



L I Z A R D

Landscape Design and Ecology

ECOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

**Wren Cottage, Horsemere Green Lane, Climping, West
Sussex**

- ON BEHALF OF: DOMUSEA DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED

Planning Issue

Prepared by	WM
Checked by	GS
Date	4th May 2020
Project Reference	LLD1963
Revision	00

Contents

	Page No.
SUMMARY	01
1.0 Introduction	02
2.0 Planning Policy and Legislation	03
3.0 Methodology	05
4.0 Baseline Ecological Conditions	09
5.0 Assessment of Effects and Mitigation Measures	15
6.0 Enhancements	19
7.0 Conclusions	20
8.0 References	20

TABLES

Table No. 01 – Categorisation Criteria
Table No. 02 – Statutory Protected Sites
Table No. 03 – Non-Statutory Protected Sites
Table No. 04 – Summary of HSI Results
Table No. 05 – Building Assessment
Table No. 06 – Species List for Habitat Parcels
Table No. 07 – Target Notes

APPENDICES:

Appendix A – Site Photographs

SUMMARY

Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology has been commissioned by MDomusea Developments Limited to undertake a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment of land at the property known as 'Wren Cottage', Horsemere Green Lane, Climping (Grid Reference: SU 996 021– hereafter referred to as 'the site').

A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (*PEA*) was undertaken on 3rd April 2020, to appraise the existing ecological resource within the land and the surrounding area.

No further surveys for protected species were recommended, due to no suitable habitat for protected species being affected as part of the proposals.

The existing site is formed of amenity grassland and scattered trees surrounded by residential gardens. The site itself is of **low ecological value** with no habitats of interest noted.

Once avoidance and mitigation measures have been taken into account, the impacts of the planned development upon biodiversity will be **negligible, non-significant** with proposed ecological enhancements resulting in a **net gain** and a **long-term positive increase** in biodiversity in line with national planning policy guidance.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology has been commissioned by Domusea Developments Limited to undertake a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal of land at Wren Cottage, Horsemere Green Lane, Climping (Grid Reference: SU 996 021– hereafter referred to as ‘the site’).
- 1.2 A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (*PEA*) was undertaken on 3rd April 2020, to appraise the existing ecological resource within the land and the surrounding area. The *PEA* comprised a baseline survey conforming broadly to the *JNCC Ecology Phase 1 Habitat Survey* protocol, to identify the existing habitats. In addition, a protected species assessment was undertaken to identify the potential for European and nationally protected species within and adjacent to the land. A full EclA was then undertaken using the baseline data.
- 1.3 A summary of the results and potential impacts of the proposals, and details of avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures have been detailed within this report. This report has been prepared by Will Mills (*Assistant Ecologist MSci (Hons); Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology*). The report has been reviewed by George Sayer (*MCIEEM, Senior Ecologist; Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology*).

Site Information

- 1.4 The proposed site is formed of part of an existing residential garden, consisting of amenity grassland, introduced scrub, tall ruderal and scattered trees. The red-line boundary covers a total area of approximately 0.1 ha. The site is bounded by neighbouring residential properties to all aspects.
- 1.5 The site is located c.4.0 metres above sea level. Soils on site are described as *freely draining slightly acid loamy soils*.

Surrounding Landscape

- 1.6 The wider landscape of Climping has a rural feel, the immediate surrounding landscape is that of residential properties, with arable farmland extending south for at least 1km. The town of Yapton is located 1.9 km NW of the site. The area surrounding the site is a mixture of scattered small pockets of deciduous woodland and coastal and floodplain grazing marsh in an easterly direction toward the Arun River.
- 1.7 There is a single waterbody located within 250.0m, with very few other waterbodies present within 500.0m of the proposed development site, with large areas of housing and hard standing in-between. The single pond is situated within the grounds of Wren cottage, approximately 2-3.0m from the proposed site boundary.

