

Bat Survey: Preliminary Roost Assessment

Elmridge Farmhouse

Elmridge Lane, Chipping, Preston

June 2017

Prepared for: Taylor Country Homes Ltd

Report prepared by: Verity Webster BSc (Hons) MSc CEcol CMIEM



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- On 15th June 2017 a Preliminary Roost Assessment was undertaken at Elmridge Farmhouse, Chipping, Preston.
- The farmhouse is considered to have moderate suitability for bats.
- No evidence of a significant roost, such as a maternity roost was discovered on site. Evidence of this, if present, is expected to have been visible as it was possible to access all areas of the property and the roof is unlined.
- However, the property has potential to support smaller numbers of crevice-roosting bats.
- In order to determine the presence or absence of bat roosts, bat emergence surveys are recommended. These surveys must be undertaken between May and August, with at least one survey in June or July.
- As no significant roost is evident within the building, based on the potential bat crevice roost types and the bat species most likely present in the locality, it is considered that if bat roost(s) are present in the building, that there will be adequate capacity to mitigate for them within the new build.
- Mitigation, if required as part of a European Protected Species Mitigation (EPSM) licence will ensure that the conservation status of the bat population in the locality is retained.

Verity Webster

Ecology and Protected Species Consultancy



1. Introduction

- 1.0.1 This report details a Preliminary Roost Assessment of Elmridge Farm House, Elmridge Lane, Chipping, Preston, Lancashire, PR3 2WU. National grid reference: SD 595 405.
- 1.0.2 Taylor Country Homes Ltd commissioned Verity Webster Ecology and Protected Species Consultancy to undertake survey work with respect to bats in order to inform the planning application for the site.

Objectives

- 1.0.3 The objectives of the Preliminary Roost Assessment are to determine:
- The suitability of the building on site to support a bat roost.
 - Whether building is currently used by bats (indicated by signs of bats or the presence of bats)
 - Whether or not further survey work to determine the presence or absence of a roost or the status of a roost is required.
 - The potential impacts of the proposals on any potential roost present or on bats using the site.
 - How any impacts might be avoided, mitigated and, or ameliorated, including advice on European Protected Species Mitigation (EPSM) application if required.
 - Potential for enhancement of the site for bats and biodiversity.
- 1.0.4 The format and content of this report follows that required by the European Protected Species Mitigation (EPSM) licence application where appropriate.

Proposals

- 1.0.5 It is understood that the proposals for the site comprise the demolition of the existing structure and the construction of a new dwelling.

Ecologist

- 1.0.6 The Bat Inspection Survey was undertaken by Verity Webster. Verity is a licensed bat surveyor (Bat Survey Class Licence WML CL18 (Class 2) Registration number: 2015-13858-CLS-CLS).
- 1.0.7 Verity has worked as an ecological consultant since 2007. She has undertaken preliminary bat assessments and further bat emergence / activity surveys for a large variety of projects and schemes, producing the required impact assessment and subsequent mitigation schemes / method statements when necessary.



2. Site Location

- 2.0.1 Elmridge Farmhouse is located in Chipping, Preston, in a rural location approximately 2.7km north of Lonridge.
- 2.0.2 The Farmhouse is part of a farm complex, the remainder of which has been subject to previous planning applications.
- 2.0.3 The site is surrounded by open countryside comprising mainly arable and pasture-land divided by a matrix of treelines and hedgerows.
- 2.0.4 There are scattered waterbodies throughout the wider landscape. Woodland is infrequent, however and where present is represent by small, managed copses.
- 2.0.5 The River Loud weaves north to south through the landscape approximately 450m to the southwest at the closest point.

Figure 1: Ordnance survey map showing surrounding landscape in relation to the survey site



Ordnance Survey Map 1:25000

Key



Survey site



Figure 2: Aerial map showing surrounding landscape in relation to the survey site



From Bing Maps 2016

250m

Key



Survey site



3. Legislation and Planning Policy

Full details of relevant legislation and planning policy can be found in Appendix 1.

3.1 UK and EU Legislation

3.1.1 Key legislation regarding the protection of bats:

- Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)
- The Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CROW), 2000
- The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC, 2006)
- Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010)

3.1.2 Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, it is a criminal offence to:

- Deliberately capture, injure or kill a bat
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat in its roost or deliberately disturb a group of bats
- Damage or destroy a bat roosting place (even if bats are not occupying the roost at the time)
- Possess or advertise/sell/exchange a bat (dead or alive) or any part of a bat
- Intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a bat roost.

