

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Roost Assessment

Survey site:

71 Dorset Way, Wokingham, RG41 3AL

Client:

Mr K Goodchild and Ms P Morrison

Survey date:

4th June 2025

Project:

This report is prepared to inform a planning application with the Wokingham Borough Council. The proposal is described as: Extension of the dwelling and constructure of an additional garage building in the front garden.

PEA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: [PEA Methodology and Legislation - 2024.](#)

PRA survey methodology and legislation can be found in the Arbtech Supplement: [PRA Methodology and Legislation - 2024.](#)

The site survey was undertaken by James Fielding PhD BA (Hons) PGcert (merit) (Natural England Bat Licence Number 2022-10412-CL17-BAT)					
Consultant Ecologist					
Date of survey	Temperature (°C)	Humidity (%)	Cloud Cover (%)	Wind (km/h)	Rain
06/06/2025	20	72	100	1	2mm

Ecological Survey Factor	Detailed using desk study and site survey. Any specific limitations noted within relevant section. This table may include further work you will need to commission (if any) to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent. All clients are expected to read and understand this section, or to contact the lead surveyor for advice.
Conclusion, Impact or Recommendations	
Habitats and plants (see habitat map in appendix 1, location plan in appendix 2, proposal plan in appendix 3 and photos in appendix 4). Botanical species are described with reference to the DAFOR scale (D = Dominant; A = Abundant, F = Frequent, O = Occasional, R = Rare).	
Summary of Survey Findings (UKHab codes used)	Site Context The survey site is centred on National Grid Reference SU 79186 68140 and has an area of approximately 0.09ha. The site comprises one dwelling (B1), associated outbuildings and sheds (B2, B3) and a vegetated garden with scattered trees. It is situated within a suburban area within the town of Wokingham. There are scattered trees within the site and extending into the local garden landscape. Aerial imagery shows the local landscape to have a woodland character, with a large woodland called Fox Hill Woodland to the west and directly immediate to the west perimeter of the garden. Water bodies can be found nearby, such as a stream that runs through Fox Hill Woodland as well as numerous ponds and a lake in the golf course to the west, the closest being 0.7km away. Such features likely enhance the area for a variety of species, including bats, amphibians and reptiles. The habitats are common and widespread and have a relatively low ecological value. No protected plant species were recorded during the survey, however invasive Virginia creeper was noted along the site’s western boundary. On-site habitat descriptions <u>u1b5</u> – Buildings <u>u1b</u> – developed land; sealed surface <u>u1e</u> – Built linear features <u>u1</u> – urban garden <u>h2b</u> – species-poor hedgerow

u1b5 – Buildings

The site features a large residential building (B1) and a series of sheds and outhouses, of which 2 (B2 and B3) will be impacted by the proposed development. These three structures are discussed in the bat section of the report in more detail below.

u1b – developed land; sealed surface

The site features a garden path and rear garden area paved with slabs on the southern side, and an asphalt drive at the northern side of the property.

u1e – Built linear features

A wooden fence is present along the site's western boundary. A brick wall also subdivides the sites front parking area from the northern garden. Invasive Virginia creeper is present growing along this brick wall and appears to have spread into adjacent woodland areas to the west.

u1 – urban garden

The site contains an urban garden with a mown lawn, scattered trees and ornamental shrubs. The garden appears to be in moderate condition. Species present include honeysuckle, cherry laurel, virginia creeper, common bamboo and bindweed.

h2b – species-poor hedgerow

A beech-dominated hedgerow, with some holly, bramble and maple, is present along the northern and eastern site boundaries.

Local notable habitats

A list of priority habitats within 2km and their distances from the site.

Habitat	Distance
Ancient woodland	0km
Deciduous woodland	0km
Wood-pasture and parkland	0.9km
Traditional orchard	0.8km
Good quality semi-improved grassland	1.5km
Reedbeds	1.7km
Purple moor grass and rush pasture	1.8km
Priority pond	1.9km