Development Proposals

- 1.8 It is understood that the development proposals form part of a larger development to include the development of 9 no. new dwellings and associated gardens within the larger site boundary. The existing dwelling is outside of the ownership boundary and would be retained.
- 1.9 The aim of this ecological appraisal survey has been:
- *To identify habitats and protected species present, and any other features of ecological value;*
 - *Identify any potential ecological constraints;*
 - *Identify impacts of the proposed development and set out appropriate avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures.*
 - *To provide suggestions for enhancements to be incorporated into the scheme.*

2.0 PLANNING POLICY AND LEGISLATION

Legislation

2.1 Legislation relating to wildlife and biodiversity of particular relevance to this EclA includes:

- *The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017;*
- *The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended);*
- *The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006;*

2.2 This above legislation has been addressed, as appropriate, in the production of this report.

National Planning Policy

2.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 sets out the government planning policies for England and how they should be applied. 'Chapter 15: *Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment*' states that development should be '*minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.*'

2.4 The Government Circular 06/2005, which is referred to by the NPPF, provides further guidance in respect of statutory obligations for biodiversity and geological conservation and their impact within the planning system.

Local Planning Policy

2.5 The Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014 – 2029 - Policy 49 (*Biodiversity*) states that development will only be permitted where:

- *Biodiversity value of the site is safeguarded;*
- *Demonstrable harm to habitats or species which are protected or which are of importance to biodiversity is avoided or mitigated;*
- *The proposal has incorporated features that enhance biodiversity as part of good design and sustainable development;*
- *The proposal protects, manages and enhances the District's network of ecology, biodiversity and geological sites;*

- *The benefits of development outweigh any adverse impact on the biodiversity on the site. Exceptions will only be made where no reasonable alternatives are available; and planning conditions and/or planning obligations may be imposed to mitigate or compensate for the harmful effects of the development.*

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Desk Study

- 3.1.1 The Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAG/C) was consulted for all designated sites, priority habitats and protected species licence records within 2.0km of the site. The desk search was conducted on 05th August 2017. Due to the small scale of the proposals a full data search was not considered proportionate.

3.2 Field Survey

- 3.2.1 A preliminary ecological appraisal was undertaken on 3rd April 2020, and the site subjected to an ecology survey using guidelines set out in the *Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey – A Technique for Environmental Audit (JNCC, 2003)*.
- 3.2.2 Habitats within the land were classified and the presence, or potential presence, of certain protected and / or notable species of flora and fauna were identified. A summary description of the habitat within the site following the *Phase 1 Habitat Survey Methodology* is presented in Section 4.0. This involved identifying features that may be used by protected species, potential foraging areas and other signs of use. Water bodies were recorded wherever possible, within 500 metres of the proposed development site.
- 3.2.3 The results are summarised and accompanied in large part by photographic evidence contained in *Appendix A – Site Photographs*. Recommendations for further investigation and survey are made in the following report.

Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment

- 3.2.4 A Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment was undertaken on 3rd April 2020 by an experienced bat surveyor who undertook an internal and external assessment of all buildings and trees within the proposed construction zone.
- 3.2.5 The bat surveyor assessed the existing buildings visually and searched for evidence such as:
- Grease Marks;
 - Urine Stains;
 - Bat Droppings;
 - Feeding Remains;
 - Dead or Live Bats.
- 3.2.6 Trees were visually identified from the ground, using binoculars where necessary, for features that could be used by bats such as:
- Woodpecker Holes;
 - Knot Holes;
 - Tear-outs;
 - Flush Cuts;
 - Double Leaders.

- 3.2.7 Once features had been assessed the trees were then categorised in accordance with *Table 4.1 of the Bat Conservation Trust's Good Survey Guidelines (2016)*:

Table No. 01 – Categorisation Criteria

Category	Buildings	Trees
'Negligible'	<i>No suitable features identified.</i>	<i>No suitable features identified.</i>
'Low'	<i>A structure which could be used opportunistically, however, are not likely to be used on a regular basis / by a large number of bats.</i>	<i>Tree of sufficient size / age to support bat roost features; but with none identified from the ground.</i>
'Moderate'	<i>A building with features which, could be used regularly by a small number of bats.</i>	<i>Tree with features which, may support a bat roost of low conservation status.</i>
'High'	<i>A building with features suitable for use by a large number of bats on a regular basis.</i>	<i>A tree with several potential bat roost sites that are suitable for use by a large number of bats.</i>

