ALCA ecology

121 Station Road, Bagworth

Biodiversity Net Gain Statement and Bat Report

Lucie Fenton

August 2026



This report has been prepared by, and is the property of Alca Ecology Ltd. It should not be amended, or disclosed to any unauthorised person without the consent of Alca Ecology Ltd. This document must be treated as draft unless signed off by Alca Ecology Ltd.

The advice within this document has been produced in accordance with guidance from the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM).

Revision	Prepared by	Date	Checked by
-	Bill Jeffreys ACIEEM MSc BSc (Hons)	12.01.26	BRJ / 12.01.26
A – Amended Tables 1 and 3	Bill Jeffreys ACIEEM MSc BSc (Hons)	06.08.26	BRJ / 06.08.26

Registered Office: Gothic House, Barker Gate, Nottingham, NG1 1JU
Phone: 07951 014150
Email: bill@alcaecology.com
Website: www.alcaecology.co.uk

Contents

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3
2.0 INTRODUCTION 3
3.0 METHODS 4
4.0 RESULTS / CONCLUSION 6

Tables

Table 1: Baseline Habitat Value

Table 2: Proposed Habitat Value

Table 3: Headline Results from Statutory Metric

Appendices

Appendix 1: BNG Condition Assessment Sheets

Appendix 2: Site Photos

Figures

Figure 1: Baseline Habitats Plan

Figure 2: Baseline Habitats Condition / Distinctiveness

Figure 3: Retention Plan

Figure 4: Proposed Habitats Plan

Figure 5: Proposed Habitats Condition / Distinctiveness

1.0 Executive Summary

1.1 Alca Ecology were commissioned to undertake a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment and Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) at a site located at 121 Station Road, Bagworth. This included a site survey and condition assessment, the data of which was then used to undertake a BNG assessment using the Statutory BNG Metric.

1.2 The assessment shows that a 10% net gain in BNG units is not achievable on-site, and that off-site units must be sourced in order to achieve an overall 10% net gain.

1.3 The single on-site building is of **negligible** bat roost potential, and no further surveys are required.

1.4 None of the on-site trees contained any potential roost features (PRFs) and so no further surveys are required.

2.0 Introduction

Background / Site Context

2.1 Alca Ecology were commissioned to undertake a BNG assessment and PRA at a site located at 121 Station Road, Bagworth, Leicestershire (central grid ref SK 44503 08488), hereafter referred to as 'the site'.

2.2 A desk study and site walkover were undertaken to categorise present habitats and to determine their strategic significance. The Statutory BNG Metric was then used to calculate the baseline and post-development unit value.

2.3 The site, approximately 0.025 hectares in extent, lies within the central western extent of Bagworth and consists of a small area of garden space and single-storey garage building. The site is located within a residential setting, with houses to the north, east and south, and a playing field to the west.

2.4 Proposals for the site include the demolition of the existing building and construction of a single residential dwelling, with associated garden / driveway.

Legislation

2.5 BNG is a statutory requirement under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as part of the Environment Act 2021. This legislation came into effect on the 12th February 2024, meaning any applications submitted after this date (with certain exceptions) must demonstrate a measurable 10% net gain in biodiversity post-development. If a sufficient on-site gain is not achievable, off-site biodiversity units must be purchased.

2.6 This report has been produced in order to show that a BNG assessment has been completed and that the proposals will be compliant with the Environment Act 2021.

3.0 Methods

3.1 All stages of the BNG assessment were undertaken in accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide[1].

Desk Study

3.2 A consultation exercise was undertaken whereby baseline ecological information was collected from Natural England via the Multi Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) website[2]. Any designated sites, including statutory and non-statutory designations, were recorded, as well as any Priority Habitats under the Priority Habitat Inventory.

3.3 The Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS)[3], including the accompanying Local Habitat Map, was consulted to determine the site's strategic significance.

Habitat Survey

3.4 A walkover of the site was undertaken on the 22nd December 2025 by an experienced ecologist with a Field Identification Skills Certificate (FISC) level 3. Survey methods broadly followed the UKHab survey methodology. The purpose of the walkover was to classify present habitats and assess their condition in line with guidance using Statutory Condition Assessment sheets. The abundance of species was quantified using the DAFOR scale, ranging from Dominant (>75%), through Abundant (75-51%), Frequent (50-26%) and Occasional (25-11%) to Rare (10-1%).

