

JLR HALEWOOD, NEW FENCE LINE

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report v2.0

JULY 2025



CONTACTS

BRANDON MURRY
Technical Director

m +44 (0) 7809 230662
e brandon.murray@arcadis.com

Arcadis.
80 Fenchurch Street,
London
EC3M 4BY

JLR Halewood, New Fence Line

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report v2.0

Author Esther Abrams

Checker Ewan Gibson

Approver Brandon Murray

Date JULY 2025

VERSION CONTROL

Version	Date	Author	Checker	Approver	Changes
01	18/07/2025	EA	EG	BM	First issue.
02	01/08/2025	EG	-	BM	Comments addressed

This report dated **01 August 2025** has been prepared for **Jaguar Land Rover** (the “Client”) in accordance with the terms and conditions of appointment between the Client and **Arcadis Consulting (UK) Limited** (“Arcadis”) for the purposes specified in the Appointment. For avoidance of doubt, no other person(s) may use or rely upon this report or its contents, and Arcadis accepts no responsibility for any such use or reliance thereon by any other third party.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1 INTRODUCTION.....	2
1.1 Background	2
1.2 Site Location and Setting	2
1.3 Scope of Work.....	3
1.4 Proposed Development	3
2 METHODOLOGY.....	4
2.1 Overview	4
2.2 Desk Study	4
2.3 Field Survey	4
2.4 Limitations.....	4
2.5 Assessment and Evaluation.....	4
3 RESULTS	6
3.1 Reporting Outline	6
3.2 Desk Study	6
3.2.1 Designated Nature Conservation Sites	6
3.2.2 Notable Habitats	6
3.3 Field Survey	6
3.3.1 Site Description and Habitats	6
3.3.2 Bats	6
3.3.3 Badgers	7
3.3.4 Birds	7
3.3.5 Otters.....	7
3.3.6 Water Voles	7
3.3.7 Hazel Dormice	7
3.3.8 Other Mammals	7
3.3.9 Amphibians.....	7
3.3.10 Reptiles.....	7
3.3.11 Fish.....	7
3.3.12 Terrestrial Invertebrates	8
3.3.13 Non-native Invasive Species	8

3.3.14	Protected and Notable Species.....	8
4	DISCUSSION.....	9
4.1	Biodiversity Net Gain Statement.....	9
4.2	Potential Ecological Constraints	9
4.3	Recommended Mitigation	9
5	LEGISLATION AND POLICY COMPLIANCE.....	10
6	CONCLUSIONS.....	11
7	REFERENCES.....	12

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Relevant Ecological Legislation and Policy

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Arcadis Consulting (UK) Limited was commissioned by Jaguar Land Rover to produce a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) report ahead of proposed works at JLR Halewood, Liverpool ('the site').

This report presents the results of the PEA informed by a desk-study and walkover survey undertaken in July 2025. The works proposed are to install a fence to provide security along the A561 Halewood slip road/Jaguar Land Rover (JLR) Halewood site boundary to prevent fly-tipping in this location.

The PEA identified minimal ecological constraints associated with the proposed works. The works will not significantly impact habitats considered to be of ecological value and the works have limited potential to impact protected or notable species.

No further surveys or assessment have been recommended.

Mitigation measures have been recommended to avoid and minimise impacts to habitats, and protected species, should they be present. An Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) should be employed to supervise the trimming of trees and vegetation, as well as during the installation of the fence in close proximity to trees. The ECoW should undertake nesting bird checks (for works within the main breeding season, March-August inclusive). The ECoW should assess the potential for trees to support roosting bats prior to any vegetation management, and supervise the avoidance of any active nest or bat roost feature discovered. The ECoW should also undertake a fingertip search of all ground vegetation in the small areas that would need trimming, in order to ensure the absence of any reptile or amphibian species. This measure would be sufficient to prevent any significant impact to ecological features during these works.