	The trees on-site likely have functional connectivity to ancient woodland / deciduous woodland, given their immediate proximity to the site and the presence of numerous trees throughout the garden landscape. Ancient woodland is classed as a priority habitat under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act, 2006.										
Foreseen Impacts	On-site habitats The proposed development will result in the loss of small areas of garden and introduced ornamental shrub. This is likely to have a minimal impact on biodiversity due to the low ecological value of these habitats. Notable habitats No direct impacts to any notable habitats will occur as a result of the proposed development. However, due to the proximity of the site to ancient woodland (immediately adjacent ot the site), indirect effects (e.g. pollution, dust, litter, surface run off, etc.) could occur during construction.										
Recommendations	On-site habitats Retained trees should be protected in line with the measures outlined in the British Standard "Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction to Construction - Recommendations" (BS 5837) (2012). A biodiversity net gain (BNG) report is unlikely to be required for the proposal, as less than 25m² of habitat is affected by the proposal (one of the exemptions). The majority of the works are occurring on hard standing, and the site garden can be retained relatively unaffected. Notable habitats Best practice measures to minimise the possibility of pollution affecting the nearby ancient woodland must be implemented during construction. A Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) may be required for this.										
Locality and Designated Sites											
Summary of Survey Findings	On-site designations The site is not subject to any designation. Statutory designated sites (within 2km) <table><tr><td>Statutory Site</td><td>Type</td><td>Distance</td><td>Description</td></tr><tr><td>Holt Copse & Joel Park</td><td>Local Nature Reserve</td><td>1.5km</td><td>Habitats include lowland mixed deciduous woodland. Ancient semi-natural woodland and a large noctule bat roost.</td></tr></table>			Statutory Site	Type	Distance	Description	Holt Copse & Joel Park	Local Nature Reserve	1.5km	Habitats include lowland mixed deciduous woodland. Ancient semi-natural woodland and a large noctule bat roost .
Statutory Site	Type	Distance	Description								
Holt Copse & Joel Park	Local Nature Reserve	1.5km	Habitats include lowland mixed deciduous woodland. Ancient semi-natural woodland and a large noctule bat roost .								

	The site lies within the impact risk zone for Longmoor Bog (SSSI) and an extension and construction of a garage is not listed as a possible high risk for this designation. Non-statutory designated sites The presence of non-statutory designated sites within 2km of the site cannot be established without data from Thame Valley Environmental Records Centre.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	On-site designations No impacts foreseen. Statutory and non-statutory designated sites No impacts to designated sites are anticipated due to the small scale and distance of the proposed development from such sites (where known) as well as the urban location of the site with surrounding physical barriers.
<i>Recommendations</i>	On-site designations None required. Statutory and non-statutory designated sites None required.
Invasive / Non-native species	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	Virginia creeper was identified on the site along a southern wall (see Appendix 1b for location) which is listed as an invasive, non-native species under Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. A visual appraisal noted that this Virginia creeper had spread into the adjacent woodland and treeline to the west of the site.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	Construction could result in the spread of Virginia creeper. In particular, this is a concern as it appears to be spreading into the designated ancient woodland to the west of the site.
<i>Recommendations</i>	The Virginia creeper on and adjacent to the site should be dug up, including roots, and disposed of in line with appropriate controlled waste measures.
Invertebrates	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	The habitats present on-site, including lawns, ornamental shrubs and trees, likely provide common invertebrates with opportunities to forage and shelter. The site contains no further notable habitats which may provide niches for specialised or protected invertebrates.