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment

3.5 A BNG assessment was undertaken based on the most up-to-date proposals (Drawing ref: 121StationRoadProposedSitePlan V1, Planning By Design). The UKHab data was inputted to GIS software, analysed, and the Statutory Metric Tool[4] was used to calculate the change in biodiversity unit value between the baseline habitats and proposed habitats.

Preliminary Roost Assessment

3.6 A Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was undertaken on the single on-site building on the 22nd December 2025 by a licenced bat worker (Natural England Class Licence Registration Number: CL18 Bat Survey Level 2 - 2025-84667-CL18-BAT). This involved an internal and external assessment of all potential roost features and their suitability to support bats. A search was also carried out for any evidence of roosting bats. The buildings suitability to support roosting bats was then classified as either negligible, low, moderate or high potential. The site itself and the immediate surroundings of the site were assessed, with particular regard to

[1] Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, 2024. *The Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide.*
[2] https://magic.defra.gov.uk/
[3] https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/local-nature-recovery-strategy/leicestershire-leicester-and-rutland-local-nature-recovery-strategy
[4] https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/statutory-biodiversity-metric-tools-and-guides

hedgerow / treelines / features that may provide good connectivity and foraging habitat for local bats.

3.7 The PRA was carried out based on most recent BCT[5] and JNCC[6] guidance, as well as statutory guidance[7].

Ground Level Tree Assessment

3.8 During the PRA / walkover, a Gound Level Tree Assessment (GLTA) was also undertaken on all trees, based on most recent guidance[8]. Trees were examined with binoculars, making note of any potential roost features (PRFs) that may provide entry/exit points for bats. Any PRFs found were categorised based on their suitability and size, using the following terms:

- NONE: No features present or likely to be present.
- FAR: Further assessment is required to establish whether PRFs are present.
- PRF-I: The PRF is suitable for individual or small numbers of bats.
- PRF-M: The PRF is suitable for multiple bats and may be used by a maternity colony.

Limitations

3.9 The botanical survey was undertaken outside the optimal botanical survey season, however the species lists obtained were considered sufficient information to determine broad habitat types.

[5] Collins, J. (ed.), 2023. *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists, Good Practice Guidelines* (4th Edition). The Bat Conservation Trust, London
[6] JNCC, 1999. Mitchell-Jones, A.J, & McLeish, A.P. Ed. *Bat Workers Manual.*
[7] Mitchell-Jones, A.J., 2004. *Bat Mitigation Guidelines.* English Nature, Peterborough.

4.0 Results / Conclusion

Biodiversity Net Gain

Strategic Significance

4.1 No statutory / non-statutory designated sites or Priority Habitats were recorded within or adjacent to the site.

4.2 The nearest designated site was approximately 3.4km away (Cliff Hill Quarry Site of Special Scientific Interest) and the nearest Priority Habitat recorded was approximately 130m away (Priority Habitat Inventory Deciduous Woodland).

4.3 As a LNRS has been published for Leicestershire, in accordance with Statutory Guidance all baseline habitats were assigned low strategic significance ('Area/compensation not in local strategy/no local strategy').

4.4 The site falls within an Area that Could Become of Particular Importance for Biodiversity (ACB), however proposed habitats include only urban type habitats (vegetated garden and developed land; sealed surface). In light of the above, the proposed habitats have been assigned low strategic significance.

4.5 No irreplaceable habitats are present within the site and there does not appear to have been any significant habitat degradation.

Baseline Habitats

4.6 The vegetated area of the site consisted mostly of a grassy area, some of which was mown and some of which was used for storing various materials such as oil drums and a caravan. The grassy part of the site was limited in botanical diversity, containing mostly Yorkshire fog *Holcus lanatus*, with some red fescue *Festuca rubra* and moss species. Some areas of the vegetated garden contained mostly bare ground with some ruderal species such as dandelion *Taraxacum* agg., nettle *Urtica dioica*, purple dead nettle *Lamium purpureum*, cleavers *Galium aparine* and caper spurge *Euphorbia lathyrism*.

4.7 All vegetated areas within the site were considered to constitute 'vegetated garden'. The condition assessment for this habitat type is automatically set to N/A.

