

Brewery House, 5 Netherley Road,
Tarbock Green, Knowsley
Ecological Appraisal
2023



RACHEL
HACKING
ECOLOGY

Client New Start Homes

Project Title Brewery House, 5 Netherley Road, Tarbock Green, Knowsley

Project Reference RHE.3997

Project Leader Megan Johnson

Contact Details megan@rachelhackingecology.co.uk

	Name	Position	Date
Author	Megan Johnson	Junior Ecologist	20/11/2023
Reviewer	Dr Rachel Hacking	Principal Ecologist	08/12/2023
Revision			



**RACHEL
HACKING
ECOLOGY**

The Stables
Paradise Wharf
Ducie Street
Manchester
M1 2JN

0161 465 8971

www.rachelhackingecology.co.uk

mail@rachelhackingecology.co.uk



**RACHEL
HACKING
ECOLOGY**

Report Contents

Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Methods	6
3. Results	8
4. Assessment	24
5. Recommendations	26
Appendix 1: Planning Policy & Legislation	
Appendix 2: Habitat Survey Plan	



Executive Summary

Development Details

The client is proposing a residential development at Brewery House, 5 Netherley Road, Tarbock Green, Knowsley, hereafter referred to as the 'site'. This report describes the ecological features of the site and its surroundings and assesses the potential impacts of the development on the ecological interest. Recommendations are provided so that the development is compliant with biodiversity policy and legislation.

Ecological Interest

The site has a moderate level of ecological interest. Ecological features of interest include suitable habitat for nesting birds and roosting bats.

Outcomes

Two dusk emergence surveys are required to determine the status of roosting bats and inform mitigation requirements. Great Crested Newt will need to be considered during the construction phase and this can be addressed through District Level Licensing (DLL). Potential impacts to common species of reptile can be avoided by following standard measures detailed in a Reasonable Avoidance method statement. Impacts to nesting birds can be avoided by timing demolition to avoid the nesting season (March to August) or undertaking a survey to establish the status of nesting birds and inform mitigation requirements. Biodiversity enhancement opportunities have been identified.



1. Introduction

1.1 Project Brief

- 1.1.1 Rachel Hacking Ecology Limited was commissioned in 2023 by New Start Homes, via Smith Young, to carry out an Ecological Appraisal, including a daytime bat survey, of land at Brewery House, 5 Netherley Road, Tarbock Green, Knowsley, located at O.S. grid reference: SJ 46023 87687 (see Figure 1).



Figure 1. Map showing the location of the site

- 1.1.2 The proposed development site is set in a semi-rural area and currently comprises a double height barn, amenity grassland, tall ruderal herb, ephemeral/short-lived perennial vegetation and bare ground. Hedgerows and trees are also present. The site is surrounded by agricultural land and residential properties with mature gardens. Ochre Brook is situated 400m north of the site and Netherley brook is situated 400m to the southeast. Additionally, woodland surrounds the north of the site, offering suitable bat foraging and commuting habitat.

Description of Development

- 1.1.3 The site will be the subject of a planning application for the re-development.

1.2 Scope of Work

- 1.2.1 The Client commissioned Rachel Hacking Ecology to carry out the following works:
- Record the extent, type, and condition of habitats within and next to the site.

- Search for signs of protected species and assessment of the potential of habitats and features to support protected and notable species.

1.3 Site Visit Information

Surveyor Details

- 1.3.1 Megan Johnson (Junior Ecologist) visited the site on 21st November 2023. Megan has professional experience of undertaking similar surveys.

Weather

- 1.3.2 The weather at the time of the survey was dry and partly cloudy with an average temperature of 10°C.



2. Methods

2.1 Desk Study

- 2.1.1 The Magic website (Multi-Agency Geographical Information for the Countryside) was interrogated for the presence of Statutory Designated Sites (and European Protected Species licences) within 2km radius of the site.
- 2.1.2 The site was checked to determine if it is located within an Impact Risk Zones for any Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and if so, whether the Local Planning Authority will need to consult Natural England.
- 2.1.3 The Local Planning Authority Policy Maps were interrogated for the locations of any non-statutory designated sites.