Considering the nature of the works, there are negligible risks of significant impacts to any other species or species groups and no ecological constraints that cannot be managed by an ECoW during the installation of the fence.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Arcadis Consulting (UK) Limited was commissioned by Jaguar Land Rover (JLR) to produce a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (PEA) to support the proposed construction of a new security fence at JLR Halewood. JLR have proposed to install a fence to provide security along the A561 Halewood slip road/Jaguar Land Rover (JLR) Halewood site boundary to prevent fly-tipping in this location.

This Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report identifies any ecological constraints associated with the proposed works and informs the design process by outlining appropriate mitigation measures.

1.2 Site Location and Setting

The site is located within the JLR manufacturing facility in Halewood, Merseyside, south of Liverpool, at approximate Ordnance Survey (OS) grid reference SJ 45957 84325. Image 1, below, highlights the development location, which is shown in as a red line, and a surrounding 15m buffer that was inspected, where accessible.

Image 1: Development area location (red line)



1.3 Scope of Work

The assessment of ecological constraints has been undertaken with reference to current good practice (CIEEM, 2017). The scope of this assessment includes the following:

- A desk study which included a 1 km search buffer from the site for non-statutory designated nature conservation sites, a 2 km buffer for protected/notable¹ species², and a 5 km buffer for statutory designated nature conservation sites;
- A walkover survey was undertaken in July 2025 for the area identified for enhancement) to identify key habitats and assess their potential to support protected and/or notable species, and record any presence of non-native invasive plant species;
- An external inspection of the buildings and an internal inspection of attic spaces (where safe) to identify features suitable for supporting roosting bats;
- A preliminary assessment to highlight potential impacts that proposals may present to biodiversity, as well as possible requirements for further survey effort, mitigation measures and enhancement opportunities;
- Identify potential ecological constraints to the proposed works;
- An outline of measures and locations for mitigation and possible ecological enhancement; and
- Associated habitat mapping.

1.4 Proposed Development

JLR propose to remove the existing fencing between the footpath and Crab Tree Rough and install 152m of 3m high security fencing. There are currently two fencing options:

- V Beam 3m High Prison Mesh;
- Steel Palisade 3m High Fencing.

It is understood that no trees would be felled for the fence's construction, keeping vegetation management minimal by trimming tree branches, and small stands of scrub and ground vegetation. This will be managed by hand-digging holes for fence posts to minimise impacts on the habitats present.

¹ Notable habitats - principal habitats for the conservation of biodiversity listed under Section 41 of the *Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006*; habitats listed under the North Mersey Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP); hedgerows identified as being 'important' under the wildlife criteria of the *Hedgerow Regulations 1997*, ancient woodlands and veteran trees

² Notable species - principal species for the conservation of biodiversity listed under Section 41 of the *Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006*; any species listed in an IUCN Red Data Book; and any other species listed under the North Mersey BAP.

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Overview

This section sets out the methodologies applied to establish the baseline conditions and identifies any limitations encountered.

The baseline was established through a desk-based study and field survey. The latter comprised a habitat survey which was extended to consider all protected and notable species relevant to the survey area.

2.2 Desk Study

A desk study was undertaken in 2025 to identify any existing ecological information relating to the site and its surroundings. The following resources/sources were used/consulted.

- The Multi-Agency Geographical Information System (MAGIC) website (MAGIC, 2025) was used to search for statutory designated nature conservation sites within 5 km of the site, and Habitats of Principal Importance in England for the Conservation of Biodiversity (HPIEs; HMSO 2006) within 100 m of the site.
- Merseyside Biobank Environmental Records Centre was consulted for records of protected species within 2 km of the site (from data collected in the last 20 years only) and non-statutory designated nature conservation sites within 1 km of the site.
- National Biodiversity Network (NBN Atlas) was reviewed for records of protected or notable species in the search area.
- North Mersey BAP was reviewed for protected species and habitats within the search area.

2.3 Field Survey

A site survey was conducted on 10 July 2025 by Consultant Ecologist Ewan Gibson ACIEEM and assisted by Intern Ecologist Emmanuel Sam. The site was surveyed to assess the potential ecological constraints relating to the installation of the proposed fence.

The habitats on site were also assessed for their potential to support protected or notable species of plants and animals, and observation was made of any incidental signs of protected or notable species.

