



South West Milton Keynes

Ecological Assessment

JULY 2016

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION	2
2.0 ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	2
3.0 BASELINE CONDITIONS	6
4.0 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF KEY IMPACTS	10
5.0 MITIGATION MEASURES	10
6.0 RESIDUAL AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	10

TABLES

Table 1: Classification and Survey Requirements for Bats in Trees

Table 2: Tree inspection Summary

FIGURES

Figure 1: Tree Assessment Plan

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Tree Assessment Table

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The following document has been prepared to assess the impacts of revisions to the South West Milton Keynes (SWMK) development scheme, in the light of updated survey work with particular focus on bats as a European Protected Species. It concludes that there are no changes in the assessment of ecological impacts to those set out in the Environmental Statement that accompanied the submitted planning application (reference 15/00314/AOP).

2.0 ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Protected Species Survey

- 2.1 The further protected species surveys undertaken and detailed below involved the ground and aerial assessment and categorisation of bat roost potential trees in accordance with the revised Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) good practice guidelines (3rd edn, 2016)¹ as set out below.
- 2.2 Tree assessments were undertaken from ground level, with the aid of a torch and binoculars (where appropriate). These surveys were undertaken on 27th June 2016 by a licenced / suitably experienced bat ecologist from FPCR (licence no. 2015-7029-SCI-SCI). Where deemed necessary, further inspections were undertaken on 5th July 2016 by aerial rope access methods by FPCR ecologists (including a Licenced bat worker) (licence no. 2015-14965-CLS-CLS) with arborist tree climbing qualifications (NPTC: Certificate to Climb Trees J/101/2449 and Perform Aerial Rescue A/101/2450).
- 2.3 During the surveys Potential Roosting Features (PRF) for bats such as the following were sought (Based on P16, British Standard 8596:2015 Surveying for bats in trees and woodland, October 2015):
- Natural holes (e.g. knot holes) arising from naturally shed branches or branches previously pruned back to a branch collar.
 - Man-made holes (e.g. cavities that have developed from flush cuts or cavities created by branches tearing out from parent stems).
 - Woodpecker holes.
 - Cracks/splits in stems or braches (horizontal and vertical).
 - Partially detached, loose or bark plates.
 - Cankers (caused by localised bark death) in which cavities have developed.
 - Other hollows or cavities, including butt rots.
 - Compression of forks with included bark, forming potential cavities.
 - Crossing stems or branches with suitable roosting space between.

¹ Collins, J (ed)(2016) *Bat Conservation Trust Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edn)*, BCT.

- Ivy stems with diameters in excess of 50mm with suitable roosting space behind (or where roosting space can be seen where a mat of thinner stems has left a gap between the mat and the trunk).
 - Bat or bird boxes.
 - Other suitable places of rest or shelter.
- 2.4 Certain factors such as orientation of the feature, its height from the ground, the direct surroundings and its location in respect to other features may enhance or reduce the potential value.
- 2.5 Trees were classified into general bat roost potential groups based upon the presence of these features. Table 1 (below) broadly classifies the potential categories as accurately as possible as well as discussing the relevance of the features. This table is based upon Table 4.1 and Chapter 6 in Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (J., Collins (Bat Conservation Trust), 2016).
- 2.6 Although the British Standard 8596:2015 document groups trees with moderate and high potential, these have been separated below (as per Table 4.1 in The Bat Conversation Trust Guidelines) to allow more specific survey criteria to be applied.

Table 1: Classification and Survey Requirements for Bats in Trees

Classification of Tree	Description of Category and Associated Features (based on Potential Roosting Features listed above)	Likely Further Survey Work / Actions
Confirmed Roost	Evidence of roosting bats in the form of live / dead bats, droppings, urine staining, mammalian fur oil staining, etc.	<p>A Natural England derogation licence application will be required if the tree or roost site is affected by the development or proposed arboricultural works. This will require a combination of aerial assessment by roped access bat workers (where possible, health and safety constraints allowing) and nocturnal survey during appropriate periods (e.g. nocturnal survey - May to August) to inform on the licence.</p> <p>Works to tree undertaken under supervision in accordance with the approved good practice method statement provided within the licence.</p> <p>However, where confirmed roost site(s) are not affected by works, work under a precautionary good practice method statement may be</p>