2.2 Field Survey

Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey

- 2.2.1 In accordance with JNCC guidelines¹ the site was walked over, and the habitats and features of ecological interest were mapped and described. Habitats and features of particular interest were target noted.
- 2.2.2 During the walkover habitat and features were assessed for their suitability to support protected and notable species in accordance with CIEEM guidelines². Field signs of protected, notable, and invasive non-native species, if encountered, were mapped, and described.

Bats

- 2.2.3 The exterior of any buildings/structures were surveyed from the ground using binoculars and a high-powered torch. Features offering potential access to roosting bats were recorded. Such features may include suitable gaps in roof coverings, gaps behind external cladding/facia and gaps in masonry.
- 2.2.4 Evidence indicating the presence of roosting bats was also searched for. This may include bat droppings on walls, windows or on the ground below roost entrances or staining from fur oil around roost entry points.

¹ JNCC (2010). *Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey: A Technique for Environmental Audit*. Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Peterborough

² CIEEM (2017). *Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal*. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.



- 2.2.5 The interior of any buildings/structures was surveyed (where accessible) to identify any evidence indicating use by roosting bats. Such evidence may include bat droppings, feeding remains, urine splashes, live or dead bats and staining from fur oil on timbers.
- 2.2.6 Any trees on the site that are to be affected by the proposals were given a ground-level assessment, searching for Potential Roosting Features (PRF's), such as flaking bark, woodpecker holes, knot holes and limb splits.

2.3 Mitigation Hierarchy

- 2.3.1 Mitigation measures should be embedded within the masterplan design and planning application process. This process from proposal to implementation needs to consider the 'mitigation hierarchy' of avoid, reduce, compensate, and enhance:
- Aim to avoid negative effects through the design process.
 - Mitigate if negative effects cannot be avoided.
 - Use compensation measures to offset residual impacts.
 - Identify and implement opportunities to enhance biodiversity.

3. Results

3.1 Survey Constraints

- 3.1.1 Field survey results are valid for a limited duration and no investigation can provide a complete description and characterisation of a site. The composition of habitats and species can change depending on environmental variables and the mobility of species, so the results of a study become less reliable over time. In some cases, surveys that are 3 years old may be acceptable for a project assuming that habitats have not significantly changed in the intervening period, but for protected species it is likely that survey data will need to be no more than 18 months old.
- 3.1.2 There were no survey constraints.

3.2 Designated Sites

- 3.2.1 The desk study provided information on the designated sites. No statutory designated sites exist within 2km of the site. Non-statutory designated sites are listed below in Table 1.

Table 1. Designated Sites			
Name	Status	Location/distance	Interest
Brickwall Covert	Local Wildlife Site	30m east	Broadleaf and mixed plantation woodland, priority habitat. Wetland habitat.
Ochre Brook	Local Wildlife Site	400m north	Open water.
Netherley Brook	Local Wildlife Site	400m south-east	Open water. Diverse aquatic vegetation.
Dog Clog Brook	Local Wildlife Site	430m north-east	Open water. Water Vole habitat.
Tarbock Green Ditch	Local Wildlife Site	460m east	Open water. Water Vole habitat.
Mill Brook	Local Wildlife Site	860m west	Open water. Water Vole habitat.

- 3.2.2 The desk study identified that the site was located within the Impact Risk Zone of Mersey Estuary SSSI. The proposed development will not, however, require the Local Planning Authority to consult with Natural England.



3.3 Habitats

3.3.1 The habitats survey plan is contained in Appendix 2.

Amenity Grassland

3.3.2 A large patch of amenity-managed grassland is located to the rear of the site (see Photograph 1). Species include Perennial Rye-grass *Lolium perenne*, Yorkshire Fog *Holcus lanatus*, Creeping Buttercup *Ranunculus repens* and Dandelion *Taraxacum officinale* agg.



