



320140124P

3 Meadowlands, Low Moor, Clitheroe. Lancashire. BB7 2ND
01200 425113 M: 07709 225783 earthworksuk@yahoo.co.uk

Mr Ron Valovin

9 Green Drive
Clitheroe
BB7 2BB

30 January 2014

Job ref: B 1392

Dear Mr Valovin

Re: EPS – Daylight scoping survey: 5 The Crescent, Dunsop Bridge, Clitheroe, BB7 3BA

Introduction

You have requested a protected species survey on behalf of your client Mr Gil Hughes as a condition of a planning application to Ribble Valley Borough Council for proposed building alterations at the above property.

The existing building is shown in figures 1 to 6 of this report.

The Local Planning Authority must take account the impact of a development on protected species in accordance with planning policy PPS9. The planning authority requires an appraisal of the likely impact of the proposed development on all bat species that are present or likely to be present at the property, in addition to any appropriate mitigation, compensation or enhancement works that may be required.

A daylight scoping survey was undertaken on Tuesday 28 January 2014 between 10.00 and 11.00 hrs.

The weather at the time of the survey was cool, wet and overcast (minimum temperature: 4°C, maximum cloud cover: 100%, wind: light south-westerly, rain: prolonged heavy showers).

Survey methodology

The aim of the scoping exercise is to consider the potential value of the site for European Protected Species (EPS) and to establish whether bats and other protected species have been active within any part of the property that will be affected by the proposed development.

Non-invasive survey methods were used to assess the use of the property by protected species (bats).

The survey methodology follows the recommended guidelines published by the Bat Conservation Trust - *Bat Surveys: Good Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition, Hundt, L (2012)*, Natural England (*Survey Objectives, Methods and Standards as outlined in the Bat Mitigation Guidelines, 2004*) and Chapter 3 - Survey and Monitoring Methods, (*Bat Worker's Manual, JNCC, Mitchell-Jones AJ and McLeish, AP, 3rd Edition 2004*).

The search was made using a high-powered lamp (*Clu-lite CB2 - 1,000,000 candle power*), close-focussing binoculars (*Leica Trinovid 10 x 32 BN*) and digital camera (*Sony Cyber-shot HX300*) were used to view all likely areas of the building for the presence of bats, ie. droppings and urine spots, bat corpses, bat fly larvae, roost staining or evidence of feeding remains such as discarded moth and butterfly wings and other insects fragments typically found in a perching and feeding area.

Survey limitations and constraints

The survey methodology is designed to determine the likely presence of bats within the property and does not necessarily prove absence.

National Biodiversity Network (NBN) and other data sources, whilst indicative of the bat species likely to occur within a 10km-grid square, do not confirm presence or absence of a species or habitat.

Crevice-roosting bat species are able to roost within very narrow gaps, frequently less than 25mm wide; solitary roosting bats are sometimes overlooked during daylight inspections, particularly in situations where bats have gained access within cavity walls and roof materials or behind wall claddings, fascias and soffits.

The daylight scoping survey does not include dusk emergence / dawn swarming / acoustic bat surveys.

Evidence of bat activity such as bat droppings or staining on external walls and surfaces is frequently removed by the action of wind and rain; apparent absence of evidence is therefore evaluated with caution.

Personnel

The survey was carried out by David Fisher (EED) - an experienced ecological consultant with more than 25 years experience of bat ecology and field survey work and a Natural England licence holder since 1989.

Natural England Licence Registration Number CLS03502 (August 2013):

Class Survey Licence WML CL15 (Volunteer Roost Visitor Level 1)

Class Survey Licence WML CL18 (Bat Survey level 2)

Pre-survey data search (10km-grid squares: SD64 and SD65)

The pre-survey desk study includes collation and review of potentially relevant information including:

- (1) European Protected Species (EPS) – ie. locally significant bat roosts or species records within the district.
- (2) Locally, regionally or nationally important wildlife and conservation areas and site designations.
- (3) EPS surveys previously carried at the property or at neighbouring properties.
- (4) National Biodiversity Network (NBN) terrestrial mammal records (chiroptera) for the 10km grid square.
- (5) Local bat records within a radius of 2.5km of the site.

The following bat species are known to be present within the wider district:

Myotis sp.

Natterer's bat

(*Myotis nattereri*)

Whiskered bat

(*M. mystacinus*)

Whiskered bat / Brandt's bat

(*M. mystacinus* / *M. brandtii*)

Daubenton's bat

(*M. daubentonii*)

Plecotus sp.

Brown long-eared bat

(*Plecotus auritus*)

Pipistrellus sp.

Common pipistrelle

(*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*)

Soprano pipistrelle

(*P. pygmaeus*)

Nyctalus sp.

Noctule bat

(*Nyctalus noctula*)

Rhinolophus sp.