Classification of Tree	Description of Category and Associated Features (based on Potential Roosting Features listed above)	Likely Further Survey Work / Actions
		possible.
High Potential	<p>A tree with one or more Potential Roosting Features that are obviously suitable for larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis and potentially for longer periods of time due to their size, shelter protection, conditions (height above ground level, light levels, etc) and surrounding habitat.</p> <p>Examples include (but are not limited to); woodpecker holes, larger cavities, hollow trunks, hazard beams, etc.</p>	<p>Aerial assessment by roped access bat workers (if appropriate) and / or nocturnal survey during appropriate period (May to August).</p> <p>Following additional assessments, tree may be upgraded or downgraded based on findings.</p> <p>If roost sites are confirmed and the tree or roost is to be affected by proposals a licence from Natural England will be required.</p> <p>After completion of survey work (and the presence of a bat roost is discounted), a precautionary working method statement may still be appropriate.</p>
Moderate Potential	<p>A tree with Potential Roosting Features which could support one or more potential roost sites due to their size, shelter protection, conditions (height above ground level, light levels, etc) and surrounding habitat but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status (i.e. larger roost, irrespective of wider conservation status).</p> <p>Examples include (but are not limited to); woodpecker holes, rot cavities, branch socket cavities, etc.</p>	<p>A combination of aerial assessment by roped access bat workers and / or nocturnal survey during appropriate period (May to August).</p> <p>Following additional assessments, tree may be upgraded or downgraded based on findings.</p> <p>After completion of survey work (and the presence of a bat roost is discounted), a precautionary working method statement may still be appropriate.</p> <p>If a roost site/s is confirmed a licence from Natural England will be required.</p>
Low Potential	A tree of sufficient size and age to contain Potential Roosting	No further survey required but a precautionary working method

Classification of Tree	Description of Category and Associated Features (based on Potential Roosting Features listed above)	Likely Further Survey Work / Actions
	<p>Features but with none seen from ground or features seen only very limited potential.</p> <p>Examples include (but are not limited to); loose/lifted bark, shallow splits exposed to elements or upward facing holes.</p>	statement may be appropriate.
Negligible/No potential	Negligible/no habitat features likely to be used by roosting bats	None.

* The Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) affords protection to “breeding sites” and “resting places” of bats. The EU Commission’s Guidance document on the strict protection of animal species of Community interest under the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC, February 2007 states that these are places “where there is a reasonably high probability that the species concerned will return”.

- 2.7 The optimal survey time for ground assessment (when trees are without leaves throughout most of the UK) is December – March. The 2016 surveys were undertaken outside this period however ground and aerial assessments resulted in similar findings to those surveys undertaken in 2014 when leaves were not present. It is therefore considered that sufficient data on tree condition was available to ensure potential features were not missed during 2016 surveys.
- 2.8 Two nocturnal surveys (1 dusk emergence and 1 dawn return survey) were undertaken on the 19th July and the 5th August 2016 respectively on four trees (T10, T26, T34 and T39) in accordance with BCT good practice guidelines. The four trees were assessed as being of moderate bat roost potential following aerial inspections. These trees are to be lost as part of the proposed development.
- 2.9 Both surveys were undertaken during suitable conditions (i.e. when ambient air temperatures exceeded 10°C and there was little or no wind and no rain). Surveyors were positioned to cover all potential bat roost features identified during aerial inspections. For each of T26 and T34 a single feature was identified with a single potential entry point and so each tree was covered by a single surveyor. T10 and T39 were each covered by two surveyors to sufficiently view their identified features.
- 2.10 Where necessary bat calls were analysed post survey using BatSound (version 4), by taking measurements of the peak frequency, inter-pulse interval, call duration and end frequency. Analysis was undertaken by experienced and/or licensed bat ecologists from FPCR.
- 2.11 A summary of the timings and conditions for each survey are shown in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Summary of Dusk & Dawn Survey Conditions

Date	Survey Start Time	Survey End Time	Survey Type	Sunrise / Sunset	Temperature (°C)	Rain (0-5, 5=heavy rain)	Wind (0-5, 5=strong wind)	Cloud %
19.07.16	20:55	22:42	Dusk	21:12	23°C	0	2	20
05.08.16	03:32	23:40	Dawn	05:47	12°C	0	1	5

Walkover Survey

- 2.12 In conjunction with the above tree-specific ground assessment surveys in 2016 a further walkover survey was also undertaken to assess whether the baseline conditions across the site as a whole with regards to likely bat suitability (detailed within the original technical ecology report) had altered since 2012 and 2014 surveys were undertaken.