4.8 The remaining areas of the site consisted of the single garage and a small hardstanding driveway. These areas were considered to constitute 'developed land; sealed surface'. The condition assessments for these habitat types are automatically set to N/A.

4.9 Two lines of Leyland cypress *Cupressus* x *leylandii* trees were present along the sites northern and western boundaries. Both tree lines were 8-10m tall and were assessed as being in poor condition. Condition assessments are provided in Appendix 1.

4.10 Baseline habitats are detailed in Table 1 and shown in Figure 1.

Table 1: Baseline Habitat Value

Habitat Type	Area / Length	Distinctiveness	Condition	Baseline Habitat Score
Developed land; sealed surface	0.0071ha	Very low	N/A	0
Vegetated garden	0.0184ha (of which 0.0117ha retained)	Low	N/A	0.04 (of which 0.02 retained)
Line of trees	0.025km (all of which retained)	Medium	Poor	0.05 (all of which retained)

Values are taken directly from the Statutory Metric, any rounding errors relate to the internal calculations within the metric workbook.

Proposed Habitats

4.11 The existing garage is proposed to be lost and replaced with a new residential dwelling. The overall layout will remain broadly the same, consisting of a mix of developed land; sealed surface and vegetated garden. The two lines of trees will be retained. Proposed habitats are shown in Figure 4.

Table 2: Proposed Habitat Value

Habitat Type	Area (ha)	Distinctiveness	Condition	Proposed Habitat Score
Developed land; sealed surface	0.0137	Very low	N/A	0
Vegetated garden	0.0001	Low	N/A	0

Assessment Results

4.12 The assessment shows an overall loss of 0.01 habitat units (-35.89%) and no change in hedgerow units.

Table 3: Headline Results from Statutory Metric

Baseline Habitats Score	Post-Development Habitats Score	Unit Difference	Percentage Difference
0.04	0.02	-0.01	-35.89%
Baseline Habitats Score	**Post-Development Hedgerow Score**	**Unit Difference**	**Percentage Difference**
0.05	0.05	0	n/a

Values are taken directly from the Statutory Metric, any rounding errors relate to the internal calculations within the metric workbook.

4.13 The completed Statutory Metric demonstrates that a 10% gain in biodiversity units is not achievable within the site. This is not unexpected for a site of this small size that is entirely under

private ownership, as habitat creation that would provide BNG uplift cannot be achieved within privately owned areas.

4.14 In order to achieve a 10% gain in BNG units, off-site units will be purchased from a third-party biobank. It is estimated that 0.02 habitat units and 0.01 hedgerow units will be required in order to achieve an overall 10% increase.

Preliminary Roost Assessment

4.15 One building is present within the site, which is a single storey garage used for storage with a breeze block base, sheet metal upper and pitched sheet metal roof. Internal wooden boarding is present behind the walls and roof which is very damaged in places. There are large doors on the eastern aspect with a security light above and single door on the western aspect with a window above allowing light ingress. Access points are present via damaged parts of the metal panels and around the doors. Internally the building was damp and partially lit by the window. No evidence of roosting bats was recorded during the survey.

4.16 Overall, the building offered **negligible** suitability for roosting bats due to the lack of suitable roosting features and no further surveys are required.

Ground Level Tree Assessment

4.17 All trees were inspected and none were found to contain any potential roost features (PRFs) suitable to support roosting bats.

4.18 No further surveys are therefore required on the trees with respect to roosting bats.

Appendix 1: BNG Condition Assessments

Line of Trees

Condition Assessment Criteria		Pass / Fail
A	At least 70% of trees are native species.	Fail – all Leyland cypress
B	Tree canopy is predominantly continuous with gaps in canopy cover making up <10% of total area and no individual gap being >5 m wide.	Pass
C	One or more trees has veteran features and or natural ecological niches for vertebrates and invertebrates, such as presence of standing and attached deadwood, cavities, ivy or loose bark.	Fail – no such features present
D	There is an undisturbed naturally-vegetated strip of at least 6 m on both sides to protect the line of trees from farming and other human activities (excluding grazing). Where veteran trees are present, root protection areas should follow standing advice2.	Fail – both trees either adjacent pavement, vegetated garden or playing field
E	At least 95% of the trees are in a healthy condition (deadwood or veteran features valuable for wildlife are excluded from this). There is little or no evidence of an adverse impact on tree health by damage from livestock or wild animals, pests or diseases, or human activity.	Pass
Total passes		**2**