Foreseen Impacts	None foreseen.																																												
Recommendations	No further surveys.																																												
Bats																																													
Summary of Survey Findings	EPSL data A search of the magic.gov.uk database for granted EPSLs within a 2km radius of the site has been completed. Displaced bats from licensed sites <2km away from the survey site will find alternative habitat either within the mitigation measures implemented as part of the licence or will relocate to other known roosts sites in close proximity to the licensed site. There are ten EPSLs within a 2km radius of site as detailed below: <table><tr><th>EPSL reference</th><th>Bat species affected</th><th>Distance from site</th><th>Impacts allowed by licence</th></tr><tr><td>2014-2425-EPS-MIT</td><td>Brown long-eared bat, Common pipistrelle</td><td>0.4 km</td><td>Destruction of resting place</td></tr><tr><td>2014-964-EPS-MIT</td><td>Brown long-eared bat</td><td>0.4 km</td><td>Damage to and destruction of a resting place</td></tr><tr><td>2017-31502-EPS-MIT</td><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>0.8 km</td><td>Destruction of resting place</td></tr><tr><td>2017-31502-EPS-MIT</td><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>1.2 km</td><td>Destruction of resting place</td></tr><tr><td>2016-22176-EPS-MIT</td><td>Brown long-eared bat</td><td>1.3 km</td><td>Destruction of resting place</td></tr><tr><td>2015-11806-EPS-MIT</td><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>1.5 km</td><td>Damage to and destruction of resting place</td></tr><tr><td>EPSM2011-3236</td><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>1.9 km</td><td>Destruction of resting place</td></tr><tr><td>2015-13607-EPS-MIT</td><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>1.9 km</td><td>Destruction of resting place</td></tr><tr><td>2015-13607-EPS-MIT-1</td><td>Common pipistrelle</td><td>1.9 km</td><td>Destruction of resting place</td></tr><tr><td>EPSM2009-1496</td><td>Noctule</td><td>1.9 km</td><td>Destruction of breeding roost and resting place</td></tr></table> Foraging and commuting habitat Habitats recorded on site are assessed to provide foraging and commuting opportunities for bats in the form of garden habitat with trees, scattered scrub, and native hedgerow with trees. These habitats are likely to provide micro-climatic conditions that support invertebrates that will in turn provide foraging opportunities for local bat populations. Most notably, the adjacent woodland will provide excellent foraging for bats. Bats are well known to utilise linear features to aid navigation whilst travelling between foraging resources and roost sites. Roosting habitat	EPSL reference	Bat species affected	Distance from site	Impacts allowed by licence	2014-2425-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared bat, Common pipistrelle	0.4 km	Destruction of resting place	2014-964-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared bat	0.4 km	Damage to and destruction of a resting place	2017-31502-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	0.8 km	Destruction of resting place	2017-31502-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	1.2 km	Destruction of resting place	2016-22176-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared bat	1.3 km	Destruction of resting place	2015-11806-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	1.5 km	Damage to and destruction of resting place	EPSM2011-3236	Common pipistrelle	1.9 km	Destruction of resting place	2015-13607-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	1.9 km	Destruction of resting place	2015-13607-EPS-MIT-1	Common pipistrelle	1.9 km	Destruction of resting place	EPSM2009-1496	Noctule	1.9 km	Destruction of breeding roost and resting place
EPSL reference	Bat species affected	Distance from site	Impacts allowed by licence																																										
2014-2425-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared bat, Common pipistrelle	0.4 km	Destruction of resting place																																										
2014-964-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared bat	0.4 km	Damage to and destruction of a resting place																																										
2017-31502-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	0.8 km	Destruction of resting place																																										
2017-31502-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	1.2 km	Destruction of resting place																																										
2016-22176-EPS-MIT	Brown long-eared bat	1.3 km	Destruction of resting place																																										
2015-11806-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	1.5 km	Damage to and destruction of resting place																																										
EPSM2011-3236	Common pipistrelle	1.9 km	Destruction of resting place																																										
2015-13607-EPS-MIT	Common pipistrelle	1.9 km	Destruction of resting place																																										
2015-13607-EPS-MIT-1	Common pipistrelle	1.9 km	Destruction of resting place																																										
EPSM2009-1496	Noctule	1.9 km	Destruction of breeding roost and resting place																																										

	Buildings and trees to be impacted by the proposed development are assessed for their suitability to support roosting bats below. No evidence of roosting bats was identified on or within B1, B2 or B3. <i>Building B1 (Figure 1 – 9)</i> B1 is a two-storey, brick-built building (Figure 1) with multiple extensions, including a northern single-storey garage and a southern UPVC/glass conservatory. The building features a mock-tudor façade, which appears in good condition with no gaps or cracks. The brickwork and rendering around the building appears in excellent condition with no gaps or cracks in which bats can roost. There are wooden soffits and bargeboards which are in good condition. The roof of the main section of B1 is pitched and gabled, and clad in concrete roof tiles which appear in good condition with no gaps or cracks suitable for bats. The roof of the garage extension is also clad in concrete roof tiles which also appear in good condition with no suitable roosting features. There is one loft space within the interior of B1, and one garage interior. <i>Loft Space 1 - L1 (Figure 8)</i> It is constructed from modern timber beams, including the ridge beam, rafters and purlins. There are wooden boards and areas of mineral wool insulation, and the loft is lined with bitumen felt which appears in good condition with no gaps or cracks suitable for bats. There are cobwebs along the ridge which may suggest a lack of recent bat roosting activity here. No bats or evidence of bat occupation (e.g. droppings, oil staining, etc.) was identified on or within L1. <i>Garage space G1 (Figure 9)</i> There is a small garage space on the northern end of B1, which has a false ceiling with a small interior space. This area lacks any notable bat roosting features. <i>B1 Suitability Assessment</i> Given the good condition of the building and lack of roosting features, B1 has been assigned a negligible habitat value for bats. <i>Building B2 (Figure 9 – 10, Appendix 4)</i> B2 is a single storey garage building with corrugated fiber roofing. It has a metal garage door on the eastern elevation and metal guttering. It appears to be in good condition with no notable roosting features. <i>B2 Suitability Assessment</i> Given the good condition of the building and lack of roosting features, B2 has been assigned a negligible habitat value for bats. <i>Building B3 (Figure 11 – 12, Appendix 4)</i>
--	---