3.2 Planning and Legislation

3.2.1 Under the NERC Act 2006, planning authorities are obliged to make sure that they have all the information on the presence of protected species on site before they make a decision on the planning permission.

3.2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) encourages Local Planning Authorities to conserve and enhance biodiversity.

3.2.3 Chapter 11, Para 109 of NPPF states: *"The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by...minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible..."*

3.2.4 Paragraph 118 states: *"if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused"*

3.2.5 The local planning authority has a responsibility, therefore, to obtain all information regarding the potential for protected species on a site prior to making a decision about a proposal.

3.3 Local policy

3.3.1 The Cheshire East Local Plan, which is currently under development, refers to supplementary planning document: Nature Conservation Strategy Supplementary Planning Document. This document outlines the strategies for the areas natural assets and biodiversity. The objectives are:

- To PROTECT existing habitats and species, particularly those with Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs).
- To MITIGATE against potentially adverse impacts to habitats and species.
- To COMPENSATE for losses to these habitats and species where damage is unavoidable.
- To ENHANCE existing environments and create new habitats and linkages where possible.
- To RAISE AWARENESS and UNDERSTANDING of the importance and value of the local natural environment in all its forms.

3.3.2 The strategy therefore supports, and contributes to, the Local Plan aim 'To protect, conserve and enhance both the natural and the man-made heritage of the Borough' and the Plan's emphasis on environmental issues and sustainability.



4. Survey Methodology

- 4.0.1 The Preliminary Roost Assessment for bats was undertaken in accordance with current accepted guidance: Collins, J. (ed.) (2016) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines* (3rd Edn). The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

4.1 Desk Study

- 4.1.1 Data sources used to establish background information about bats and their likely presence in the locality:
- Magic Map, Natural England (2016)
 - Bing Maps (2017)
 - Google Map, 2016
- 4.1.2 Satellite mapping, Ordnance survey, road map, habitat and designated site data from Magic Map (Natural England, 2014) was used to assess the value of the surrounding habitat for bats in the area at a landscape scale (5km), including any potentially important habitat corridors (linear habitat features), feeding grounds or potential roost opportunities, such as large expanses of woodland. The features and habitats immediately surrounding the site (local area) were also assessed at a finer scale as these influence the likely presence of bats within the survey site.

4.2 Preliminary Roost Assessment

- 4.2.1 An internal and external inspection of the building on site was undertaken during daylight to determine the suitability for bats and establish, if possible, whether bats are using the building or have been using the building in the past.
- 4.2.2 All accessible parts of the buildings were inspected, including loft voids and cellars, to look for bats and signs of the presence of bats, including:
- Droppings.
 - Feeding remains including moth and butterfly wings.
 - Staining from urine or oils near crevices or holes or on timber (such as roof beams), walls, chimney breasts etc.
 - Scratch marks on walls and timber.
 - Squeaking or chattering calls.
- 4.2.3 The systematic search inside the building included inspection of beams, floors, surfaces of stored materials, loose roof insulation or felt covering, junctions between roof timbers and timbers and the walls, crevices within brickwork. Potential access into the building was also inspected by searching for holes in walls, the roof and insulation and any light penetration into the interior from the outside.
- 4.2.4 The assessment outside the buildings included inspection of all walls, windows, window sills, fascias, soffits, eaves and tiles / slates, including a search for any crevices under tiles, under lifted lead flashing or lifted roofing felt, missing mortar, gaps in the ridge or gable end of the roofs, crevices in brickwork or under flaking paintwork or render, gaps in cladding or hanging tiles and any other potential bat roost opportunities.
- 4.2.5 Equipment: During the survey a ladder, close-focussing binoculars and a strong torch with directional beam was used to inspect the building.