Assessment Methodology

- 2.13 The impact assessment approach as outlined within Section 2 of the Ecology & Nature Conservation Chapter of the ES has been used as the basis for the identification of impacts and their significance on Valued Ecological Receptors.

3.0 BASELINE CONDITIONS

Bat Potential Trees

- 3.1 Though bat potential trees roost features were recorded in 2012 and significant potential remained following aerial inspection undertaken in 2014 no bat roosts were identified (full details of the original surveys are provided within Chapter 6 of the original Environmental Statement).
- 3.2 2016 ground based assessments recorded 43 trees supporting negligible – moderate potential bat roost features (detailed descriptions of each tree are provided at Appendix A). Following aerial inspections 4 trees were confirmed to still support moderate bat roost potential (Table 3). No evidence of roosting bats has been identified and no trees were considered to provide ‘high’ roosting potential.

Table 3: Tree Inspection Summary Following Aerial Inspections

Potential category	Number of trees identified	Tree ref. in category	Typical features recorded	Aerial inspection undertaken?	Recommendations
Confirmed roost	0	n/a	n/a	-	-
High	0	n/a	n/a	-	-
Moderate	4	T10, T26, T34, T39	Knot holes and woodpecker	Yes	2 nocturnal surveys.

Potential category	Number of trees identified	Tree ref. in category	Typical features recorded	Aerial inspection undertaken?	Recommendations
			holes with cavities, dead trees with multiple cracks.		
Low	25	T1a, T2a, T4, T5, T8a, T8b, T10b, T14, T14a, T15, T17, T17a, T17b, T21, T21a, T23, T28, T30, T33, T34b, T34c, T34d, T35, T36, T40	Knot holes and woodpecker holes supporting shallow cavities or small openings open to sky. Limited lifted bark.	No	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left <i>in-situ</i> for 24 hours prior to removal.
Negligible	14	T1, T2, T6, T10a, T13, T31a, T15a, T22, T22a, T31a, T31b, T32, T34a, T38.	Ivy cover, superficial cracks or holes with shallow, exposed cavities.	No	None.

Nocturnal Survey Results

- 3.3 On the dusk survey (19.07.16) no bats were recorded emerging from any of the trees.
- 3.4 T10 was located within a hedgerow running east – west along Weasel Lane where 2 surveyors were positioned to its north and south. A total of 34 bat contacts (mostly common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus*) were recorded by the northern surveyor and 22 (also mostly common pipistrelle) by the southern surveyor. The first bats were non-visual passes heard from 21:57 passing east – west along the north of the hedgerow and first seen here at 22:02. These bat contacts were heard by the southern surveyor and continued throughout the survey. Foraging from pipistrelles *Pipistrellus sp.* was recorded north of the northern surveyor's position at 22:17.
- 3.5 T26 was also located in a hedgerow running east – west and a single surveyor was positioned to its south. A total of 31 common pipistrelle contacts were recorded. The first

bat contacts were non-visual passes recorded from 21:55 foraging along the hedgerow, foraging was intermittent throughout most of the survey and the last bat was heard at 22:43.