2.4 Limitations

Field surveys are limited by a variety of factors which affect the presence of flora and fauna (i.e. climatic variation, season and species behaviour). A lack of evidence of a protected species during a survey does not mean that the species is absent; hence the survey also records and assesses the ability of habitats to support such species. The time frame in which the survey is implemented provides a snapshot of activity within the survey area and cannot necessarily detect all evidence of use by a species.

The survey data and recommendations provided in this report are valid for two years from the date of issue.

2.5 Assessment and Evaluation

In addition to establishing the baseline ecological interest within the site, the survey intended to identify areas where further surveys may be required, during the appropriate season. The potential for habitats to support legally protected or notable species was assessed from field observations carried out during the walkover and combined with the results of the desk study. This was ranked as follows and relies on habitat suitability and an evaluation of existing data.

- **Negligible** – while presence cannot be absolutely discounted, habitats are very limited or of poor quality for a particular species or species group. There may be no local returns from a data search and the surrounding habitats are considered unlikely to support wider populations of a species/species group. The site may also be outside or peripheral to the known natural range for a species/species group.

- **Low** – habitats are of poor to moderate quality for a given species/species group. There are few or no returns from the data search, but presence cannot be discounted on the basis of national distribution, the nature of surrounding habitats, habitat fragmentation or recent disturbance, etc.
- **Medium** – habitats are of moderate quality providing opportunities for a given species/species group. Desk study reveals local occurrence, or the area is within the national distribution and with suitable surrounding habitat. Factors limiting the likelihood of occurrence may include small habitat area, habitat isolation, and/or disturbance.
- **High** – habitats are of high quality for a given species/species group. Desk-top study provides evidence of local occurrence. The area is within/peripheral to a national or regional stronghold and/or has good quality surrounding habitat and good connectivity.
- **Confirmed Presence** – presence confirmed from the current survey or by recent, confirmed records.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Reporting Outline

The results of the desk study and field survey are described below, with sites or features of particular nature conservation interest detailed as appropriate. A summary of relevant legislation and policy presented in Appendix A.

3.2 Desk Study

3.2.1 Designated Nature Conservation Sites

There is one internationally or nationally important designated sites recorded within 5 km of the site. Merseyside Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) is located 2.3 km to the south of the site. It is a large estuary comprising large areas of saltmarsh and extensive intertidal sand and mudflats, there are limited areas of brackish marsh, rocky shoreline and boulder clay cliffs, within a rural and industrial environment. Adverse ecological impacts to Merseyside Estuary SPA from the works associated with this development are negligible due to a culmination of factors:

- There is a distinct lack of habitat connectivity between the SPA and proposed development, with significant fragmentation through hard-standing surfaces and structures such as roads and buildings.
- The above factor, combined with the small scale of the works and distance to the SPA scope out the necessity for further ecological considerations.

The Crab Tree Rough and Hopyard Wood Plantation local wildlife site is located immediately to the north of the works. This site is predominantly broadleaf woodland with ponds, neutral grasslands and areas of regeneration. The key driver for the installation of the fence it's prevent fly tipping into this area. The area is also being cleared of waste as part of a related project by Jaguar Land Rover.

Other local wildlife sites are present within 2km of the site but all are over 250m of the site. This, combined with the small scale of the works scope out the necessity for further ecological consideration with regards to these sites.

3.2.2 Notable Habitats

No ancient woodlands were returned by the desk study within 100 m of the site (one ancient woodland is located 300m to the south of the site). Crab Tree Rough to the immediate north of the proposed fence location supports deciduous woodland.

3.3 Field Survey

3.3.1 Site Description and Habitats

The fence is proposed to be installed immediately next to a hard-standing foot path to replace an existing wooden fence.

The habitats present in the area include a semi-natural woodland (species including Pedunculate Oak *Quercus robur*, Sycamore *Acer pseudoplatanus* and Wild Cherry *Prunus avium*) and bramble scrub (dominated by Bramble *Rubus fruticosus*), as well as other common shrubs and vegetation such as Common Nettle *Urtica dioica* and Rosebay Willowherb *Chamaenerion angustifolium*.