3.3 Ecological Impact Assessment

- 3.3.1 The methodology for Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) follows best practice guidelines set by the Chartered Institute of Ecology & Environmental Management (CIEEM): 'Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment' (CIEEM, 2018). This includes identifying the baseline conditions on the site and subsequently rating the potential effects of the development based on the sensitivity and value of the resource affected, combined with the magnitude, duration and scale of the impact (or change). This is initially assessed without mitigation measures, and then assessed again after allowing for the proposed mitigation measures; this provides the residual effects. The assessment is divided into construction effects and longer-term operational effects.

3.3.2 Each ecological feature within the site has been considered within a defined Geographic context such as:

- *International and European*
- *National*
- *Regional*
- *County*
- *District*
- *Local*
- *Site Level*
- *Negligible*

3.3.3 Based upon CIEEM guidance, value was determined with reference to the following factors:

- *Its inclusion as a Designated Site or other protected area;*
- *The presence of habitat types of conservation significance, e.g. Habitats of Principal Importance (NERC 2006);*
- *The presence (or potential presence) of species of conservation significance e.g. Species of Principal Importance (NERC 2006);*
- *The presence of other protected species e.g. those protected under The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981;*
- *The sites social and economic value.*

3.3.4 The ecological impacts resulting from the proposals were then described according to a defined set of characteristics as defined within '*Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland*' (CIEEM, 2018). This assessment considers residual impacts (once all mitigation has been taken into account), with any significant effects highlighted. A significant effect is defined as "*an effect which either supports or undermines biodiversity conservation objectives for 'important ecological features' or for biodiversity in general*".

3.3.5 The confidence that a certain activity will result in a significant adverse effect has been ranked as follows:

- *Highly probable;*
- *Probable;*
- *Unlikely;*
- *Highly unlikely;*

3.3.6 Where initial impacts have been identified as significant, avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures have been proposed to avoid, prevent or offset such effects. Enhancement has been proposed to ensure that the development represents a net gain in biodiversity in accordance with National Policy.

4.0 BASELINE ECOLOGICAL CONDITIONS

4.1 Designated Sites

Statutory Protected Sites

4.1.2 MAGIC was consulted for details of ecologically sensitive statutory protected sites within 2.0km of the proposed development; these are detailed below.

Table No. 02 – Statutory Protected Sites

Site	Description	Location
<i>Climping Beach SSSI.</i>	Nationally uncommon habitat which supports important populations of wintering birds.	2.1 km SE.
<i>West Beach LNR.</i>	Site forms part of Climping Beach SSSI. The area includes mud flats, shingle and sand dunes.	2.15 km SE.

4.1.3 The site is located within the *Impact Risk Zone of Climping Beach Site of Special Scientific Interest*. The development proposals are do not require further consultation with *Natural England* due to the small scale of proposals.

Non-Statutory Protected Areas

- 4.1.4 *Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCIs)* are designations applied to the most important non-statutory nature conservation sites. They are recognised by the *National Planning Policy Framework (2019)* and as such are material considerations when assessing planning applications. The following SNCIs were identified within 2.0 km of the site:

Table No. 03 – Non-Statutory Protected Sites

SINC	Locations
<i>Climping to Houghton Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA).</i>	<i>1 Km E.</i>

4.2 Habitats

- 4.2.1 Within 2.0 km of the site there are *Priority Habitats* of *Coastal Vegetated Shingle, Maritime Cliffs and Slopes, Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh, Intertidal Substrate Foreshore (sand, mud and sand and gravel) and Deciduous Woodland*.

- 4.2.2 Habitats within and adjacent to the land include:

- *Amenity Grassland;*
- *Scattered Trees;*
- *Tall Ruderal;*
- *Allotment;*
- *Existing Building*

Amenity Grassland

- 4.2.3 Amenity Grassland habitat dominates the site. This habitat is heavily maintained with a sward height of <5cm. Few forb species are present within the sward including occasional daisy (*Bellis perennis*), dandelion (*Taraxacum officinale*) and Creeping Buttercup (*Ranunculus repens*). This common and widespread habitat is of **site value only**.