- 4.2.6 As a result of the preliminary roost assessment, the buildings on site were characterised as having 'negligible', 'low', 'medium' or 'high' suitability for bats. It may also be possible to confirm presence of a roost.
- 4.2.7 Buildings or structures typically characterised as having:
- **Negligible** suitability for bats will lack features with any potential to support roosting bats. Modern or newly-built well-sealed structures may fall into this category. Structures that are metal clad with metal internal beams might have negligible potential if there are no favourable roosting spaces. Structures may also be unfavourable due to the level of disrepair, being subject to poor weather conditions.
 - **Low** suitability for bats will have sub-optimal roost features with limited potential for roosting bats. Features may be used by single bats opportunistically, but do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions and / or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis by large numbers of bats.
 - **Medium** suitability for bats may have few features with potential for bats, that provide enough space, shelter, protection and other suitable conditions, or several features with limited potential for bats. It may also be that a potentially suitable structure is situated in an area with habitat that has only low potential for foraging and commuting bats.
 - **High** suitability for bats will support at least one or more features that provide opportunities for roosting bats such that they might be used regularly, for longer periods by larger numbers of bats. These may be external features, such as lifted weatherboard or crevices in brick or stonework, or internal, such as large loft spaces with potential access. Barns, with open doorways and windows with wooden rafters and beams may fall into this category. If a structure is close to good habitat, such as a waterway, marshland or woodland, this also increases potential for roosting bats.
 - **Confirmed** roost presence when it is evident as a result of signs from inspection, such as droppings, or sight of bats, that a roost exists within the building. It is not always possible to ascertain presence or absence of a roost even if some signs, such as droppings or feeding remains are found.

5. Survey Limitations

- 5.0.1 There were no notable limitations to the survey. The whole building was accessible and allowed adequate assessment of the suitability for bats. The survey was undertaken in mid-June, at an ideal time of the year to survey for bats, when bats are active and likely to be present in summer roost sites.
- 5.0.2 Data from the local biological records centre was not obtained to inform this report. In this instance, due to the scale of the proposals, the Preliminary Roost Assessment alone was considered sufficient to inform the assessment and decision to proceed with further survey.



6. Survey Findings

6.1 Desk Study

Potential for bats in the area

Site location in relation to bats

- 6.1.1 At a landscape level, the area surrounding the survey site is very good for bats. Refer to Section 2 and Figure 2.
- 6.1.1 The mix of rough grassland, arable land, hedgerows and tree lines with scattered water bodies provides a diverse landscape that provides foraging habitat to support a range of bat species. Widespread species such as common and soprano pipistrelle bat (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus* and *Pipistrellus pygmaeus* respectively) would be expected, but also species that favour open habitats such as Leisler's (*Nyctalus leisleri*) and those that favour open water, such as Daubenton's bat (*Myotis daubentonii*). However, there is little woodland in the area. This reduces the likely presence of woodland bat species, such as brown long-eared bat (*Plecotus auritus*), whiskered bat (*Myotis mystacinus*) and Natterer's bat (*Myotis nattereri*).
- 6.1.2 The numerous linear features, such as the river, treelines and hedgerows that form a matrix through the managed landscape will provide good habitat corridors for commuting bats, facilitating their movement across the landscape.
- 6.1.3 Overall the site is considered to be in an area with high potential for several bat species.

The Conservation Status of Bats in the Area

- 6.1.4 The conservation status of bats in the area is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: The Conservation Status of Bats in the area at a Local, County and Regional Level

Species	Local	County	Regional
<i>Common pipistrelle</i>	Likely to be common in the area. There are records of this species in the area (10km).	Common and widespread Frequently recorded.	Common and widespread Frequently recorded across the Northwest
<i>Soprano pipistrelle</i>	Likely to be present due to the presence of riparian habitat.	Widespread. Frequently recorded.	Common and widespread Frequently recorded across the Northwest
<i>Nathusius's pipistrelle</i>	Likely to be rare in the area.	Infrequently recorded, but this may be due to low survey effort. Not yet recorded breeding in the county.	Rare across the northwest. A migratory species.
<i>Brown long-eared bat</i>	Likely to be in the area. There is a recent record of this species within 10km of the site.	Common and widespread Frequently recorded.	Common and widespread Frequently recorded across the Northwest.
<i>Natterer's bat</i>	Likely to be in the area, although this species favours woodland	Scattered distribution in Lancashire..	Widespread and scattered across the Northwest.



	<i>habitat, which is infrequent in the landscape.</i>		
<i>Noctule</i>	<i>Presence is likely</i>	<i>Widespread and frequently recorded.</i>	<i>Common and widespread. Frequently recorded in the Northwest.</i>
<i>Whiskered bat</i>	<i>Presence is likely</i>	<i>Present</i>	<i>Widespread.</i>
<i>Brandt's bat</i>	<i>Presence is likely</i>	<i>Present</i>	<i>Widespread.</i>
<i>Alcathoe's bat</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Widespread. Likely under-recorded.</i>
<i>Daubenton's</i>	<i>Presence is likely due to the riparian habitat present.</i>	<i>Widespread, frequently recorded near water.</i>	<i>Widespread</i>
<i>Serotine</i>	<i>Rare / absent</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Restricted to south and southwest Britain, rarely recorded in the northwest.</i>
<i>Leislars</i>	<i>Rare / absent</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Rare, but widespread in Britain. Likely present in the northwest.</i>
<i>Barbastelle</i>	<i>Unlikely to be present in the area. This species is a woodland-specialist and there is a lack of this habitat present.</i>	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Present south of a line from North Wales to the Wash.</i>

*NBN database: National Biodiversity Network.