Photograph 1 showing the amenity grassland

Ephemeral/ Short Perennial Vegetation

3.3.3 Ephemeral/short perennial vegetation is present throughout the site, predominantly towards the south and centre of the site and along site boundaries (see Photograph 2). Species include, Willowherb *Epilobium* sp., Herb-Robert *Geranium robertianum*, Common Ragwort *Jacobaea vulgaris*, White Clover *Trifolium repens*, Ribwort Plantain *Plantago lanceolata*, Creeping Buttercup, Yorkshire Fog, Dandelion, Ivy *Hedera helix*, Bramble *Rubus fruticosus* agg. and Spear Thistle *Cirsium vulgare*.



Photograph 2 showing the ephemeral/short perennial vegetation

Tall, Ruderal Herb

- 3.3.4 Tall, ruderal vegetation is present in front of the main barn, to the south and as a small patch in the northeastern corner (see Photograph 3). This habitat is dominated by a Rosebay Willowherb *Chamaenerion angustifolium* and Common Nettle *Urtica dioica*.



Photograph 3 showing the tall, ruderal vegetation

Scattered Scrub

- 3.3.5 Scattered scrub is occasional and includes Bramble and tree saplings (see Photograph 4).



Photograph 4 showing the scattered scrub

Ornamental Hedgerow

- 3.3.6 The site is bordered by hedgerows to the east and south (see Photograph 5). The hedgerows are species poor, dominated by Leyland cypress *Cupressus x leylandii*.



Photograph 5 showing Leyland Cypress hedgerow

Individual Trees

- 3.3.7 Several individual trees are scattered throughout the site (see Photograph 6). Species include Horse Chestnut *Aesculus hippocastanum*, Silver Birch *Betula pendula* and Pine *Pinus* sp.



Photograph 6 showing individual trees

Spoil

- 3.3.8 Piles of spoil surround the main barn on site (see Photograph 7).



Photograph 7 showing a pile of spoil

Buildings/Structures

- 3.3.9 A brick barn is situated to the south of the site (see Photograph 8), and remnants of a brick structure exist to the north of the barn (see Photograph 9).



Photograph 8 showing the main barn



Photograph 9 showing the remnants of a building

Bare Ground

- 3.3.10 Hardstanding is situated at the southwest of the site (see Photograph 10).



Photograph 10 showing hard standing

3.4 Species

Bats: External Survey

- 3.4.1 The main building on site is a two-storey barn, currently used for storage. The barn is semi-detached, with a section to the west with two levels (see Photograph 11).



Photograph 11 showing the external masonry of the main barn

- 3.4.2 Gaps are present within the brickwork providing potential access points for bats (see Photograph 12).



Photograph 12 showing gaps in the external brickwork

- 3.4.3 Gaps are present between the fascia boarding and brickwork providing potential access points and roosting features for bats (see Photograph 13).



Photograph 13 showing gaps under the fascia

- 3.4.4 The roof appears to be intact, however slipped and missing slates are present across the entire roof (see Photograph 14). Potential roosting features exist where slates have lifted (see Photograph 15).



Photograph 14 showing a section of roof on the barn



Photograph 15 showing lifted tiles

- 3.4.5 Gaps exist where wooden doors have been damaged, providing potential access points for bats. An open letterbox and a smashed window on the southern elevation of the barn to the west also provide potential access points for bats and birds (see Photograph 16).



Photograph 16 showing potential access points on the southern elevation of the barn

- 3.4.6 Several cavities are present within the brickwork of the building, however the cavities are shallow and cobwebbed (see Photograph 17).



Photograph 17 showing a cavity in the wall

- 3.4.7 The tree in the northeastern corner of the site offers low potential to support roosting bats. No obvious roosting features were identified on any of the other trees on site.

Bats: Internal Survey

- 3.4.8 Several gaps exist within the brickwork, providing access points for bats (see Photograph 18).



Photograph 18 showing the interior of the barn

- 3.4.9 The roof of the main section of the building is open access. The roof is unlined, with several gaps between slate tiles providing potential access points for bats, the timber joists and beams are intact with minimal gaps or cracks present (see Photograph 19).