3.3.2 Bats

The desk study returned records of brown long-eared bat (*Plecotus auritus*), common pipstrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*), noctule (*Nyctalus noctule*), soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*), Daubenton's bat (*Myotis daubentonii*) and Brandt's bat (*Myotis brandtii*). The data does not differentiate between records for flying bats and roosting bats.

Due to challenging access to the steep bank below the fence line, not all trees could be fully assessed for potential bat roost features on trees, though the majority were of an age such that the presence of features

was not considered to be likely (and it is understood no tree removal is required). Although it is reasonably likely that the woodland edge may be used by bats for foraging and commuting, the works will not cause any significant reduction in the woodland edge features and will be conducted during daylight hours (no lighting overnight), so there would be no significant effect here.

3.3.3 Badgers

The desk study returned 10 records of badger (*Meles meles*), however none within the site. No badger setts or signs of badgers were recorded on or near the site, and there were no signs of badgers. Badgers are considered to be absent from the works area.

3.3.4 Birds

Habitats within the site are suitable to support nesting birds. The desk study returned one record of barn owl (*Tyto alba*), which is listed on Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) (HMSO 1981). However, no evidence of barn owl or other nesting bird species were noted at the time of the survey and habitats within the site (development and enhancement area) have negligible potential of supporting barn owl. The vegetation to be removed could support other nesting birds.

3.3.5 Otters

The habitat on or adjacent to the site (development and enhancement area) was assessed as having negligible potential to support otters (*Lutra lutra*) and therefore, they are considered to be likely absent from the site.

3.3.6 Water Voles

The habitat on or adjacent to the site (development and enhancement area) was assessed as having negligible potential to support water voles (*Arvicola amphibius*) and therefore, they are considered to be likely absent from the site.

3.3.7 Hazel Dormice

The site (development and enhancement area) is outside of the natural range of hazel dormouse (*Muscardinus avellanarius*) and no hazel dormouse records were received from the desk study. Habitats on site were assessed as having negligible potential to support hazel dormice and lacked connectivity to known populations. Therefore, hazel dormice are considered to be likely absent from the site.

3.3.8 Other Mammals

Records of hedgehog (*Erinaceus europaeus*) were returned by the desk study. The works area is assessed as having low potential of supporting hedgehog.

3.3.9 Amphibians

The desk study returned records of common toad (*Bufo bufo*), smooth newt (*Lissotriton vulgaris*), common frog (*Rana temporaria*), and palmate newt (*Lissotriton helveticus*) within 2 km of the site. Ponds were present within 500 m of the site and therefore the site is assessed as having low potential of supporting the above species.

No desk study records of great crested newt (*Triturus cristatus*) were returned within 500 m of the site. Ponds were present within 500 m of the site and therefore the site is assessed as having low potential of supporting this species in the terrestrial phase.

3.3.10 Reptiles

The desk study returned records of common lizard (*Zootoca vivipara*) and slow worm (*Anguis fragilis*). The habitats within the development area of the site is assessed as having moderate potential to support common species of reptiles

3.3.11 Fish

There are no watercourses present within or in proximity to the site (development and enhancement area). The site is assessed as having negligible potential to support fish species and are not considered further.

3.3.12 Terrestrial Invertebrates

There were records of protected terrestrial invertebrates returned by the desk study. This included Alder Leaf Beetle (*Agelastica alni*), Wall Butterfly (*Lasiommata megera*) and Common Darter (*Sympetrum striolatum*). Habitats on site were considered common and widespread. There is negligible potential that habitats present in the site have potential to support rare, diverse, or valuable assemblage of invertebrates.

3.3.13 Non-native Invasive Species

No non-native invasive species as listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) (HMSO, 1981) were identified during the survey. There were a number of records of non-native invasive species identified in the search area but not within the site, from the desk search.

3.3.14 Protected and Notable Species

The legislative context for the inclusion of these species is provided in Section 5, below, and in Appendix A.

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement

The Environment Act 2021 followed by the Biodiversity Gain Site Register Regulations 2024 mandate the requirement for 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) for new developments (HMSO, 2021). BNG is measured using the Statutory BNG Metric and guidance documents published by DEFRA (DEFRA 2024a and 2024b).