Scattered Trees

- 4.2.4 Within the site there are a number of scattered trees, many of which are fruit trees such as Apple (*Malus sp.*) others include Hazel (*Corylus avellana*). None of the trees on site were found to be suitable for roosting bats. This habitat is of **negligible value**.

Tall Ruderal

- 4.2.5 In the south-east corner of the site there was a small patch of tall ruderal habitat with abundant rosebay willowherb (*Chamaenerion angustifolium*) and occasional common nettle (*Urtica dioica*) and broad-leaved dock (*Rumex obtusifolius*). This common and widespread habitat is of **site value only**.

Allotment

- 4.2.6 There is a parcel of land currently being used as a residential allotment, containing rhubarb (*Rheum rhabarbarum*), gooseberry (*Ribes uva-crispa*) raspberry (*Rubus idaeus*). This habitat is assessed as being of **site value only**.

Existing Building

- 4.2.7 A single building identified within the proposed construction zone. The building is a garden shed; a summary of findings is detailed in section 4.3 below.

Native Hedgerow

- 4.2.8 Part of the eastern boundary consisted of a native hawthorn (*Crataegus monogyna*) hedgerow. This common and widespread habitat is of **site value only**.

Ornamental Hedgerow

- 4.2.9 There are 3 sections of ornamental hedgerow forming parts of the eastern and western boundary as well as a small section leading into the garden from the western aspect to screen the allotment. These consist of garden privet (*Ligustrum ovalifolium*), cypress (*Cupressus sp.*) and cherry laurel (*Prunus laurocerasus*). This common and widespread habitat is of **site value only**.

4.3 Protected Species Assessment

Amphibians

Desk Study

- 4.3.1 A detailed search returned no records of GCN within 2.0km of the site. Great Crested Newts are protected under *The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017*. It is an offence for anyone to intentionally kill, injure or disturb a Great Crested Newt or to damage, destroy or block access to areas of suitable habitat.

Site Assessment

- 4.3.2 All except one of the ponds identified are located over 250m from the proposed development site. The pond that wasn't is located ~2-3.0m from the proposed site boundary and is currently within the confines of the residential garden of Wren cottage. The HSI assessment of the pond is summarised in table no. 04 below:

Table No. 04 – Summary of HSI Results

HSI Criteria	P1
Location	1
Pond Area	0.2
Permanence	0.9
Water Quality	0.67
Shade	1
Waterfowl	1
Fish	1
Pond Count	0.95
Terrestrial Habitat	0.67
Macrophytes	0.9
HSI Score	0.77
Suitability	Good

- 4.3.3 Given the large distances to other surrounding water bodies and the lack of GCN records within 2.0km of the site and lack of suitable terrestrial habitats on site, habitats onsite are considered to be of **negligible value** to GCN and of **Site value** to widespread amphibians.

Reptiles

Desk Study

- 4.3.4 A detailed search returned limited records of common lizard and grass snake within 2.0km of the site. All species of UK reptile are protected against reckless or intentional killing or injuring under *The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)*.

Site Assessment

- 4.3.5 A large compost heap (TN01) and separate log piles (TN02) were noted on site. However, given the limited number of reptile records within 2.0km of the site, it is considered to be of **site value** to reptiles.

Bats

Desk Study

- 4.3.6 Common Pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*), Daubentons (*Myotis daubentonii*) and Serotine (*Eptesicus serotinus*) bats have been recorded within 2.0km of the site area.

Site Assessment

- 4.3.7 The existing building and trees on site were assessed for their potential to support roosting bats, a summary of the assessment is shown below:

Table No. 05 – Building Assessment

Ref.	Description	Category
B01	Garden shed constructed of wooden slat panelling and roofed with roofing felt. Building is in very good condition and well maintained. No internal access was possible. No external signs of bats were noted.	Negligible

- 4.3.8 No trees on site were found to be suitable as potential bat roosts, thus the site area is considered to be of **site value** to foraging/commuting bats.