Photograph 19 showing the underside of the roof of the barn

- 3.4.10 The section to the west of the building has two levels with open access between the two levels. The missing letterbox and smashed window provide potential access points for bats (see Photograph 20 and 21).



Photograph 20 showing the lower elevation of the western section/room of the barn and open letterbox



Photograph 21 showing the upper elevation of the western section of the barn and smashed window

- 3.4.11 The roof of this section of the building is lined with breathable membrane with no tears or gapping within the lining (see Photograph 22). Cavities exist within the brickwork and where timber beams attach to the wall, providing potential roosting features for bats (see Photograph 23).



Photograph 22 showing the underside of the roof in the western section of the barn



Photograph 23 showing cavities in the brickwork

3.4.12 Feeding remains (butterfly and moth wings) were found scattered throughout both sections of the building (see Photograph 24).



Photograph 24 showing feeding remains

- 3.4.13 Scattered bat droppings were also found throughout both sections of the building (see Photograph 25).



Photograph 25 showing a bat dropping

Nesting birds

- 3.4.14 An old birds' nest was recorded within the eastern section of the building, above the main barn door (see Photograph 26). Trees and hedgerows on site also offer suitable nesting bird habitat, with a birds nest located within a tree in the north-eastern corner of the site.



Photograph 26 showing a bird's nest within the barn

Great Crested Newt

- 3.4.15 No ponds exist on site. Six ponds are located up to 250 metres distance from the site but were inaccessible at the time of the survey.
- 3.4.16 Pond 1 is situated 134m north-east of the site. Pond 2 is situated 109m north-west, Pond 3 is situated 147m north-west and Pond 4 is situated 226m north-west. Ponds 1-4 are reasonably well connected to site via woodland and hedgerows. Ox Lane runs between the ponds and site, but this is not considered to be a significant barrier to newt dispersal. Pond 5 is situated 243m west and Pond 6 is situated 222m south. Both of these ponds are reasonably well connected to the site via hedgerows. Netherley Road runs between these two ponds and site.
- 3.4.17 The site supports suitable habitat for Great Crested Newt *Triturus cristatus*.

Reptiles

- 3.4.18 No evidence of reptiles was found on site. The site offers habitats suitable for reptiles within spoil piles and rough vegetation but no optimal reptile habitat exists on site nor immediately adjacent.

Hedgehogs

- 3.4.19 No signs of Hedgehog *Erinaceus europaeus* were recorded on site during the survey. The site offers suitable Hedgehog habitat along hedgerows and spoil piles.

Badger

- 3.4.20 No evidence of Badger *Meles meles*, such as hairs, paw prints or latrines were found on site. The grassland on site is suitable for foraging and commuting Badgers.

Invasive Species

- 3.4.21 No invasive, non-native species, as listed on Schedule 9 of The Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as

amended), were found on site. Invasive species are not, therefore, considered any further in this report.



4. Assessment

4.1 Impacts on Designated Sites

- 4.1.1 No impacts to designated sites are anticipated due to the absence of impact pathways. All sites are geographically separated, and the proposed development will not increase visitor pressure on any of the sites.

4.2 Impacts on Habitats

- 4.2.1 The habitats on site are common, heavily disturbed and do not support any rare or notable plant species so they are considered to be of limited ecological interest.
- 4.2.2 Trees and hedgerows on site are assumed to be retained within the proposals. They will need to be protected from damage during the construction phase.

4.3 Impacts on Species

Bats

- 4.3.1 The redevelopment of the main barn could result in impacts to bats, should they be present. The evidence indicates occasional use by an individual or small number of bats. No evidence to indicate a maternity roost was recorded. The presence of bats has been confirmed and the overall assessment is of a building with features to support roosting and foraging bats. Works to the barn, without mitigation could risk individual bats being killed or injured and roosts could be damaged or destroyed.
- 4.3.2 Further survey work is considered necessary to determine the type of bat roost present on site (see Section 5).

Amphibians

- 4.3.3 The site contains spoil heaps and rough vegetation that could provide foraging opportunities for Great Crested Newt and other amphibians if they are present in the local area. There are six ponds within 250m of the site and the ponds have connecting habitat with only minor barriers. At this stage, an adverse impact cannot be discounted because there is potential for Great Crested Newt to be present in the local area and on site. If Great Crested Newt is present the proposed development has the potential for an adverse impact. Mitigation measures are proposed within Section 5.