Due to the method of fence installation only requiring minor vegetation removal for individual fence posts (which will be hand dug), and minor branch trimming along the fence line, Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is not applicable for this project as the *de minimis* exemption applies – the area of habitat impacted being below 25m² in total. This was calculated as up to 60 fence posts, each with a maximum 0.3 x 0.3m hole being required (but likely to be smaller), therefore the fence posts will impact a maximum of 5.4m² of habitat. The fencing is along an existing fence alignment (and do not require any impact to the ground to install), therefore the area of the fence panels is considered negligible.

4.2 Potential Ecological Constraints

Although the Works are immediately adjacent to Crab Tree Rough and Hopyard Wood Plantation, the works are to replace an existing fence and are going to be conducted using hand tools, therefore there is no potential for significant impacts on this site. Conversely, the driver for the works is to prevent illegal fly tipping into this site (after the site is cleared of waste by Jaguar Land Rover), therefore the fence is likely to have a positive impact on the status of Crab Tree Rough and Hopyard Wood Plantation.

To the South, the proposed fence location is bordered by a slip road and beyond this a busy A road. There is no connectivity to habitats, therefore the insulation of the fence has no potential to cause fragmentation to routes used for commuting and foraging by species.

Although not observed during the survey, the presence of nesting birds (March – August inclusive), bats (roosting, foraging and commuting – all year), reptiles and amphibians (in the terrestrial phase) cannot be ruled out due to the presence of suitable habitat on site.

Due to challenging access to the steep bank below the fence line, not all trees could be fully assessed for potential bat roost features on trees, though the majority were of an age such that the presence of features was not considered to be likely. Although it is reasonably likely that the woodland edge may be used by bats for foraging and commuting, the works will not cause any significant reduction in the woodland edge features and will be conducted during daylight hours (no lighting overnight), so there would be no significant effect.

Should reptiles and amphibians be present in the works location, the scale of the works is such that the likelihood of any impact to these species is negligible.

4.3 Recommended Mitigation

An Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) should be employed to supervise the trimming of trees and vegetation, as well as during the installation of the fence in close proximity to trees. The ECoW should undertake nesting bird checks (for works within the main breeding season, March-August inclusive) and assess the potential for trees to support roosting bats prior to any vegetation management, and supervise the avoidance of any active nest or potential bat roost feature discovered. The ECoW should also undertake a fingertip search of all ground vegetation in the small areas that would need trimming, in order to ensure the absence of any reptile or amphibian species or hedgehogs. This measure would be sufficient to prevent any significant impact to ecological features during these works.

Considering the nature of the works, there are negligible risks of significant impacts to any other species or species groups and no ecological constraints that cannot be managed by an ECoW during the installation of the fence.

5 LEGISLATION AND POLICY COMPLIANCE

Relevant legislation and policy is presented in Appendix A.

6 CONCLUSIONS

No significant ecological constraints to the installation of the proposed fence were identified. Limited works that will impact the surrounding habitats are required, ensuring minimal ecological impact and disturbance during construction. A BNG assessment is not required due to the small development area.

An Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) should be employed to supervise the trimming of trees and vegetation, as well as during the installation of the fence in close proximity to trees.

Considering the nature of the works, there are negligible risks of significant impacts to any other species or species groups and no ecological constraints that cannot be managed by an ECoW during the installation of the fence.

