proposed works, a non-licenced Precautionary Working Method Statement (PWMS) will be implemented which will ensure the protection of the bats on Site and the contractors/client. A PWMS is used for low-impact development where protected species, such as bats, are present. Its purpose is to set out the measures and working methods required to avoid harm or disturbance to bats and their roosts, while ensuring compliance with relevant wildlife legislation. The PWMS to be followed is provided in Table 8.

Table 8: PWMS

Proposed Bat Avoidance Measures	- The works will avoid the winter hibernating period (November to March). - All contractors to be inducted by the supervising ecologist in a Toolbox Talk prior to conducting any works on site. - Removal of all tiles, felt and other materials to be done sensitively by hand and under supervision of a suitably bat licenced ecologist. All materials to be inspected on all sides and inside layers of felt/insulation for evidence of bats in the forms of bat present or bat droppings. Only when confident no bats or droppings are present will materials be disposed of. - The use of power tools may be necessary to complete some of the works, these are likely to cause vibration disturbance as well as noise and dust. Tools of this kind must be used sparingly and precisely so as not to cause unnecessary, excess disturbance. - Potential bat roost features outside the work area to be retained.
Measures for Discovery of Bats	- If evidence of bats in the form of droppings or bats present is discovered at any point during works when the supervising bat licenced ecologist is not present, works must immediately cease, materials replaced and the ecologist notified urgently. - The following procedures will be implemented: • Telephone the supervising ecologist immediately. • Should the supervising ecologist not be available, telephone the Johns Associates office on 01225 723652. Inform the office that you are working under the PWMS for 65 Longcroft Road and need to speak to a bat ecologist for urgent advice. • The bat(s) should not be handled by contractors on site. Clear the area around the bat(s) and make sure the bat is not at risk of harm. Turn off any power tools or radios etc to minimise noise. • If the bat(s) are flying inside the space, leave the area for a minimum of 15 minutes to allow the bat to settle before re-entering. • Do not use lights, torches or flash photography on or near the bat(s).

Bat Enhancement Measures

One bat box (Greenwood's Ecohabitats two crevice bat box) should be installed on the existing dwelling to enhance the Site for roosting bats. It should be installed on the chimney facing east towards the rear garden.

It is recommended that the proposed bungalow loft be constructed using Type 1 bitumen roofing felt and not Breathable Roof Membrane which is highly harmful to bats and causes fatalities due to the bats becoming entangled in the fibres.

4.4.2 Priority Species

A common toad was observed within the Site in an area of sparsely vegetated urban land.

Priority Species Avoidance Measures

Any rubble and brick piles (or similar) should be removed by hand to avoid injury to common toads and to allow for their safe escape.

Priority Species Mitigation Measures

Trenches/holes/excavations should not be left open overnight during construction, or an access ramp (such as a scaffold plank at an angle of no more than 45 degrees) should be provided to enable any trapped animals a means of escape. Such excavations should be checked each morning for the presence of animals before work commences.

Priority Species Enhancement Measures

Habitat refugia/hibernacula piles will be created around the edges of the grassland area to provide shelter for amphibians.

5 BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN (BNG)

5.1 BNG EXEMPTION STATEMENT

The proposed development meets the conditions to qualify for an exemption as a self-build or custom build. It consists of one new dwelling on a site which has an area of 0.047 hectares. The dwelling will be designed by the householder and on completion they will occupy the dwelling, in compliance with the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015.

As a result, the proposed development is exempt from biodiversity net gain requirements and planning conditions under Self-build and Custom build applications, Section 8 of The Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024.

6 CONCLUSIONS

In summary, several access and roosting features were identified during the PRA, and a confirmed bat roost in the main bungalow loft void. However, the side porch has low/negligible suitability for bat roosting and avoidance measures are to be implemented to avoid harm to bats and their roost. The proposed works will not be modifying a bat roost and due to the low-level nature of the works, the proposed works should be conducted under a Precautionary Working Method Statement with a suitably qualified ecologist present during the side porch demolition to ensure compliance with relevant wildlife legislation.