6.2 Preliminary Roost Assessment

6.2.1 The building inspection and Roost Assessment was undertaken in daylight on 15th June 2017.

6.2.2 **The farmhouse is considered to have moderate suitability for bats.**

The Farmhouse: Structure

- 6.2.3 The farmhouse is a two-storey stone and brick structure with a pitched slate roof. The building is rectangular and oriented northeast to southwest. On the northeast elevation there is a hay-barn with a first-floor access.
- 6.2.4 The main body of the farmhouse contains a loft-space, which was also accessible at the time of survey. The loft space is approximately 2m to the apex.
- 6.2.5 The majority of the building is rendered, although this is falling always on part of the southeast elevation.



The southeast elevation of the farmhouse



- 6.2.6 There is a wooden fascia along the southeast and northwest elevation, but none on the gable ends.
- 6.2.7 There is a porch in the middle of the southeast elevation, also with a pitched, slate roof.
- 6.2.8 The roof is unlined and much of the mortar on the underside of the slates has fallen away.

Roost potential – Features

- 6.2.9 Internally, the building has features with suitability for bats, but no evidence of use by bats.
- 6.2.10 The hayloft provides a large, open void with potential for foraging bats. The space is open to the eaves. As is true for the entire building, the roof is unlined and nearly all of the mortar lining the slates has fallen away. There are numerous crevices and gaps that may allow access for bats. The window present does allow entry of much natural light however, which will deter free-hanging bat species, such as brown long-eared bat (*Plecotus auritus*).
- 6.2.11 No signs of the presence of bats (droppings or feeding remains) were found in the hayloft. The space is considered unsuitable for void-dwelling bats, such as brown long-eared bats in which to roost, but the numerous crevices under the slates, between the slates and the remaining mortar and between slates and the joists may provide opportunities for crevice-roosting bats such as pipistrelle species.
- 6.2.12 The loft void within the main body of the building is similar; there is potential for bats such as brown long-eared bat to roost, but no evidence of this. The masses of cobwebs along the ridge beam and throughout the space further support this finding, as this would be clear were bats flying through the space with any regularity.
- 6.2.13 The numerous crevices under the slates and between beams do provide opportunities for crevice-dwelling bats to roost. Nevertheless, if a significant roost, such as a maternity roost were present, droppings would be expected in the interior of the building where they have fallen through from the roof.
- 6.2.14 Externally, the suitability for bats lies with the roof, as explained above. The mortar is missing from the gable ends of the building and slipped and missing slates provide opportunities for bats to enter the structure.
- 6.2.15 There are also some crevices in the walls of the building, but these are few and no evidence of bats (droppings) was found during inspection.



The northwest elevation of the farmhouse



The hayloft



The loft void

7. Appraisal

- 7.0.1 Given the numerous opportunities for crevice-roosting bats within the roof structure, Elmridge Farmhouse is considered to have moderate suitability for bats and further survey work to determine the presence or absence of bat roosts is recommended.
- 7.0.2 However, given that there is very little covering below the slates, if a significant roost were present, or if bats were using the roof structure with any regularity, droppings within the building (in the hayloft or loft void) would be expected.
- 7.0.3 Due to the habitat within the surrounding area and in particular the absence of significant areas of woodland, the bat species likely to be present within the locality are those that are common and widespread. The rarest species within the county are largely associated with woodland.
- 7.0.4 For this reason, it can be anticipated with a reasonable level of confidence that a significant roost is unlikely to be present. Similarly, bat species, if present, are likely to be crevice-dwelling species. It is somewhat simpler to mitigate for crevice-roost species than void-favouring bats, which are not evident. Appendix B shows a typical example of crevice-roost mitigation with the use of 'bat slate' allowing bats access in to the space between the slates and a bat-friendly lining beneath.
- 7.0.5 Overall, it is considered that if a roost is present, there is adequate scope to mitigate for loss of such a roost in the proposed new building.
- 7.0.6 Although the exact level of impact upon bats (if any) and the requirements and mitigation (if necessary) cannot be fully determined until the further survey work has been completed, it is likely that they can be addressed with appropriate mitigation.