Lesser horseshoe bat

(*Rhinolophus hipposideros*)

*data sources: NBN / EED / North Lancashire Bat Group / East Lancashire Bat Group

Pre-existing information

No data available at this location.

There is no known history of roosting bats at the property or within neighbouring buildings.

Description of the property

The property is a detached two storey house (built circa 1950's) with rendered brick cavity wall construction and duo-pitched rafter-with-purlin roof (figures 1 and 2). There is also an attached single storey utility area to the side elevation (figure 3).

The main roof void has recently been converted to accommodate a playroom and storage area; the conversion is under-drawn with PVC cladding and the floor is boarded throughout. There is no access within the existing eaves voids; the eaves and under floor are insulated with thermal glass fibre material. The roof is clad with tiles and lined with bitumen felt. There is some evidence of ingress of water (figure 5). The roof void is clean, dry and well-ventilated and there is no evidence of access by bats or birds into the roof structure.

Externally, the roof appears to be generally well-sealed and the timber fascia soffits are secure. All ridge tiles and verge tiles are secure. There is a hipped tiled roof above the side extension. The roof soffit is open beneath the eaves; although there are no signs of access by bats, nesting birds may have been present.

All windows and doors (uPVC double-glazed units) are securely fitted and fully-maintained throughout the property. External walls are cement rendered and pebble-dashed; there are no obvious gaps or crevices where roosting bats are likely to gain access.

Images: 5 The Crescent, Dunsop Bridge - 28/01/2014



Figure 1:



Figure 2:



Figure 3:



Figure 4:



Figure 5:



Figure 6:

Proposed works

It is understood the proposed two storey side extension will replace the existing single storey structure (fig. 3) requiring demolition of the existing building in addition to modifications to the existing roof verge and fascia soffits on the west (side) elevation. The house will also be re-tiled and the existing timber fascias replaced.

(Drawings as seen: existing / proposed plans by Ron Valovin).

Location of the property

National Grid Reference: SD 658 501; elevation: approximately 125m;

The property is located at Dunsop Bridge and is within the boundary of the Forest of Bowland AONB. The site is adjacent to several other residential properties of similar age, design and construction. The site is semi-rural and very close to open countryside; there is open ground to the front and rear of the house.

The site is within 150 metres of the River Dunsop, approximately 400m east of Langden Brook and 400m west of the River Hodder. The site is not adjacent to a river channel or area of open standing water.

Although the house is not immediately adjacent to woodland, there is some broadleaved woodland and conifer plantation within 250 metres.

A local data search has shown there are no designated nature conservation sites immediately adjacent to the property – ie. Special areas of Conservation (SACs), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Biological Heritage Sites (BHS), National Nature Reserves (NNR's), Local Nature Reserves (LNR's) or Regionally Important Geological and Geo-morphological Sites (RIGS).

Although several bat species are known to be present within the wider district, the location of the property is sub-optimal in terms of feeding, foraging and commuting habitat for bats.

Survey results

There is no evidence of roosting bats in any part of the property.

All internal and external and external features of the house were carefully inspected for signs of access by roosting bats; no evidence was found.

There are no records of roosting bats at this property or within the neighbouring buildings.

At least two old house martin nests (*Delichon urbica*) are present under the roof soffits; it is also likely that birds are nesting on some of the neighbouring properties. It is understood, the house martins did not nest on this property during 2013.

Evaluation of results

There are no signs of access by bats within any part of the building.

It is highly unlikely that roosting bats will be disturbed or exposed during the proposed building alterations.

The overall scale of impact of this development on local bat populations is likely to be **minimal / negligible**.

It is recommended the proposed works proceed with reasonable caution and vigilance for the 'unexpected' presence of any solitary roosting bats.

Nesting house martins are normally site faithful and are likely to return to nest on the property between mid-April and mid-May.

Site significance to bats and wild birds

Species	House (external features)	House (internal features and roof voids)
Bats	low	low
House martins	Moderate / high	N/A

Table based on figure 4. Page 39 – Guidelines for proportionate mitigation (BMG).

Risk of disturbance

The risk of causing disturbance to **roosting bats** at this property is likely to be **low / minimal***.

Minimal / negligible risk: it is highly unlikely any bat species have been active within any of the out-buildings.

***Low risk:** there is only low risk of disturbance to solitary bats or small numbers of common and widespread bat species.

Low / moderate risk: caution required; activity of common / rarer species is possible, including the presence of occasional / regular night perching and feeding activity or the presence of small numbers of rarer species (but not a maternity or hibernation site).

Moderate risk: caution required; there is moderate risk of disturbance to common bat species; activity may include the presence of regular / significant feeding perches and signs of feeding, a regularly used day / night roost or a maternity site of a common and widespread species or the likely presence of low numbers of rarer species ('rarer' as defined within the local context).