	B3 is a single storey wooden shed which lacks any notable bat roosting features. It has a wood and bitumen felt clad roof in moderately poor condition, with heavy moss and tree-debris obscuring the roof. The interior is brightly lit from a western window during the daytime, which will reduce its suitability for bats. There is evidence of mouse activity in places, including mouse droppings on sections of mineral wool insulation on the eastern side of the shed. <i>B3 Suitability Assessment</i> Given the lack of roosting features, B3 has been assigned a negligible habitat value for bats.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	Roosting habitat [Buildings] Bats are very unlikely to be roosting within B1, B2 or B3 and as such, there are not anticipated to be any impacts on bats in this location as a result of the proposed development. B3 has a low habitat value for bats, but will not be directly impacted by the proposals. Foraging and commuting habitat The proposed development will not result in the removal of any habitats which could be used by foraging or commuting bats. However, the proposed development will include the use of lighting which could spill on to bat roosting, foraging or commuting habitat and deter bats from using these areas. Artificial lighting The proposed development may lead to an increase in the amount of current lighting of surrounding habitats or the retained building without mitigation. This may disturb commuting bats.
<i>Recommendations</i>	Roosting habitat [Buildings] In the unlikely event that a bat or evidence of bats is discovered during the development all work must stop and a bat licensed ecologist contacted for further advice. Foraging and commuting habitat No further surveys are required. Artificial lighting A low impact lighting strategy will be adopted for the site during post-development which outlines the areas of the site that will be retained as dark corridors. Parameters can be found on the Bat Conservation Trust website: https://www.bats.org.uk/our-work/buildings-planning-and-development/lighting-2

	Suggested biodiversity enhancements The installation of two bat boxes at the site will provide additional roosting habitat for bats. The bat boxes will be incorporated into the fabric of the new extension. They will be suitable for pipistrelles (which have been identified locally through EPSL data). Suitable bat boxes include Habibat Bat Box, Ibstock Enclosed Bat Box or similar alternative brand. Bat boxes should be positioned 3-5m above ground level facing in a south or south-westerly direction with a clear flight path to and from the entrance, away from artificial light.
Birds	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	Buildings No evidence of nesting birds was identified on or within B1, B2 or B3. They are deemed to provide negligible habitat value for nesting birds due to a lack of suitable nesting sites or access points. Trees and vegetation No bird nests were identified within the vegetation on-site, however the vegetation offers nesting opportunities and nest-building resources for birds. Barn owls The site does not appear to provide any suitable nesting sites for barn owls. Overwintering birds Due to the small size of the site and the extent and type of the habitats recorded, the site not considered suitable to support a significant assemblage of protected and/or notable birds.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	Buildings/trees No impacts are anticipated on nesting birds as a result of the proposed development. Barn owls None foreseen. Overwintering birds None foreseen.
<i>Recommendations</i>	Buildings/trees