7 REFERENCES

- Chartered Institute for Ecology and Environmental Management (2017). *Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (2nd edn)*. Chartered Institute for Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester
- DEFRA (2024a). *Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation Tool*. Available online at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides>
- DEFRA (2024b). *Statutory Biodiversity Metric – User Guide*. website [online] Available online at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides>
- Google Earth (2024). website location https://www.google.co.uk/intl/en_uk/earth/.
- MAGIC (2025). *Magic Interactive Mapping Application*. [online] Available at: <http://www.magic.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>.
- HMSO (2006). *Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006*. [online] Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/16/contents>.
- Stace, C. (2019). *New Flora of the British Isles, Fourth Edition*. C&M Floristics, Stowmarket.
- Collins, J. (ed.) (2024). *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edn)*. The Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- HMSO (1981). *The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)*. [online] Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1981/69/contents>.
- HMSO (1990). *Town and Country Planning Act 1990*. [online] Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/8/contents>
- HMSO (1996). *Wild Mammals (Protection) Act 1996*. [online] Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1996/3/contents>.
- HMSO (2017). *The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017*. [online] Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2010/490/contents/made>.
- HMSO (2021). *The Environment Act 2021*. [online] Available online at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2021/30/contents/enacted>
- HMSO (2024). *Biodiversity Gain Site Register Regulations 2024*. [online] Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2024/45/contents/made>
- UKHabitat User Guide: UKHab – UK Habitat Classification.

APPENDIX A

Relevant Ecological Legislation and Policy

Table 2: Relevant ecological legislation

Legislation	Details
Conservation of Habitats and Species (as amended by the (EU Exit) Amendment Regulations) 2017 ('Habitats Regulations') (HMSO, 2019a)	The Regulations require authorities on behalf of the Secretary of State to maintain a list of sites which are important for either habitats or species (Natura 2000 sites – Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs)) and to provide protection for these sites through designation, planning and other controls. The Regulations make it an offence (subject to exceptions) to deliberately capture, kill, disturb, or trade in the animals listed in Schedule 2, or pick, collect, cut, uproot, destroy, or trade in the plants listed in Schedule 4. However, these actions can be made lawful through the granting of licenses by the appropriate authorities (Natural England in England). Licenses may be granted for a number of purposes (such as science and education, conservation, preserving public health and safety), but only after the appropriate authority is satisfied that there are no satisfactory alternatives and that such actions will have no detrimental effect on the favourable conservation status of the species concerned.
The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended (WCA) (HMSO, 1981)	The Act is the main mechanism for legislative protection of wildlife in England. It gives protection to native species (particularly threatened species), their resting places and places of shelter by making it an offence to kill, injure, take, damage, destroy, sell, or possess them (with exceptions).
Protection of Badgers Act 1992 (HMSO, 1992)	The Act makes it an offence to kill or take a badger, to cruelly ill-treat a badger, or to interfere with a badger sett, including disturbing a badger while it is occupying a sett.
Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (HMSO, 2000)	The Act places a duty on government departments to have regard for the conservation of biodiversity and maintain lists of species and habitats for which conservation steps should be taken or promoted, in accordance with the Convention on Biological Diversity. It also strengthens legal protection for species considered to be threatened under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and increases powers for the protection and management of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).
The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 (HMSO, 2006)	The NERC Act 2006 places a duty upon public bodies to maintain Section 41 (S41) lists of flora, fauna, and habitats (previously UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) habitats and species) and to consider these ecological features as a material consideration in planning. It also requires decision-makers to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in England, when carrying out their normal functions.
The Invasive Alien Species (Enforcement and Permitting) Order 2019 (the Invasive Species Order') (HMSO, 2019b)	This order strengthens the legislation in relation to widely spread species of European Union concern; requiring effective management measures to be put in place to minimise their impacts. It is an offence to import, keep, breed / grow, transport, sell, use, allow to reproduce, or release into the environment the species listed in Schedule 2 of this Order.

Legislation	Details
The Environment Act 2021 (DEFRA, 2021a)	In line with the 25 Year Plan for the Environment (HM Government, 2018), new development should identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity and for the wider environment. The Environment Act 2021 introduces a mandatory requirement for 10% biodiversity net gain for new developments to ensure that they enhance biodiversity and create new green spaces for local communities to enjoy. Integrating biodiversity net gain into the planning system will provide a step change in how planning and development is delivered. There is also a strong focus on delivering environmental net gain. This would preferably be achieved onsite, but there are options to deliver these gains offsite and this would be demonstrated via the Biodiversity Metric 3.1 calculator tool (Panks <i>et al.</i> , 2021).

Arcadis Consulting (UK) Limited

80 Fenchurch Street

London

EC3M 4BY

T: +44 (0)20 7812 2000 1624 624694

[arcadis.com](https://www.arcadis.com)

