1044

David Hewitt

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:
Attachments: EPS report 1877 Salesbury.docx

Hello Dave

I have tried contacting you this week but messages didn't get through I assume; I have had an enquiry from a client (George Hargreaves) which I have a little reluctantly decided to follow up on his behalf
(I made the decision to retire from surveying entirely in July this year).

I surveyed his property in October 2017 finding it Low Risk (report 1877 - copy attached), he tells me that the Planning Dept have asked him for a letter to confirm that the risk remains low since the plans have changed and it is now over 12 months since it was surveyed. I thought that an email to you may be sufficient to re-assure RVBC that the risk of disturbing bats despite there being a small change in his proposed plans. Having gone through last years survey I am confident that the proposed work will remain low risk as before - I hope this will be sufficient to satisfy the planning dept.

Hope all is well with you.

kind regards, Dave

David Fisher
earthworks environmental design (EED)

Protected species surveys

EED

3 Meadowlands, Low Moor, Clitheroe. Lancashire. BB7 2ND
Office: 0 .co.uk

ves

ad

Lancashire
BB1 9HT

24 October 2017
1877

Job ref: B

Dear Mr Hargreaves

Re: EPS – Daylight scoping survey: 81 Ribchester Road, Salesbury, Blackburn, BB1 9HT

You have requested a scoping survey (European Protected Species) as a condition of a planning application to Ribble Valley Borough Council (RVBC) for building alterations to the above property.

The Local Planning Authority is required to take account of the impact of a development on protected species in compliance with current planning policy (National Planning Policy Framework). RVBC 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 mitigation and enhancement works that may be necessary.

As a consequence of the historical declines in bat populations during the second half of the twentieth century, all bats and their roosts are protected by UK law. The depletion of natural habitats throughout the UK means that some bat species are now more than ever dependent on houses and other structures as roosting sites. It is this dependence that makes them vulnerable to redevelopments that can result in damage or destruction of a roost, particularly maternity roosts, resulting in negative impacts on a local bat population.

Since 2008 bats have been included in the list of UK Biodiversity Indicators which aim to show the response of species to the pressures, changes and threats to our natural and built environment.

A preliminary roost assessment (scoping survey) has found no evidence of bat roosting activity at this property.

There are no signs of any maternity roost, mating roost or place of hibernation and it is unlikely that bats have ever been present at this site. The proposed building alterations are unlikely to result in disturbance to roosting bats; therefore the overall impact of the development on protected species is likely to be minimal.

It is recommended the development proceeds without a requirement to obtain a development licence (EPSL) since the proposed building works are unlikely to result in a breach of the Habitats Regulations.

Please find a copy of the survey report now attached.

Yours sincerely

David Fisher
Director (EED Surveys)

(European Protected Species)

PRELIMINARY ROOST ASSESSMENT – EPS REPORT

81 Ribchester Road, Salesbury, Blackburn, BB1 9HT

Date of survey: 24 October 2017

Introduction

The Local Planning Authority is required to take account of the impact of a development on protected species in compliance with current planning policy (National Planning Policy Framework). RVBC 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 mitigation and enhancement works that may be necessary.

As a consequence of the historical declines in bat populations during the second half of the twentieth century, all bats and their roosts are protected by UK law. The depletion of natural habitats throughout the UK means that some bat species are now more than ever dependent on houses and other structures as roosting sites. It is this dependence that makes them vulnerable to redevelopments that can result in damage or destruction of a roost, particularly maternity roosts, resulting in negative impacts on a local bat population.

Since 2008 bats have been included in the list of UK Biodiversity Indicators which aim to show the response of species to the pressures, changes and threats to our natural and built environment.

Timing of survey / weather conditions

The scoping survey was undertaken on Tuesday 24 October 2017 between 11.00 and 11.30.

The weather at the time of the inspection was mild, dry and overcast (min. temperature: 15ºC, cloud: 100%, wind: light south-westerly, rain: nil) providing satisfactory conditions for this level of survey.

Personnel

The inspection was carried out by David Fisher (EED Surveys) - an ecological consultant and Natural England volunteer bat roost visitor and bat licence holder since 1989.

Current licences held:

Natural England Class Licence WML-A34 - Level 1 (Registration Number: 2015 – 17599-CLS-CLS)

Natural England Class Licence WML-A34 – Level 2 (Registration Number: 2015 – 12106-CLS-CLS)

Aims of the survey*

Collect robust data to determine the likely impacts of the proposed development on bat populations and other protected species at the property.

Facilitate the design of mitigation, enhancement and monitoring strategies for bats and all protected species.

Provide a clear assessment of risk to bats and other protected species enabling the Local Planning Authority to reach an informed planning decision.

Assist clients in meeting their statutory obligations.

Facilitate the conservation of bat populations and other protected species.

*Adapted from 'Defining aims and objectives', p15 BCT Bat Surveys - Good Practice Guidelines,

Survey methodology

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 survey protocol requires that a full visual inspection of the property is carried out. The survey aims to cover all internal and external features of the building including any accessible roof voids and out-buildings that are likely to be affected by the proposed works. The main purpose of the search is to look for evidence of flight, feeding, perching or other indicative signs of bat activity or evidence of other protected species at the property.