	Any vegetation removal should be undertaken outside the period 1st March to 31st August. If this timeframe cannot be avoided, a close inspection of the vegetation should be undertaken immediately, by a qualified ecologist, prior to the commencement of work. All active nests will need to be retained until the young have fledged. Precautions should be taken with machinery and noise levels when working close to any retained nests so as not to disturb any nearby nesting birds during construction works. At least a 3-5m buffer should be created between any machinery and active nests until the young have fledged. Barn owls None required. Overwintering birds None required. Suggested biodiversity enhancements The installation of a minimum of one bird box on mature trees around the site boundaries or on retained buildings will provide additional nesting habitat for birds e.g. Schwegler No 17 Swift Nest Box (buildings) Schwegler 1SP Sparrow Terrace (buildings) Schwegler 1B Nest Boxes (trees) Schwegler 2H Robin Boxes (trees) Woodstone Nest Box (buildings or trees) Or a similar alternative brand. Tree boxes should be positioned approximately 3m above ground level where they will be sheltered from prevailing wind, rain and strong sunlight. Small-hole boxes are best placed approximately 1-3m above ground on an area of the tree trunk where foliage will not obscure the entrance hole. Swift and sparrow boxes should be positioned at the eaves of a building and can be incorporated into the fabric of the building during construction.
Reptiles	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	EPSL data A review of the MAGIC database returned no granted EPSL records for protected reptiles within 2km of the site. Habitat suitability Habitats recorded on site are assessed to provide small amounts of habitat suitable foraging, commuting, and refuge opportunities for reptiles in the form of garden with ornamental shrub. It is noted that due to regular mowing of the garden and the presence of a dog, the garden is currently suboptimal for reptiles due to an absence of refuge opportunities. Furthermore, the urban areas to the east of the site

	will have limited opportunities for reptiles and reduce commuting opportunities, however the woodland to the west could contain reptile habitat, and reptiles from these habitats could commute to the site. Thus, although potential connectivity and habitat value for reptiles is limited in extent, the presence of a small population of common reptiles cannot be fully discounted, albeit limited to peripheral vegetation.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	No significant amounts of reptile habitat is being removed, and therefore no impacts are anticipated on reptiles as a result of the proposed development.
<i>Recommendations</i>	None required.
Amphibians	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	EPSL and survey data A review of the MAGIC database returned no granted EPSL records for great crested newts within 2km of the site. Further, no positive class survey licence return or DLL historic survey data (2017 – 2019) were present within 2km of the site. Habitat suitability No ponds are present on site or within 500m of the site, with the nearest being located 700m to the west. The site provides limited suitable terrestrial habitat for amphibians given the lack of optimal habitat (i.e. scrub, rank grassland). The areas of hard standing and amenity grass offer sub-optimal habitat for terrestrial amphibians. The hedgerows and woodland may offer refuge for these species, however given the urban nature of the surrounding landscape to the east (i.e. dominated by roads and hard standing which are sub-optimal for amphibians) it is less likely that amphibians will migrate on to site.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	Given the lack of suitably connected breeding ponds within 500m of the site, the presence of GCN on-site is considered unlikely and therefore impacts to amphibians as a result of the proposed development are deemed to be acceptably low.
<i>Recommendations</i>	None required.
Badger	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	No badger setts were noted on site or within a 30m radius of the site. Further, no evidence of foraging badgers was noted within the development area. However, the site was considered suitable for badger sett excavation and foraging habitat.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	No works will be undertaken within 30m of a badger sett. Small amounts of garden and ornamental scrub will be removed during construction. The loss of such habitats is likely to be inconsequential to local badger populations owing to their low value and the presence of more extensive habitat locally. However, construction activities could result in the death or injury of badgers, if present.


<i>Recommendations</i>	Owing to the nature of the proposed development and the low potential for impacts to badgers, further badger surveys are considered to be disproportionate. A precautionary working method will be implemented during construction, including the following measures: • A toolbox talk will be given to contractors regarding the possible presence of badgers at the site. • A pre-commencement inspection of the site will be undertaken for any new badger activity if works do not commence within three months. • Heras fencing will be erected around the working area to prevent encroachment into retained habitats where badger setts could be present. • Any excavations will be covered overnight, or a ramp will be installed to enable any trapped animals to escape. • The use of night-time lighting will be avoided, or sensitive lighting design will be implemented to avoid light spill on to retained habitats which badgers could use. • Any chemicals or pollutants used or created by the development should be stored and disposed of correctly according to COSHH regulations. In the unlikely event that a badger sett is identified, works must cease and advice must be sought from a suitably qualified ecologist. Suggested biodiversity enhancements Planting fruit bearing trees and species-rich grassland to increase foraging opportunities for badgers.
Riparian animals	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	A review of the MAGIC database returned no granted EPSL records for otters or water voles within 2km of the site. There are no water courses on or connected to the site. There are also no riparian habitats present on site or within an influencing distance.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	No impacts are anticipated on riparian animals as a result of the proposed development.
<i>Recommendations</i>	None required.
Hazel dormouse	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	EPSL data A review of the MAGIC database returned no granted EPSL records for hazel dormice within 2km of the site. Habitat suitability Dormice typically utilise a three-dimensional habitat structure as to commute between feeding and breeding sites whilst avoiding predation. As such habitats on site are considered unsuitable for hazel dormice and therefore the likelihood of this species being present on site is considered acceptably low.

