

Date of panel meeting	Site code	Site Name	District	Panel decision	Status	Boundary amendments	Year of survey	Criteria	Comments	Recommendations
20/02/2026	SU67502	Land at Kentwood and Armour Hills, Tilehurst	Reading	Accept	pLWS	No	2025	15, 5	<p>As part of the panel's decision-making process, an overview of the bat records in the consultant's ecological report was requested to discuss the site's eligibility for Criterion 15. The bat surveys from the ecological report indicated that a diverse assemblage of bat species uses this site, which is notable given its urban environment. The records presented demonstrated high use of the site by four species. These included Serotine and Barbastelle bats, which is significant as these species are considered vulnerable. It was discussed that Serotine bats can be misidentified by classifiers but not here.</p> <p>Overall, the bat assemblage reported was therefore decided to be towards the higher spectrum in terms of interest, particularly considering the number of species in the context of an urban site acting as a key connecting habitat to other suitable habitats for bats. The ecological report also stated that the site is of county value for commuting/ foraging bats, primarily on the basis of the presence of individual barbastelle bats. This was also taken into consideration during the decision making.</p> <p>The amphibian and reptile records were not sufficient for the site to pass, though they are not insignificant. It was noted that these records are likely to represent populations reliant on the allotments.</p> <p>Criterion 5: connectivity to other wooded stands is quite good and it was agreed by the panel to accept this criterion based on that. The panel further agreed that, for an urban site, it appears well connected, as supported by the green corridor mapping from the Local Plan and its proximity and connectivity through nearby woodlands to the BOA.</p> <p>In considering the site as an urban site, it was noted that this would afford some flexibility on criteria 2. However, it was decided that the site still does not pass on naturalness, as there is not enough evidence that it is a degraded priority habitat. Criterion 8, it was decided not to include this criterion as access and views are restricted.</p>	<p>Add to report and site selection form: Criterion 15: Include an extract of bat data from the ecological report. For the reasoning behind Criterion 15, state that it is based on the assemblage, with four or more species (at least Common Pipistrelle, Soprano Pipistrelle, Nathusius' Pipistrelle and Noctule) regularly using the site for foraging. It is also of county importance for commuting/foraging Barbastelle bats. Criterion 2: Note that we considered it as an urban site, but the panel decided it still does not pass on naturalness.</p> <p>Boundary: Keep as suggested. Criterion 5: Add a screenshot showing the connectivity through green corridors on the local plan and the site's proximity to the BOA.</p>