- 3.6 T34 was located within a hedgerow running in a north-west – south-east direction and a single surveyor was positioned to its north-east. A total of 3 bat contacts (mostly common pipistrelles, one pipistrelle species) were recorded and one of these denoted multiple passes over 15 minutes. The first bat comprised a pipistrelle *Pipistrelle sp.* at 21:54 flying in a south-east direction, passing around the tree and then heading north-west. A non-visual common pipistrelle was recorded at 22:08 making a single pass. Two common pipistrelle were recorded foraging along the hedgerow from 22:27 until the end of the survey (22:42).
- 3.7 T39 was located in a hedgerow running in a north-west – south-east direction and surveyors were position to the east and west. The eastern surveyor recorded a total of 14 common pipistrelle bat contacts and the western surveyor recorded 12 common pipistrelle contacts. The first bat contact was recorded at 22:02 commuting in a southerly direction down the hedgerow. A bat was recorded commuting west – east across the hedgerow at 22:03 and foraging in a southerly direction along the hedgerow at 22:11. A bat was recorded foraging in a northerly direction up the hedgerow at 22:17 and in a southerly direction down the hedgerow at 22:31. Non-visual commuting and foraging from common pipistrelle were recorded intermittently between 22:15 and 22:27 and between 22:31 to 22:42.
- 3.8 On the dawn return survey (05.08.16) surveyors were positioned at the same locations as on the above dusk emergence and no bats were recorded returning to any of the trees.
- 3.9 At T10 the northern surveyor recorded a total of 8 bat contacts (6 common pipistrelle and 2 soprano pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pygmaeus*) and the southern surveyor also recorded 8 contacts (all common pipistrelle). The first bat contact was a soprano pipistrelle recorded at 03:32. Non-visual common pipistrelle contacts were recorded intermittently by the southern surveyor between 03:36 and 04:07 and from 04:22 and 04:30. The northern surveyor recorded non-visual common pipistrelle contacts at 04:11, 04:20 and 04:24. A common pipistrelle was recorded commuting north to the west of T10 at 04:19 and at 04:34 the same species was recorded commuting west – east along Weasel Lane. At 04:46 the last bat, a common pipistrelle was recorded commuting south to the east of T10.
- 3.10 At T26 the single surveyor recorded a single faint non-visual common pipistrelle pass at 04:21 and no other bats were recorded.
- 3.11 At T34 no bats were recorded.
- 3.12 At T39 the western surveyor recorded no bat contacts. The eastern surveyor recorded a total of 6 bat contacts (mostly common pipistrelle, 1 unidentified bat). The first bat was a common pipistrelle recorded commuting south past the east of T39 at 04:26. Several passes by common pipistrelle were recorded while foraging in a southerly direction down the hedgerow past T39 at 04:28. A single silent, unidentified bat was seen passing in a northerly direction up the hedgerow away from T39 at 04:43 and was the last bat recorded.
- 3.13 The ecology ES Chapter made an assessment of **local value** on the site for roosting bats given the number of trees providing potential for roosts and the absence of any evidence of roosting bats. No bat roosts have been identified in the 4 trees supporting the most suitable bat roost features (moderate potential). Given the provisions for safeguarding of the

remaining bat potential trees during construction (sections 5.61 & 5.62 within the Environmental Statement ecology chapter) and retention of the majority of these trees within the proposed layout the significance of any effects was assessed as **minor adverse**.

- 3.14 The removal of T10, T26, T34 and T39 should be section felled in accordance with the detailed Method Statement for Tree Works provided in Appendix C of the Bat Survey Report².

Habitats

- 3.15 The 2016 survey considers that the overall habitats on site remained unaltered from the previous surveys (2012 and 2014) with the arable and semi-improved grassland habitats considered to be of **negligible value** and losses as a result of proposals were not considered to be significant.
- 3.16 Semi-natural woodland, mature trees and hedgerows were considered to be of **local value**. The limited loss of mature trees and semi-natural woodland was not considered to be significant given the extent of green infrastructure proposed and the limited loss of hedgerows was considered to be of **minor adverse** significance.

² FPCR Environment and Design Ltd (2014) *Salden Chase, Milton Keynes Bat Survey Report*, Hallam Land Management, Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd, William Davis, Connolly Homes and Bellcross Homes

4.0 IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF KEY IMPACTS

Bat Tree Roosts

- 4.1 No additional construction or operational impacts have been identified in relation to the effects on bat potential tree roosts as a result of the further surveys undertaken. The significance of the potential direct and indirect impacts to potential bat tree roosts, as outlined in the Ecology & Nature Conservation Chapter of the ES remains unchanged.
- 4.2 No additional construction or operational impacts have been identified in relation to the effects on the habitats and the baseline data gathered from the walkover survey confirms that the condition and extent of habitats remains unchanged. The significance of the potential direct and indirect impacts to the habitats, as outlined in the Ecology & Nature Conservation Chapter of the ES remains unchanged.

5.0 MITIGATION MEASURES

Bat Potential Trees

- 5.1 Following targeted ground and aerial tree inspections in 2014 and 2016 and the further nocturnal emergence and dawn return surveys in July and August 2016 no bat roosts have been identified. It is therefore considered highly unlikely that a bat roost is present on site. The mitigation described in paragraphs 5.61 and 5.62 of the Ecology & Nature Conservation ES Chapter remains unchanged.