7 REFERENCES

British Standards Institution, (2013). BS42020 Biodiversity – A code of practice for planning and development. Available at:

<https://www.n-somerset.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2022-06/16%20-%20biodiversity%20-%20code%20of%20practice%20for%20planning%20and%20development%20%282013%29%20BS%20420202013.pdf>

CIEEM, (2017). Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, 2nd edition. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester. Available at: <https://cieem.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Guidelines-for-Preliminary-Ecological-Appraisal-Jan2018-typo-edit.pdf>

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

MAGIC Map <https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>

Mammal Society (2025) Hazel Dormouse Conservation Handbook. Third Edition. Ian White , Robert Wolton , Simone Bullion

Mammal Society (2025) Hazel Dormouse Mitigation Handbook. David Wells, Paul Channin & Leonardo Gubert.

NARRS, Reptile Habitat Guide. [Online] Available at: http://narrs.org.uk/documents/Reptile_habitat_guide.pdf

Reason, P.F. and Wray, S. (2023). UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines: a guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats. Version 1.1. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Ampfield.

Stace, C., (2019). New Flora of the British Isles. 4th Edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Surveying Badgers, The Mammal Society, 1989

UK Government, 2015. Reptiles: surveys and mitigation for development projects.[Online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/reptiles-protection-surveys-and-licences>

The UK Habitat Classification Habitat Definitions Version 2.0, July 2023

UK Government, (2021). Environment Act 2021. Available at:

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2021/30/contents/enacted>

UK Government, (2019). Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2019/579/contents/made>

UK Government, (2006). Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Available at:

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/16/contents>

UK Government (1990) Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Available at:

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/contents>

UK Government, (1981). Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Available at:

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1981/69>

APPENDIX A – LEGISLATION AND PLANNING POLICY

LEGISLATION

Many species of animal and plant receive some degree of legal protection. For the purposes of this report, legal protection refers to: species included on Annex II of the Habitats Directive 1992 (Council of European Communities, 22/07/1992) , Schedules 2 and 5 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019 and Schedules 1, 5 and 8 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) , excluding species that are only protected in relation to their sale (see Section 9[5] and 13[2]) reflecting the fact that the proposed development does not include any proposals relating to the sale of species.

Legal offences associated with species listed on Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations and Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act in England and Wales include inter alia:

- Deliberate capture, injury or killing of animals or taking or destroying their eggs;
- Deliberately disturb animals in a way that would significantly affect their local distribution or abundance, or affect their ability to survive, breed or rear young;
- Intentional or reckless disturbance of an animal in its place of shelter or protection;
- Damaging or destroying a resting place or breeding site;
- Intentionally or recklessly obstructing access to a place of shelter or protection; and
- Possess, control, transport, sell, exchange or offer for sale/exchange any live or dead animal or any part of an animal.

All species of wild bird are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) (as amended) from killing or injury. In addition, it is an offence to take or damage/ destroy their eggs and to damage or destroy a nest whilst it is in use. Species listed on Schedule 1 (such as barn owl) receive additional protection in that it is illegal to disturb birds or their young whilst occupying, or near to, an active nest.

A number of wild plants, habitats and animals (including reptiles, hedgehog and most species of bat) are also included within Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 which lists flora, fauna and habitats considered by the Secretary of State to be of principal importance for conserving biodiversity. The publication of the "England Biodiversity List" satisfies the requirements of Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006 for the conservation of biodiversity. Section 40 of the NERC Act 2006 requires public bodies, including local planning authorities, to have regard for the conservation of biodiversity in England, when carrying out their normal functions.

Badgers are protected under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992 (UK Government, 1992) which makes it an offence to willfully kill, injure or take (or attempt to kill, injure or take) a badger; or to disturb badgers whilst occupying their setts.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY

NPPF

There are numerous national and local planning policies associated with flora and fauna (also referred to as biodiversity) that need to be addressed as part of the planning process. The Government has issued its National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2025, which requires impacts to biodiversity to be minimised. Paragraph 194 of the NPPF applies the same protection to Ramsar sites as that conferred by the Habitats Regulations to SACs and SPAs, it also applies the same protection to sites identified or required as compensatory measures for adverse effects on habitat sites.

There are numerous national and local planning policies associated with flora and fauna (also referred to as biodiversity) that need to be addressed as part of the planning process. The Government has issued its National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) February 2025, which requires impacts to biodiversity to be minimised. Paragraph 194 of the NPPF applies the same protection to Ramsar sites as that conferred by the Habitats Regulations to SACs and SPAs, it also applies the same protection to sites identified or required as compensatory measures for adverse effects on habitat sites.

To protect and enhance biodiversity plans should:

- 192a) Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation;
- 192b) promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.