Moderate / high risk: considerable caution is required; this category may include a maternity site of rarer species.

High risk: considerable / extreme caution is required; there is a significant risk of causing disturbance to roosting bats at this site including large numbers of common species, a maternity site of locally rare or rarest UK species or a significant hibernation site for rare or rarest species; this is likely to be a site meeting the SSSI guidelines.

Table 1: Risk categories (adapted from Guidelines for proportionate mitigation - Bat Mitigation Guidelines (2004) fig. 4, page 39.

SUMMARY

The proposed building alterations at this property are **unlikely to cause disturbance to bats** or result in the loss of a bat roost or cause injury or death of a European Protected Species – (Bats) or result in any significant impact on a local bat population.

The **scale of impact** of building works at site level on local bat populations is likely to be **low / negligible**.

Additional survey effort (ie. dusk emergence and dawn re-entry and swarming surveys) during the optimal survey period May to August is **not required** at the property.

An EPS development licence (EPSL) is **not required**.

NESTING BIRDS

Where there is likely to be a risk of disturbance to nesting house martins you are advised to remove any existing nests during the winter months when the house martins are not in residence.

NB. Removal or destruction of an **active** nest or preventing birds' access to their eggs or young is illegal.

Please note: I do not provide a copy of this report to the local planning authority, therefore it is your responsibility to forward the report to Ribble Valley Borough Council with the planning application.

Yours sincerely



David Fisher
Director (EED Surveys)

APPENDIX A

Mitigation guidance (bats) - summary

Mitigation refers to the practices adopted to reduce or remove the risk of disturbance, injury or death of a protected species or damage to a roost. The Bat Mitigation Guidelines (Natural England, 2004) define mitigation as "...measures to protect the bat population from damaging activities and reduce or remove the impact of development".

ACTION	METHOD / NOTES
1. Further survey effort	Not required
2. Timing constraints	Not required
3. Method statement	Not required
4. EPS Licence requirement	Not required
5. Removal of roofing materials	Awareness at all times; very occasionally, solitary roosting bats are disturbed or exposed beneath some roof materials such as roof tiles, ridge tiles and lead flashings.
6. Accidental exposure of bats	<p>In the unlikely event of bats being exposed or vulnerable to harm, all work in that area must stop immediately.</p> <p>Cover the exposed bats to reduce further risk of harm.</p> <p>Seek further advice (see below).</p>
7. Legal protection	Site contractors and project managers should be fully aware of the legal protection afforded all species of bat in the UK and procedures should be in place to mitigate for the potential impact on bats - see notes on 'Bats and the Law' in this report.
8. Emergency advice on bats	<p>If you require specific advice on injured or exposed bats during the building works please contact:</p> <p>EED Surveys (David Fisher): 01200 425113 (office) or 07709 225783 (mobile) email: earthworksuk@yahoo.co.uk</p> <p>The Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) provides a bat helpline: 0845 1300 228; in an emergency, BCT will call the nearest volunteer bat worker in your area to arrange a site visit at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>BCT also provides an out-of-hours service run by volunteers at the end of the working day for emergency calls and operates between 19.30 and 23.30 or 07.30 and 09.00 next day.</p>
9. General advice on bats:	Refer to BCT website www.bats.org.uk Email: enquiries@bats.org.uk
10. Nesting house martins	SEE GUIDANCE BELOW (page 7)

Mitigation guidance (nesting birds) - advisory

All birds, their nests and eggs are protected by law and it is an offence (with certain exceptions) to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird or to intentionally take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while it is in use or being built.

ACTION	METHOD / NOTES
1. House martins and the law	<p>House martins and their nests are fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (WCA) which makes it an offence to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird.</p> <p>It is an offence to take, damage or destroy the eggs, young or nest of a house martin whilst it is being built or in use.</p> <p>The RSPB advises that the Act allows for fines of up to £5,000 for every bird, egg or nest destroyed, or even custodial sentences.</p>
2. Exclusion of nesting birds	<p>If maintenance work that would affect either a natural or artificial house martin nest needs to be carried out, this should be scheduled for the autumn, winter or early spring when the birds are not in residence.</p> <p>It is advisable to block the entrance to the nests to prevent other birds from using the nest, or remove the nests completely before the nesting birds return in April / May.</p>
3. Provide an artificial nest	<p>House martins often nest colonially and the birds are usually faithful to traditional sites.</p> <p>YOU ARE ADVISED TO REPLACE THE LOSS OF ANY EXISTING NEST WITH AN ARTIFICIAL NEST.</p> <p>Make sure that you replace any artificial nests to exactly the same spot where they came from house martins as martins are very particular about the exact location of their nests.</p> <p>Artificial nests products are easy to obtain and can be very effective in attracting wild birds.</p> <p>The RSPB offers sound advice and a range of suitable products.</p>