8. Conclusion and Recommendations

- 8.0.1 Elmridge Farmhouse is considered to have moderate suitability for bats. This is because the roof structure contains features with potential for crevice-dwelling bat species.
- 8.0.2 There is no evidence of void-dwelling bats being present in the building and there is no evidence of a significant roost, such as a maternity roost.
- 8.0.3 It is anticipated that there is adequate scope to mitigate for a roost (if present) in the proposed new building.
- 8.0.4 Such mitigation would be subject to obtaining a European Protected Species Mitigation (EPSM) licence from Natural England, should it be necessary.
- 8.0.5 Survey work must be undertaken in line with the latest good practice guidance:
- Collins, J. (ed.) (2016). *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines* (3rd Edn). The Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- 8.0.6 In order to determine the presence or absence of bats, and to inform any mitigation that may be required, it is recommended that:
- *Two evening emergence / dawn re-entry surveys are undertaken between May-September, with at least one survey undertaken in June or July.*

Table 7.3 Recommended minimum number of survey visits for presence/absence survey to give confidence in a negative result for structures (Collins, 2016).

Low roost suitability	Moderate roost suitability	High roost suitability
One survey visit. One dusk emergence or dawn re-entry survey.	Two separate survey visits. One dusk emergence and a separate dawn re-entry survey.	Three separate survey visits. At least one dusk emergence and a separate dawn re-entry survey. The third visit could be either dusk or dawn.

9. References

- BCT (2003) *BATS AND LIGHTING IN THE UK* Bats and the Built Environment Series. Version 3. Bat Conservation Trust.
- Collins, J. (ed.) (2016) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines* (3rd edn). The Bat Conservation Trust, London. ISBN-13 978-1-872745-96-1
- MAGIC Map (2016) <http://www.natureonthemap.naturalengland.org.uk>
- BING Maps (2016) <https://www.bing.com/maps>



• APPENDIX A: Wildlife Legislation and Planning Policy

UK AND EU LEGISLATION

8.1 KEY LEGISLATION

8.1.1 Key legislation regarding the protection of bats:

- Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)
- The Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CROW), 2000
- The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC, 2006)
- Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010)

8.2 WILDLIFE AND COUNTRYSIDE ACT 1981 (AS AMENDED)

8.2.1 The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 is UK legislation.

8.2.2 Bats are listed on Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (WCA) 1981. Under Section 9 of this legislation it is an offence to:

- Kill, injure or take a bat.
- Possess, a live or dead bat.
- Intentionally or recklessly damage or destroy any structure or place which any bat uses as shelter or protection.
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat whilst it is occupying a structure or place which it uses for shelter or protection.
- Internationally or recklessly obstruct access to any structure or place which a bat uses as shelter or protection.
- Sell, offer or expose for sale any live or dead bat.

8.3 COUNTRYSIDE AND RIGHTS OF WAY ACT 2000

8.3.1 Schedule 12 of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000, amended by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 by removing the need to prove intent to damage a roost / harm (etc) a bat or other species listed on Schedule 1 by adding the words 'or recklessly' after 'intentionally' into the wording in Section 9 of the WCA 1981. The CROW act also strengthened the penalties for offences to bats and other species listed on Schedule 5.

8.4 CONSERVATION OF HABITATS AND SPECIES REGULATIONS 2010

8.4.1 The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 consolidate all the various amendments made to the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 in respect of England and Wales.

8.4.2 The 1994 Regulations transposed Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (EC Habitats Directive) into national law. The regulations came into force on 30 October 1994.

8.4.3 The Regulations provide for the designation and protection of European Sites and European Protected Species, including bats.

8.4.4 Under the Regulations, competent authorities (ie any government department or public body) have a general duty, in the exercise of any of their functions, to have regard to the EC Habitats Directive.

8.4.5 With regard to European Protected Species (including bats), the Regulations make it an offence to:

- Deliberately capture;
- Kill;
- Disturb or;
- Trade in animals listed in Schedule 2, which include all UK bat species.