The NPPF requires development to apply the following principles (Paragraph 193):

- a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
- b) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;
- c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and
- d) development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate.

Planning authorities should follow key principles to ensure that the potential impacts of planning decisions on biodiversity conservation are considered. Circular 06/05: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation provides guidance on the application of the law relating to planning and nature conservation and complements the NPPF.

The Natural Environment Paper

“The Natural Choice: Securing the Value of Nature” outlines the Government’s approach and vision for nature in the UK including protecting and improving our natural environment, growing a green economy and reconnecting people and nature.

Biodiversity 2020

A strategy for England’s wildlife and ecosystem services, are the country level strategies for England and builds on the natural Environment White Paper. It sets out the strategic direction for biodiversity policy for the next decade on land (including rivers and lakes) and at sea. The priorities for action include a more integrated large-scale approach to conservation, putting people at the heart of biodiversity policy, reducing environmental pressure and improving knowledge.

LOCAL PLANNING POLICY

As well as national policy, there is relevant biodiversity policy contained within Wiltshire Core Strategy adopted in January 2015. Core Policy 50 is relevant to the proposed application and is summarised below.

Core Policy 50 Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Protection

Development proposals must demonstrate how they protect features of nature conservation and geological value as part of the design rationale. There is an expectation that such features shall be retained, buffered, and managed favourably in order to maintain their ecological value, connectivity and functionality in the long-term. Where it has been demonstrated that such features cannot be retained, removal or damage shall only be acceptable in circumstances where the anticipated ecological impacts have been mitigated as far as possible and appropriate compensatory measures can be secured to ensure no net loss of the local biodiversity resource and secure the integrity of local ecological networks and provision of ecosystem services.

All development proposals shall incorporate appropriate measures to avoid and reduce disturbance of sensitive wildlife species and habitats throughout the lifetime of the development.

Any development potentially affecting a Natura 2000 site must provide avoidance measures in accordance with the strategic plans or guidance set out in paragraphs 6.75-6.77 above where possible, otherwise bespoke measures must be provided to demonstrate that the proposals would have no adverse effect upon the Natura 2000 network. Any development that would have an adverse effect on the integrity of a European nature conservation site will not be in accordance with the Core Strategy.

Biodiversity enhancement

All development should seek opportunities to enhance biodiversity. Major development in particular must include measures to deliver biodiversity gains through opportunities to restore, enhance and create valuable habitats, ecological networks and ecosystem services. Such enhancement measures will contribute to the objectives and targets of the Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) or River Basin/Catchment Management Plan, particularly through landscape scale projects, and be relevant to the local landscape character.

Local sites

Sustainable development will avoid direct and indirect impacts upon local sites through sensitive site location and layout, and by maintaining sufficient buffers and ecological connectivity with the wider environment. Damage or disturbance to local sites will generally be unacceptable, other than in exceptional circumstances where it has been demonstrated that such impacts:

- i. cannot reasonably be avoided
- ii. are reduced as far as possible
- iii. are outweighed by other planning considerations in the public interest
- iv. where appropriate compensation measures can be secured through planning
- v. obligations or agreements.

Development proposals affecting local sites must make a reasonable contribution to their favourable management in the long-term

Local Biodiversity Action Plans

The "England Biodiversity List" satisfies the requirements of Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006 and includes those habitat and species considered to be of Principal Importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England and Wales. This list replaces the UK BAP Priority Habitats and Species.

However, many local authorities/counties still maintain a Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) document which includes those habitats and species considered to be a priority within the local area in terms of their biodiversity importance.

The Wiltshire Biodiversity Action Plan produced in 2008 has a separate action plan for the 15 species of bats found in the county. The county is a stronghold for bats, and they utilise a wide range of habitats. Existing roosts, hibernation sites and key flight lines are protected, and more potential hibernation and roost sites should be created.

APPENDIX B - POST-DEVELOPMENT UKHAB PLAN



-  Site Boundary
-  g4 - modified grassland
-  u1b5 - buildings
-  u1b6 - other developed land
-  u1f - sparsely vegetated urban land

CLIENT Trevor Williams

PROJECT 65 Longcroft road

TITLE UKHab Postdev Classification Plan

SCALE @ A3	CREATED BY	CHECKED BY
1:200	AE	KT

REFERENCE	ISSUE/REVISION	DATE
J01890-003		16/1/2026