Badger*Desk Study*

- 4.3.9 Badger records are confidential and were therefore not included within the data search.

Site Assessment

- 4.3.10 No evidence of badger activity was noted within the site or the immediate surrounding area, thus the area is considered to be of no more than **site value** to commuting badgers.

Other Mammals

- 4.3.11 Numerous records of common mammals including rabbit, weasel and stoat exist within 2.0km of the site area. No evidence of other mammals was recorded on site.

Birds*Desk Study*

- 4.3.12 A total of 185 no. bird species have been returned within 2.0km of the site, including 19 no. Schedule I species and 13 no. species listed on the BoCC Red List.

Site Assessment

- 4.3.13 The grassland habitats may be of some limited value to winter visitors such as redwing and fieldfare. However, the value is reduced by the relatively high levels of disturbance within the site. The hedgerows within the site provide suitable nesting habitat for breeding birds. The area overall is likely to be of **site value** to breeding / foraging birds.

Invertebrates*Desk Study*

- 4.3.14 The data search returned records of numerous species of invertebrates within 2.0km of the site including Grayling UK BAP butterfly and stag beetle.

Site Assessment

- 4.3.15 The site in general lacks the floral diversity to support a good range of invertebrates and is likely to be of value within the **site area only**.

Others

- 4.3.16 No suitable habitat for any other protected species was recorded on site.

4.4 Survey Constraints / Considerations

- 4.4.1 No major constraints which would cast doubt on these results were encountered, full access was available to all areas of the site.

5.0 ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**5.1 Designated Sites***Potential Impacts*

- 5.1.1 The site is located within the *Impact Risk Zone* of *Climping Beach SSSI*. The impacts on the surrounding SSSI's are unlikely to be of any significance due to intervening distances and the small scale of proposals.

Mitigation and Compensation

- 5.1.2 Lighting proposals will be designed to comply with Dark Skies technical advice note, April 2018.

Residual Impacts

- 5.1.4 **No likely significant effect** upon surrounding European designated sites will arise from the proposed development.

5.2 Habitats

Potential Impacts

- 5.2.1 Development proposals will result in the loss of amenity grassland, scattered trees, tall ruderal, native and ornamental hedgerows and allotment habitats. Given the scale of the development the potential impacts would be of minor impact magnitude and likely to occur.

Mitigation and Compensation

- 5.2.2 All trees that are to be retained are to be protected in accordance with BS5837:2012 'Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction'. All habitats lost would be replaced with similar replacement habitats post-construction. Construction works shall follow best practice guidelines with regard to prevention of noise, dust and light pollution.

Residual Impacts

- 5.2.3 Once mitigation is taken into account, the impacts will be **negligible** in the short-term and longer terms.

5.3 Amphibians

Potential Impacts

- 5.3.1 Due to the close proximity of the pond within the grounds of Wren Cottage to the proposed development boundary possible impacts on amphibians could include the injury or possible death of widespread amphibians during the construction period, and loss of small areas of amphibian habitat.

Mitigation and Compensation

- 5.3.2 To reduce the likelihood of commuting amphibians coming on to site, it is recommended that the grassland habitat bordering and surrounding the site to be kept short to a sward height no greater than 50mm to further reduce its suitability for amphibians. This is of particular importance in respect to the grassland within 10.0m of the pond located at Wren Cottage. In the highly unlikely event that GCN are found on site, all works will cease until a suitably qualified ecologist has been contacted for advice.

5.3.3 Works shall follow a series of *Reasonable Avoidance Measures* to prevent harm to amphibians. These shall include but are not limited to:

- No works to be carried out at night;
- All excavations to be checked every morning prior to work commencing;
- All materials to be stored on hard surfaces or on pallets or other containers to prevent amphibian ingress;
- Compost and log piles to be manually dismantled prior to works commencing;
- No storage of any cement, fuels, liquids, paints or chemicals within 10.0 m of the adjacent pond.