APPENDIX B

Wildlife legislation – Bats and the law

All bat species in the UK receive full protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (amended by the Environment Protection Act 1990). The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 amends the Wildlife and Countryside Act to also make it an offence to intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy or obstruct a place that bats use for shelter or protection. All species of bats are listed on Schedule 5 of the 1981 Act, which makes it an offence to:

- *intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bat.*
- *intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy or obstruct access to any place that a wild bat uses for shelter or protection. This is taken to mean all bat roosts whether bats are present or not.*
- *intentionally or recklessly disturb any wild bat while it is occupying a structure or place which it uses for shelter or protection.*

The protected status afforded to bats means planning authorities may require extra information (in the form of surveys, impact assessments and mitigation proposals) before determining planning applications for sites used by bats. Planning authorities may refuse planning permission solely on grounds of the predicted impact on protected species such as bats. Recent case law has underlined the importance of obtaining survey information prior to the determination of planning consent¹.

*"It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by a development proposal, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision."*²

All British bat species are included in Schedule 2 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) (Amendment) Regulations 2007, (also known as Habitats Regulations) which defines 'European Protected Species' (EPS).

¹ Bat Mitigation Guidelines, AJ Mitchell Jones, Joint Nature Conservation Committee, (2004) ISBN 1 86107 558 8

² Planning Policy Statement (PPS9) (2005), Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. ODPM.

Protected species (Bats) and the planning process¹

For development proposals requiring planning permission, the presence of bats, and therefore the need for a bat survey, is an important 'material planning consideration'. Adequate surveys are therefore required to establish the presence or absence of bats, to enable a prediction of the likely impact of the proposed development on them and their breeding sites or resting places and, if necessary, to design mitigation and compensation. Similarly, adequate survey information must accompany an application for a Habitats Regulations licence (also known as a Mitigation Licence) required to ensure that a proposed development is able to proceed lawfully.

The term 'development' [used in these guidelines] includes all activities requiring consent under relevant planning legislation and / or demolition operations requiring building control approval under the Building Act 1984.

Natural England (Formerly English Nature) states that development in relation to bats "covers a wide range of operations that have the potential to impact negatively on bats and bat populations. Typical examples would be the construction, modification, restoration or conversion of buildings and structures, as well as infrastructure, landfill or mineral extraction projects and demolition operations".*

*(Tony Mitchell-Jones, 2004)

¹ 2.2.3 - Planning for development, p10, Bat Surveys, Good Practice Guidelines, BCT (2007).

Other references:

Bats, development and planning in England, (Specialist support series) - Bat Conservation Trust, 5th Floor, Quadrant house, 250 Kennington Lane, London, SE11 5RD, 0845 1300 228

Defra Circular 01/2005 (to accompany PPS 9) - Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. www.defra.gov.uk

Natural England - Cheshire, Cumbria, Greater Manchester, Lancashire and Merseyside offices are located at:

Crewe: Natural England, Electra Way, Crewe business park, Crewe, Cheshire, CW1 6GJ 0300 060 2922

Kendal: Natural England, Juniper House, Murley Moss, Oxenholme Rd, Kendal, Cumbria, LA9 7RL 0300 060 2122

Manchester: Natural England, 3rd Floor, Bridgewater House, Whitworth Street, Manchester, M1 6LT 0300 060 1062

Bibliography

- Altringham, JD., (2011) Bats, From Evolution to Conservation. OUP.
- Dietz, C., Helversen, O., Nill, D.,(2009) Bats of Britain, Europe and Northwest Africa. A&C Black.
- Gunnell K, Murphy B, Williams C, (2013) Designing for Biodiversity, RIBA Publishing / BCT – 2nd Edition.
- Hundt, L., (2012) BCT Bat Surveys, Good practice Guidelines – 2nd Edition.
- JNCC, (2010), Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey – a Technique for Environmental Survey.
- Mitchell, AJ., McLeish, AP., (2004), JNCC Bat Workers Manual 3rd Edition.
- Mitchell, AJ., (2004), English Nature Bat Mitigation Guidelines, version January 2004
- Russ, J., (2012), British Bat Calls, A Guide to Species Identification. Pelagic Publishing.

Additional sources:

- (1) National Biodiversity Network (NBN) terrestrial mammal records (chiroptera) for the 10km grid square.
- (2) Local bat records within a radius of 2.5km of the site. (East Lancashire Bat Group)
- (3) MAGIC map - Nature on the map – Natural England / Defra
- (4) MARIO maps (Lancashire County Council maps and related information online)
- (5) Ribble Valley Borough Council / Planning
- (7) Lancashire County Council / Lancashire Wildlife Trust / Natural England - BHS Partnership site register