8.5 European Protected Species (EPS) Licenses and the Three Tests

8.5.1 These actions can be made lawful through the granting of licenses by the appropriate authorities. Licenses may be granted for a number of purposes (such as science and education, conservation, preserve public health and safety). For such a licence to be granted the appropriate authority would have to be satisfied that an application has met the three tests, which are:

- 1)- The licence may be granted "to preserve public health or public safety or for reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences or primary importance for the environment"
- 2)- There must be "no satisfactory alternative"
- 3)- The proposal "will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the species at a favourable conservation status in its natural range"

8.6 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND RURAL COMMUNITIES (NERC) ACT 2006 (PLANNING SYSTEM)

Planning Authorities: A Duty to Conserve Biodiversity

8.6.1 Under this legislation, planning authorities are obliged to make sure that they have all the information on the presence of protected species on site *before* they make a decision on the planning permission.

8.6.2 Part 2, Section 40 confers on the planning authorities a duty to conserve biodiversity and states:

"Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of biodiversity"

Species of Principal Importance

8.6.3 Part 3, Section 41 requires the Secretary of State to "*publish a list of the living organisms and types of habitat which in the Secretary of State's opinion are of **principle importance** for the purpose of conserving biodiversity*".

8.6.4 This requirement leads to production of a list of species and habitats of Principal Importance. This list includes all UK bats.

PLANNING POLICY

8.7 NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

8.7.1 In March 2012 the Government introduced the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Chapter 11: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

8.7.2 Chapter 11: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment replaces PPS 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.

8.7.3 Chapter 11, Para 109 of NPPF states: "The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by...minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible...including establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures".

8.7.4 Para 114 states: "Local Planning authorities should set out a strategic approach in their local plans, planning positively for the creating, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure".

8.7.5 Para 117 gives guidance about how impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity should be minimised at a



landscape scale by identifying and mapping components of local ecological networks and connecting them, and promotes the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats and ecological networks in relation to priority species populations, and specifies suitable indicators should be identified for the purposes of monitoring.

8.7.6 Para 118 states: "When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles:

- **if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;**
- **proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest likely to have an adverse effect on a Sites of Special Scientific Interest (either individually or in combination with other developments) should not normally be permitted.** Where an adverse effect on the site's notified special interest features is likely, an exception should only be made where the benefits of the development, at this site, clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest and any broad impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;
- **Development proposals where the primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be permitted;**
 - opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged;
 - planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss;
 - and the following wildlife sites should be given the same protection as European sites:
 - Potential Special Protection Areas and possible Special Areas of Conservation
 - listed or proposed Ramsar sites; and
 - sites identified, or required, as compensatory measures for adverse effects on European sites, potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation, and listed or proposed Ramsar sites."

ODPM CIRCULAR 06/2005: BIODIVERSITY AND GEOLOGICAL CONSERVATION

8.7.7 This document, to be read in conjunction with NPPF provides administrative guidance on the application of the law relating to planning and nature conservation as it applies in England. It makes it clear that it is the intention of the government that local authorities and developers consider protected species at the earliest possible stage in the planning process. Any planning application that is likely to affect protected species should come with details of the surveys which have been undertaken and should include, if necessary, recommendations for mitigation. Applications which do not include sufficient data should be rejected.

8.8 LOCAL PLANS

8.8.1 Bury Council is currently at an early stage in developing the Bury Local Plan which will, once adopted, replace the current adopted Bury Unitary Development Plan.

8.8.2 The existing policies currently used under Part 2, Chapter 6: Environment, include:

8.8.3 EN6: Conservation and The Natural Environment.

- EN6/1 - Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (Sites of Special Scientific Interest, National Nature Reserves and Grade A Sites of Biological Importance) states:

Planning permission will not be granted for development in or in the vicinity of a designated or proposed site of national or county/regional importance (Site of Special Scientific Interest or National Nature Reserve or Site of Biological Importance which has been identified as of national or county/regional importance i.e. Grade A) which would destroy or adversely affect, either directly or indirectly, the nature conservation interest of the site, unless it can be demonstrated that other material considerations outweigh the special interest of the site.



- EN6/2 - Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (Local Nature Reserves and Grade B and C Sites of Biological Importance) states:

Planning permission will not be granted for development which would damage either directly or indirectly, the nature conservation interests of sites of particular ecological significance (Local Nature Reserves or Grade B and C Sites of Biological Importance) unless conditions can be imposed that would acceptably mitigate those impacts.

- EN6/3 - Features of Ecological Value states:

The effect of land use changes on existing features of ecological or wildlife value will be taken into account when assessing development proposals. Any proposal should seek to retain such features and incorporate them into the development.



- **APPENDIX B: Example of a Crevice Roost**