Residual Impacts

5.3.4 The impacts will be negligible and **non-significant**.

5.4 Reptiles

Potential Impacts

5.4.1 The compost heap and log pile are potential reptile habitat, thus the improper removal of these habitats could result in injury or death to reptiles.



Mitigation and Compensation

5.4.2 The noted compost heap and log pile habitats should be removed with the use of hand tools prior to works commencing. In the highly unlikely event that reptiles are found on site, all works will cease until a suitably qualified ecologist has been contacted for advice.



Residual Impacts

5.4.3 The impacts will be negligible and **non-significant**.

5.5 Bats

Potential Impacts

5.5.1 None predicted, the site is of negligible value to bats.

Mitigation and Compensation

- 5.5.2 None required. Night working and unnecessary illumination of the site shall generally be avoided.

Residual Impacts

- 5.5.3 The overall impact of the scheme will be **negligible** in the short-term and longer terms.

5.6 Badgers*Potential Impacts*

- 5.6.1 In the absence of mitigation, impacts would include the trapping of badgers in footings/trenches, fragmentation of habitat and disruption of commuting corridors. Impacts would be of low impact magnitude and unlikely to occur.

Mitigation and Compensation

- 5.6.2 Any trenches will be covered or have a ramp installed overnight to prevent any mammals becoming trapped. Commuting corridors around the margins of the site will be retained.

Residual Impacts

- 5.6.3 The overall impact of the scheme will be **negligible, non-significant**.

5.8 Breeding Birds*Potential Impacts*

- 5.8.1 In the absence of avoidance / mitigation, the development could result in the damage / destruction of a bird nest. Impacts would be of minor impact magnitude and unlikely to occur as scrub will be retained.

Mitigation and Compensation

- 5.8.2 Clearance of any hedgerows or trees will be undertaken outside the bird nesting season (*season: March-August inclusive*). Should this not be possible, vegetation / buildings will be checked prior to removal by a Suitably Qualified Ecologist to ensure no active nests are present.

Residual Impacts

- 5.8.3 The overall impact of the scheme will be **negligible, non-significant**.

5.10 Invertebrates*Potential Impacts*

- 5.9.1 None predicted, current land-use (amenity grassland) is unsuitable for invertebrates.

Mitigation and Compensation

- 5.9.2 None required.

Residual Impacts

- 5.9.3 The overall impact of the scheme will be **negligible, non-significant**.

6.0 ECOLOGICAL ENHANCEMENTS

- 6.1 The design of any proposed development should consider ecological enhancements for the benefit of wildlife in line with the *National Planning Policy Framework* and *Local Planning Policy*. Ecological enhancements which will be included as part of development proposals include:

- The use of night-scented species and pale flowers to increase bat foraging potential across site, such as evening primrose (*Oenothera fruticosa*); cornflower (*Centaurea cyanus*); knapweed (*Centaurea nigra*); yarrow (*Achillea millefolium*); honeysuckle (*Lonicera*); and lavenders (*Lavandula*);
- The provision of nesting boxes for a variety of bird species and the incorporation of open fronted areas / access holes to outbuildings to allow swallow access;
- Increased roost opportunities will be provided through the installation of bat boxes to the southern aspect of mature trees along the woodland edge;
- Use of a sympathetic lighting scheme across the site, with lighting angled down and away from surrounding trees, hedgerows and woodland.
- Native fruit and nut producing species will be utilised within the scheme to increase the foraging resource for birds and mammals.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1 The existing site is formed of amenity grassland and scattered trees surrounded by residential gardens. The site itself is of **low ecological value** with no habitats of interest noted.
- 7.2 Once avoidance and mitigation measures have been taken into account, the impacts of the planned development upon biodiversity will be **negligible, non-significant** with proposed ecological enhancements resulting in a **net gain** and a **long-term positive increase** in biodiversity in line with national planning policy guidance.

8.0 REFERENCES

JNCC: Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey – A Technique for Environmental Audit; (2003);

Collins J (ed): Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd ed.) The Bat Conservation Trust (2016);

Mitchell-Jones and McLeish: Bat Workers Manual; JNCC, 3rd Edition (2004);

Streeter, D.: The Most Complete Guide to the Flowers of Britain and Ireland; Harper Collins, London (2010);

www.magic.gov.uk.