Reptiles

- 4.3.4 The site contains spoil heaps and rough vegetation that could provide suitable habitat for reptiles if they are present in the local area. Without mitigation, the proposed development has potential to impact reptiles should they be present. A Reptile Reasonable Avoidance Methods Statement (RAMS) is recommended (see Section 5).

Badger

- 4.3.5 No impacts to Badger setts are anticipated, but without mitigation, there is a risk of harm to Badgers if they access the construction site.

Nesting Birds

- 4.3.6 Trees and hedgerows on site offer suitable nesting bird habitat. Inactive nests were present within the building and trees. The site contains habitats that are suitable to be used by nesting birds. Without mitigation, clearance of vegetation and works affecting the building may have an adverse impact on nesting birds, should these be present (see Section 5).

Hedgehog

- 4.3.7 Without mitigation, there is a risk of harm to Hedgehog, if they are present in the local area, if they access the construction site. Mitigation measures are proposed within Section 5.



5. Recommendations

5.1 Further Surveys

Bats

- 5.1.1 Further targeted survey is required in order to determine the status of roosting bats at the site and inform mitigation requirements. In accordance with current guidelines, two dusk emergence surveys should be carried out on the main barn between May and September, under suitable weather conditions.

5.2 Mitigation and Enhancement Measures

- 5.2.1 Protection of ecological features (habitats and species) during the construction phase will be described in a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). The CEMP will contain Operational Aims and Objectives, Rationale for management, Prescriptions and schedules detailing the timing and responsibility for delivering the prescriptions. It is anticipated that the CEMP will be provided as a planning condition in advance of the commencement of the proposed development.

Habitats

- 5.2.2 Trees and hedgerows should be retained where possible. Any mature or semi-mature trees that are to be removed should be replaced with appropriate planting upon completion of the construction phase.
- 5.2.3 Retained trees and Hedgerow should be protected by fencing.
- 5.2.4 Opportunities to enhance the biodiversity on site should be considered by planting trees and shrubs and creating flowerbeds with a diverse range of species.

Bats

- 5.2.5 Any external lighting should avoid illuminating hedgerows, trees, or bat boxes.
- 5.2.6 At this stage it is not feasible to provide specific mitigation details without further information that will be gathered as a consequence of targeted survey work.

Great Crested Newt

- 5.2.7 Six ponds are present within 250m of the site with no major barriers between, some of the ponds have the appearance of Great Crested Newt (GCN) mitigation ponds and it is considered reasonably likely that GCN is present in the wider area. The most expedient option is to apply to enter the site into the District Level Licensing (DLL) scheme with Natural England. No further survey work is required if DLL is chosen.



Badger, Hedgehog and other Mammals

- 5.2.8 To ensure that Badgers, Hedgehog, and any other mammals are not trapped or harmed during the construction work, smaller excavations should be covered if left overnight. Larger excavations, if left overnight or for longer periods, should be ramped to enable animals to escape.

Nesting Birds

- 5.2.9 Impacts on nesting birds should be avoided by carrying out site clearance and similar operations outside of the bird breeding season (March- August). Construction activities that might directly impact upon breeding birds should hence be limited to the September-February period. If vegetation has to be cleared during the bird breeding season checks immediately before clearance by a suitably qualified ecologist will be required. If nesting activity is detected work in that area will need to stop until the ecologist considers that nesting activity is finished.
- 5.2.10 Redeveloped buildings should incorporate nesting bricks³ for species of conservation concern such as Swift *Apus apus* and House Sparrow *Passer domesticus*. These should be installed at eaves level, on northeast to northwest facing elevations. Bird boxes could also be installed on suitable trees on site⁴.

Reptiles

- 5.2.11 The risk of harming Reptiles can be managed by following a Reasonable Avoidance Method Statement (RAMS) during construction. This will include measures such as sensitive vegetation clearance and storage of materials as well as ensuring site staff are aware of what to do should a Reptile be encountered.