Habitats

- 5.2 The baseline data regarding the habitats present on site has not changed since the ES was written and the mitigation detailed in paragraphs 5.36 – 5.39 of the Ecology & Nature Conservation ES Chapter remains unchanged.

6.0 RESIDUAL AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

- 6.1 No additional residual or accumulative impacts have been identified as a result of the further tree and walkover surveys for bats completed. As is consistent with the findings of the ES Chapter, it is considered that following the provision of compensatory habitats and mitigation measures the South West Milton Keynes proposals would result in **minor** impacts overall.

Appendix A: Tree Assessment Table

Tree ref. number	Species	Potential bat roost features (distance above ground and aspect)	Potential for roosting bats (high, moderate, low, negligible) following aerial/ground based assessment as appropriate	Evidence of roosting bats?	Aerial Inspection?	Further action required (in the event that pruning works/felling are required to the tree)
1	Ash	Woodpecker (WP) hole on severed stem open at top. Superficial knot hole does not extend	Negligible	No	Yes	None.
1a	Ash	Hazard beam with uncluttered 0.5m long split open to sky	Low	No	No	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
2	Ash	Superficial rot hole in collapsed stem. Vertical crack- too much clutter from branches / foliage. Collapsed severed main stem open to elements	Negligible	No	Yes	None.
2a	Ash	Partially closed knot hole	Low	No	No	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.

Tree ref. number	Species	Potential bat roost features (distance above ground and aspect)	Potential for roosting bats (high, moderate, low, negligible) following aerial/ground based assessment as appropriate	Evidence of roosting bats?	Aerial Inspection?	Further action required (in the event that pruning works/felling are required to the tree)
4	Grey Poplar	Vertical crack on limb in crown hanging doubled over, open to elements.	Low	No	No	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
5	Grey Poplar	Open horizontal split.	Low	No	No	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
6	Ash	WP hole does not extend	Negligible	No	Yes	None.
8	Ash	Large open hole to main stem cavity cluttered with vegetation growing in entrance. WP hole does not extend. Rotten crown with superficial flaky bark.	Negligible	No	Yes	None.

Tree ref. number	Species	Potential bat roost features (distance above ground and aspect)	Potential for roosting bats (high, moderate, low, negligible) following aerial/ground based assessment as appropriate	Evidence of roosting bats?	Aerial Inspection?	Further action required (in the event that pruning works/felling are required to the tree)
8a	Ash	Butt rot with column of decay extending up 70cm and small entry hole at top, married to small void.	Low	No	Yes	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
8b	Ash	Severed rotten limb with rot hole open to sky	Low	No	No	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
10	Ash	Knot hole, some cobwebs, entrance 10x15cm extends back 20cm, extends up 40cm into 2 separate voids. Dry with woodlice. Cavity from pruning does not extend.	Moderate	No	Yes	Pre-felling nocturnal survey.
10a	Ash	WP hole (6cm diameter) extending back 10cm and narrowing.	Negligible	No	Yes	None.

Tree ref. number	Species	Potential bat roost features (distance above ground and aspect)	Potential for roosting bats (high, moderate, low, negligible) following aerial/ground based assessment as appropriate	Evidence of roosting bats?	Aerial Inspection?	Further action required (in the event that pruning works/felling are required to the tree)
10b	Ash	3 WP hole all extending downward 10-15cm. Does not extend up or join.	Low	No	Yes	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
13	Ash	WP hole in small lateral, well-rotted.	Negligible	No	No	None.
13a	Ash	Hazard beam with superficial cracks.	Negligible	No	No	None.
14	Ash	Clean, uncluttered WP hole extends down 15cm. Clean, uncluttered WP hole does not extend. Clean, uncluttered knothole does not extend	Low	No	Yes	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
14a	Ash	Heavily cluttered rot hole	Low	No	No	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
15	Horse Chestnut	Knot hole open to sky and exposed.	Low	No	No	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24

Tree ref. number	Species	Potential bat roost features (distance above ground and aspect)	Potential for roosting bats (high, moderate, low, negligible) following aerial/ground based assessment as appropriate	Evidence of roosting bats?	Aerial Inspection?	Further action required (in the event that pruning works/felling are required to the tree)
						hours.
15a	Horse Chestnut	A number of shallow rot holes open to sky and not extending	Negligible	No	No	None.
17	Ash	WP hole, rot hole facing sky and knot hole with 4cm x 10cm opening, all joined internally going down 25cm with squirrel drey in bottom. Branch tear-out diameter 20cm, extending back 10cm very open and dry inside.	Low	No	Yes	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
17a	Ash	Knot hole 7cm diameter opening extending horizontally 10cm.	Low	No	Yes	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
17b	Ash	WP hole rotted through in dead leader. Well-rotted cavity open to sky.	Low	No	No	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.