<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	No significant hazel dormice habitat will be removed during the development and thus no significant impacts are anticipated on hazel dormice.
<i>Recommendations</i>	None foreseen.
Other e.g. hedgehog	
<i>Summary of Survey Findings</i>	The garden, shrubs and trees on site provide limited foraging and commuting opportunities for hedgehogs, with woodland habitat nearby.
<i>Foreseen Impacts</i>	Small amounts of garden and ornamental shrubs will be removed during construction. The loss of such habitats is likely to be inconsequential to local hedgehog populations owing to their low value and the presence of more extensive habitat locally. However, construction activities could result in the death or injury of hedgehogs, if present.
<i>Recommendations</i>	Similar to the badgers, a precautionary working method will be implemented during construction, including the following measures: • Any excavations will be covered overnight, or a ramp will be installed to enable any trapped animals to escape. • The use of night-time lighting will be avoided, or sensitive lighting design will be implemented to avoid light spill on to retained habitats which hedgehogs could use. • Any chemicals or pollutants used or created by the development should be stored and disposed of correctly according to COSHH regulations. If any hedgehogs are found in the working area these should be allowed to disperse of their own accord or, if at immediate risk, should be moved by hand to a sheltered, vegetated area away from disturbance. Suggested biodiversity enhancements The following habitat creation and enhancement opportunities could be incorporated into the proposed development which would be beneficial for hedgehogs: • Planting fruit bearing trees and species-rich grassland to increase foraging opportunities. • Creation of brash piles or installation of hedgehog houses in shady areas. • Installation of gaps under boundary fencing to enable hedgehogs to move freely through the site.

Appendix 1a: Habitat map



Appendix 1b: Bat Survey Map and Invasive Species location



Appendix 2: Location map



Appendix 3: Proposed plan



Appendix 4: Photos

Figure 1: Northern elevation of B1	Figure 2: B1 northern garage extension
 A photograph showing the northern elevation of a two-story house. The house has a dark tiled roof, a chimney on the left, and a front door with a small porch. The upper floor has white walls with dark timber framing. The lower floor is made of light-colored brick. A timestamp "Jun 4, 2025 10:47:19" is visible in the bottom right corner.	 A photograph showing the northern garage extension of the house. It features a light-colored brick wall, a dark wooden garage door, and a window. A timestamp "Jun 4, 2025 10:47:15" is visible in the bottom right corner.
Figure 3: B1 northern garage extension	Figure 4: B1 southern elevations
 A photograph showing the northern garage extension of the house. It features a light-colored brick wall, two dark wooden garage doors, and a car parked in front. A timestamp "Jun 4, 2025 10:46:33" is visible in the bottom right corner.	 A photograph showing the southern elevations of the house. It features a two-story house with a dark tiled roof, a chimney, and a large glass conservatory on the right. A timestamp "Jun 4, 2025 10:42:33" is visible in the bottom right corner.

Figure 5: B1 southern elevation and conservatory



Figure 6: B1 western gable end



Figure 7: loft interior of B1



Figure 8: garage interior of B1



Figure 9: B2 view from east



Figure 10: B2 view from south



Figure 11: B3 view from the south



Figure 12: B3 interior



Figure 13: site northern wall with virginia creeper**Figure 14: Virginia creeper****Figure 13: north-eastern boundary hedgerow****Figure 14: Site northern garden**

Figure 15: Site south-western garden	Figure 16: Site northern garden
	

Limitations and CopyrightLegal

Arbtech Consulting Limited has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named client or their agents in accordance with our General Terms and Conditions, under which our services are performed. It is expressly stated that no other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Limited. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by third parties. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Limited.

© This report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

Version control			
Status	Issue	Name	Date
Draft	0.1	James Fielding PhD BA (Hons) PGcert (merit) Consultant Ecologist	21/06/2025
Final	1.0	James Fielding PhD BA (Hons) PGcert (merit) Consultant Ecologist	22/06/2025