Invertebrates

- 5.2.12 Invertebrate houses or Bug hotels⁵ should be installed in sunny sheltered locations in the garden on site.

³ <https://www.ibstock.co.uk/product/swift-box?page=1&>

⁴ <https://www.nhbs.com/1b-schwegler-nest-box>

⁵ <https://www.nestbox.co.uk/products/bug-hotel>



Appendix 1: Planning Policy & Legislation

National Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023) describes the Government's planning policy for England and how it should be applied. Within this framework, the requirements in relation to biodiversity are included within several policies. The two most relevant to individual planning decisions are Paragraphs 174 and 180, shown below:

- 174. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:
 - a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan);
 - b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;
 - c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate;
 - d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures; etc...
- 180. When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:
 - 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.

Legislation

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the CRow Act 2000) includes the notification and confirmation of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). SSSIs can be notified for their floral, faunal, geological, or physiographical features. Protection against damaging operations and management of SSSIs is also included within the Act. Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) are zones around an SSSI account for the particular sensitivities of the features for which it is notified and identify development proposal which could have adverse impacts.

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the CRow Act 2000) protects native animals, plants and habitats. Under the Act it is an offence to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild animal listed on Schedule 5 and it is an offence to interfere with places used for shelter or protection, or intentionally disturb animals occupying such places. The Act prohibits picking, uprooting or destroy any wild plant (or any attached seed or spore) listed in Schedule 8.

European Protected Species (EPS) such as bats, Hazel Dormouse, Otter, Natterjack Toad, Smooth Snake, Sand Lizard and Great Crested Newt are protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the CRow Act 2000) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. The Acts make it an offence to:

- a) Deliberately capture, injure or kill an EPS;
- b) Deliberately impair an EPS's ability to survive, breed, reproduce, rear or nurture young; to hibernate or migrate; or significantly affect the local distribution or abundance of the EPS.
- c) Possess or control live or dead EPS or any part of, or anything derived from a EPS;
- d) Damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of an EPS;
- e) Intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to any place that is used for shelter or protection by an EPS;
- f) Intentionally or recklessly disturb a structure or place that it uses for shelter or protection that is occupied by an EPS.

All common herptiles are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the CRow Act 2000). Grass Snake, Slow Worm, Common Lizard, Adder are protected against intentional killing or injury.



Common Frog, Common Toad, Smooth Newt and Palmate Newt is protected against sale. In addition, all British reptiles, Common toad and Great Crested Newt are listed as Species of Principal Importance.

All nesting birds are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). It is an offence to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird or take, damage, or destroy its nest whilst in use or being built, or take or destroy its eggs. It is an offence to intentionally or recklessly disturb a species listed on Schedule 1 of the Act while they are nest building or at or near a nest with eggs or young, or to disturb the dependent young.

The Protection of Badgers Act 1992 makes it an offence to wilfully, or to attempt to kill, injure, take, possess or cruelly ill-treat a Badger, or intentionally or recklessly interfere with a sett. Interference of a sett includes disturbing badgers during occupation of a sett, or damaging or destroying a sett, or obstructing access to the sett.

Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 places a duty on every public authority to have regard to conserving biodiversity. Section 41 of the same Act requires the Secretary of State to publish a list of the living organisms and types of habitats that are of 'Principal Importance' for the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The Secretary of State must take steps, as appear reasonably practicable, to further the conservation of those living organisms and habitats in any list published under this section. The list of species and habitats of principal importance currently includes 943 species and 56 habitats. These are the species and habitats found in England which are regarded as conservation priorities under the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework

The Hedgerows Regulations 1997 protect 'important' hedgerows from destruction or damage. A hedgerow is 'important' if it (a) has existed for 30 years or more; and (b) satisfies at least one of the criteria listed in Part II of Schedule 1 of the Regulations. Under the Regulations, it is against the law to remove or destroy 'important' hedgerows unless permitted by the local planning authority.



Appendix 2. Habitat Survey Plan