Tree ref. number	Species	Potential bat roost features (distance above ground and aspect)	Potential for roosting bats (high, moderate, low, negligible) following aerial/ground based assessment as appropriate	Evidence of roosting bats?	Aerial Inspection?	Further action required (in the event that pruning works/felling are required to the tree)
21	Ash	Hazard beam with small, shallow c.2cm opening. C.10cm long vertical crack in lateral limb. Both exposed to elements.	Low	No	No	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
21a	Field Maple	C.1m long vertical split c.1cm wide in cluttered crown	Low	No	No	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
22 / 22a	Ash	Dense ivy cover not mature enough to provide potential	Negligible	No	No	None.
23	Ash	Small patches of lifted bark in dead crown.	Low	No	No	Remove ivy and sectional fell, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
26	Ash	Knot hole goes in and down 40cm with birds nest and dead squirrel at bottom	Moderate	No	Yes	Pre-felling nocturnal survey.
28	Ash	Partially occluded knot hole. WP hole c.1cm	Low	No	No	Remove ivy and sectional fell, sections gently

Tree ref. number	Species	Potential bat roost features (distance above ground and aspect)	Potential for roosting bats (high, moderate, low, negligible) following aerial/ground based assessment as appropriate	Evidence of roosting bats?	Aerial Inspection?	Further action required (in the event that pruning works/felling are required to the tree)
		diameter				lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
30	Ash	2 knot holes occluded with deadwood	Low	No	No	Remove ivy and sectional fell, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
31a	Ash	4 WP holes all c.2cm deep with bird droppings inside	Negligible	No	Yes	None.
31b	Ash	2 knot holes facing sky and occluded with deadwood	Negligible	No	No	None.
32	Pedunculate Oak	Superficial splits in multiple branches	Negligible	No	Yes	None.
33	Ash	Knot hole facing sky	Low	No	No	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
34	Ash	WP hole in dead limb, unsafe to climb	Moderate	No	Yes	Pre-felling nocturnal survey.
34a	Ash	Dense ivy cover not mature enough to provide potential	Negligible	No	No	None.

Tree ref. number	Species	Potential bat roost features (distance above ground and aspect)	Potential for roosting bats (high, moderate, low, negligible) following aerial/ground based assessment as appropriate	Evidence of roosting bats?	Aerial Inspection?	Further action required (in the event that pruning works/felling are required to the tree)
34b	Ash	Vertical crack c.0.5m long on dead limb. Exposed to elements	Low	No	No	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
34c	Ash	Vertical cracks c.10cm long and limited lifted bark	Low	No	No	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
34d	Ash	WP hole 8cm diameter with nest material in entrance. Extends up 5cm and back 30cm flat base and dry.	Low	No	Yes	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
35	Ash	Hollow main cavity extends up 12cm, dry and rough inside and cobwebbed. Knot hole that does not extend	Low	No	Yes	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.
36	Grey Poplar	Limited lifted bark on single lower limb stump	Low	No	No	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.

Tree ref. number	Species	Potential bat roost features (distance above ground and aspect)	Potential for roosting bats (high, moderate, low, negligible) following aerial/ground based assessment as appropriate	Evidence of roosting bats?	Aerial Inspection?	Further action required (in the event that pruning works/felling are required to the tree)
38	Ash	2 superficial rot holes that do not extend. Superficial rot holes in lifted bark	Negligible	No	Yes	None.
39	Horse Chestnut	Dead tree exhibiting many small cracks and splits and minor lifted bark. Unable to inspect due to poor condition of features	Moderate	No	Yes	Pre-felling nocturnal survey.
40	Ash	Horizontal split c.7cm wide and 50cm long	Low	No	No	Sectional felling of bat potential areas, sections gently lowered to ground and left in-situ for 24 hours.