5 passes: Good condition; 3-4 passes: Moderate condition; 2 or fewer passes: Poor condition

Appendix 2: Site Photos



Photo 1: Vegetated garden and tree line TL1



Photo 2: Vegetated garden and tree line TL2



Photo 3: Side of property and existing garage (left)



Photo 4: Front of site



Photo 5: Existing building exterior



Photo 6: Existing building interior



This drawing has been prepared by, and is the property of Alca Ecology Ltd.It should not be amended,or disclosed to any unauthorised person without the consent of Alca Ecology Ltd.

All Rights Reserved - GoogleSatellite

Key

Hedgerow Baseline

- Line of trees

Habitats Baseline

- Building
- Developed land; sealed surface
- Vegetated garden

client
Lucie Fention

project name
121 Station Road,
Bagworth

title
Baseline Habitats

title
FIGURE 1

ALCA ecology

date
12/01/26

drawn by
BRJ

scale
1:250 @ A3

rev
-

Alca Ecology Ltd / wwwalcaecology.co.uk / bill@alcaecology.com / 07951 014150

0 10 20 m

This drawing has been prepared by, and is the property of Alca Ecology Ltd.It should not be amended,or disclosed to any unauthorised person without the consent of Alca Ecology Ltd.

All Rights Reserved - GoogleSatellite

Key

Site Boundary

Baseline Habitat Condition

N/A - Other

Baseline Habitat Distinctiveness

Low

V.Low

Baseline Hedgerow Condition

Poor

Baseline Hedgerow Distinctiveness

Low

client
Lucie Fenton

project name
121 Station Road,

Bagworth

title
Baseline Habitats Condition / Distinctiveness

date
12/01/26

drawn by
BRJ

scale
1:250 @ A3

rev
-

title
FIGURE 2

Alca Ecology Ltd / www.alcaecology.co.uk / bill@alcaecology.com / 07951 014150

0 10 20 m



This drawing has been prepared by, and is the property of Alca Ecology Ltd.It should not be amended,or disclosed to any unauthorised person without the consent of Alca Ecology Ltd.

All Rights Reserved - GoogleSatellite

Key

- Site Boundary

Habitat Retention

- Retained
- Lost

Hedgerow Retention

- Retained

client
Lucie Fenton

project name
121 Station Road,
Bagworth

title
Habitat Retention

title
FIGURE 3

ALCA ecology

date
12/01/26

drawn by
BRJ

scale
1:250 @ A3

rev
-

Alca Ecology Ltd / wwwalcaecologyco.uk / bill@alcaecologycom / 07951 014150

0 10 20 m



This drawing has been prepared by, and is the property of Alca Ecology Ltd.It should not be amended,or disclosed to any unauthorised person without the consent of Alca Ecology Ltd.

All Rights Reserved - GoogleSatellite

Key

- Site Boundary

Habitats Proposed

- Building
- Developed land; sealed surface
- Vegetated garden

Hedgerow Proposed

- Line of trees

client
Lucie Fenton

project name
121 Station Road,
Bagworth

title
Proposed Habitats

title
FIGURE 4

ALCA ecology

date
12/01/26

drawn by
BRJ

scale
1:250 @ A3

rev
-

Alca Ecology Ltd / wwwalcaecology.co.uk / bill@alcaecology.com / 07951 014150

0 10 20 m



This drawing has been prepared by, and is the property of Alca Ecology Ltd.It should not be amended,or disclosed to any unauthorised person without the consent of Alca Ecology Ltd.

All Rights Reserved - GoogleSatellite

Key

- Site Boundary

Proposed Habitat Condition

- Condition Assessment N/A

Proposed Habitat Distinctiveness

- Low
- V.Low

Proposed Hedgerow Condition

- Poor

Proposed Hedgerow Distinctiveness

- Low

client
Lucie Fenton

ALCA ecology

project name
121 Station Road,

Bagworth

date
12/01/26

drawn by
BRJ

title
Proposed Habitats Condition / Distinctiveness

scale
1:250 @ A3

rev
-

title
FIGURE 5

Alca Ecology Ltd / www.alcaecology.co.uk / bill@alcaecology.com / 07951 014150

0 10 20 m