Table No. 06 – Species List for Habitat Parcels**D – Dominant; A – Abundant; F – Frequent; O – Occasional; R – Rare; L – Locally****Scattered Trees**

Common Name	Scientific Name	DAFOR
Apple	<i>Malus sp.</i>	F
Ash	<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>	R
Cherry	<i>Prunus sp.</i>	O
Hazel	<i>Corylus avellana</i>	O
Oak	<i>Quercus robur</i>	R
Pear	<i>Pyrus sp.</i>	R
Plum	<i>Prunus sp.</i>	R
Silver Birch	<i>Betula pendula</i>	R
Willow	<i>Salix sp.</i>	R

Amenity Grassland

Common Name	Scientific Name	DAFOR
Common Mouse-Ear	<i>Cerastium fontanum</i>	F
Creeping Buttercup	<i>Ranunculus repens.</i>	F
Daisy	<i>Bellis perennis</i>	A
Dandelion	<i>Taraxacum officinale</i>	F
Dock	<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>	R
Dovesfoot Cranesbill	<i>Geranium mole</i>	R
Moss	<i>Moss sp.</i>	O
Perennial Rye Grass	<i>Lolium perenne</i>	D
Wild Parsnip	<i>Pastinaca sativa</i>	O
Wild Primrose	<i>Primula vulgaris</i>	O

Tall Ruderal

Common Name	Scientific Name	DAFOR
Cleavers	<i>Galium aparine</i>	O
Common Nettle	<i>Urtica dioica</i>	O
Common Thistle	<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>	R
Dock	<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>	O
Purple Dead-nettle	<i>Lamium purpureum</i>	O
Purple Ryegrass	<i>Lolium perenne</i>	LA
Rosebay Willowherb	<i>Chamaenerion angustifolium</i>	A
White Dead-nettle	<i>Lamium album</i>	R

Native Hedgerow

Common Name	Scientific Name	DAFOR
Hawthorn	<i>Crataegus monogyna</i>	D

D – Dominant; A – Abundant; F – Frequent; O – Occasional; R – Rare; L – Locally

WREN COTTAGE
HORSEMER GREEN LANE, CLIPPING
ECOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
LLD1963-ECO-REP-001-00

Ornamental Hedgerow

Common Name	Scientific Name	DAFOR
Cherry Laurel	<i>Prunus laurocerasus</i>	D
Garden Privet	<i>Ligustrum ovalifolium</i>	D
Cypress	<i>Cupressus sp.</i>	D

Allotment

Common Name	Scientific Name	DAFOR
Rhubarb	<i>Rheum rhabarbarum</i>	R
Gooseberry	<i>Ribes uva-crispa</i>	O
Raspberry	<i>Rubus idaeus</i>	F

D – Dominant; A – Abundant; F – Frequent; O – Occasional; R – Rare; L – Locally

Table No. 06 – Target Notes

Ref	Feature	Description
TN01	Compost heap	A compost heap was noted along the western boundary to the south of the allotment.
TN02	Log pile	A log pile was noted along the western boundary to the south of the allotment.

APPENDIX A - SITE PHOTOGRAPHS



Photograph No. 1 - View of the southern half of the site, depicting the amenity grassland and the scattered trees.



Photograph No. 2 - The view of the site towards the northern aspect from the southern boundary.

WREN COTTAGE.
HORSEMER GREEN LANE, CLIMPING, WEST SUSSEX,
ECOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
LLD1963-ECO-REP-001

APPENDIX A - SITE PHOTOGRAPHS



Photograph No. 3 - A log pile was noted on site on the western boundary (TN02).



Photograph No. 4 - It was noted that a large compost heap was present along the western boundary (TN01) south of the allotment area which encompassed the garden shed (B01).

WREN COTTAGE.
HORSEMER GREEN LANE, CLIMPING, WEST SUSSEX,
ECOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
LLD1963-ECO-REP-001