The search was made using a high-powered lamp *(Clu-lite CB2 - 1,000,000 candle power),* close-focussing binoculars *(Swarovski Optik EL8 x 32 WB)* 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 or other insects fragments typically found in a perching and feeding area.

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

Survey limitations

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

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 rubble infill walls or beneath roof materials and other structural features.

Evidence of bat activity such as bat droppings, feeding signs and other indicative evidence such as staining on external walls and surfaces is frequently removed by the action of wind and rain – please note that absence of evidence of bats is not necessarily evidence that bats are not present.

Records whilst indicative of the bat species likely to occur within an area, do not confirm presence or absence of a species or habitat. Some local records may contain unverified public data.

Proposed works

(1) Two storey side extension

(2) Single storey rear extension requiring removal of an existing small kitchen extension

(3) Re-roofing of the property

(4) Replace existing garage with new build

Pre-existing information

An EPS scoping survey was undertaken at the property by this surveyor (EED Job No. B1239) on 29/11/2012; no evidence of roosting bats or nesting wild birds was recorded.

A data search has found no records of roosting bats at this property or within neighbouring dwellings.

Pre-survey data search

The aim of the pre-survey data search is to collate background information about the proposed development site on bat activity, roosts and significant landscape features that may be used by bats and other protected species. Information sources include:

(1) European Protected Species (EPS) - ie. species records of local, regional or national significance.

(2) National Biodiversity Network (NBN)* terrestrial mammal records (chiroptera).

(3) Local bat records: (i) East Lancashire Bat Group (ELBG) (ii) EED Surveys (iii) other ecological consultants.

The following bat species are recorded within the 10km national grid squares: SD73 and SD74 (Ribble Valley):

Common name	Scientific name	Status of local population
Natterer's bat	(*Myotis nattereri*) [1 2]	widespread/common
Whiskered bat	(*M. mystacinus*) * [1]	widespread
Brandt's bat	(*M. brandtii*)[2]	widespread
Daubenton's bat	(*M. daubentonii*) * [1 2]	widespread/locally common
Brown long-eared bat	(*Plecotus auritus*)* [1 2]	widespread/locally common
Common pipistrelle	(*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*)* [1 2]	widespread/common
Soprano pipistrelle	(*P. pygmaeus*)* [1 2]	widespread/locally common
Noctule bat	(*Nyctalus noctula*)[1 2]	widespread
Nathusius's pipistrelle	(*P. nathusii*) [2]	rare, distribution unknown

*NBN data [1]East Lancashire Bat Group [2]EED surveys [3]Bowland Kilns and Caves Research Group

Location of the property

NGR: SD 682 328 Elevation: 135 metres

The property is located on Ribchester Road, Salesbury (B6245) opposite St Peter's Church and close to an extensive area of recreational open space adjacent to the church. The location is urban in character and situated within a well-established residential district; the property is surrounded by dwellings of similar age, design and construction.

There are no extensive areas of broadleaved woodland or plantation within 1.5km of the site and there are no significant area of standing open water, riparian woodland or river channel nearby. The location of the property is sub-optimal in terms of connectivity to high-value feeding, foraging and commuting habitat for bats.

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).

Description of the property

The property is a semi-detached two storey house with standard brick cavity wall construction and hipped roof (figures 1). The rafter-with-purlin tiled roof is back-pointed and roofing membrane is absent (figures 5 and 6).

The roof void is insulated with glass fibre material above the first floor ceiling joists; there are considerable accumulations of dust and debris derived from the back-pointing and the roof void area is generally cool, dry and well-ventilated / draughty. There are no signs of access by roosting bats or nesting wild birds.

External brickwork is rendered and stone chipped above the brick plinth; timber box soffits are well-sealed and the property is double-glazed throughout.

At the rear of the property is a single storey lean-to kitchen extension with mono-pitched tiled roof and timber fascia board; all roof areas are secure.

A single storey garage in the rear garden (figures 2 and 4) has a concrete panel construction and duo-pitched cement- fibre panelled roof. The garage is generally well-sealed and secure and there is no evidence of access by roosting bats or wild birds.

Images: 24/10/17

Figure 1:

Figure 2:

Figure 3:

Figure 4:

Figure 5:

Figure 6:

Survey results

A preliminary roost assessment has found no evidence of roosting, perching or feeding bats at the property.

There are no signs of roosting bats within the enclosed roof void.

The surveyor has found no historical evidence that bats have ever been present at this site.

A previous survey in November 2012 found no evidence of roosting bats at this property.

There are no records of bats at this location.

The property has low conservation significance in terms of access to roosting bats or nesting wild birds.

Evaluation of results

The building has low roosting potential for bats; it is unlikely that bats have ever been present.

The proposed building and re-roofing operations are unlikely to result in disturbance to roosting bats.

The impact of the proposed works on protected species is likely to be **minimal.***

Impact assessment

***Minimal:** it is highly unlikely any bat species have been active within any part of the property.

***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.

Summary and recommendations

BATS

Minimal – low impact.

The proposed roofing operations 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.

It is recommended the works proceed **without a requirement to obtain a development licence (EPSL)** since the proposed development is unlikely to result in a breach of the Habitats Regulations.

Further survey effort at the property is not required.

Nesting wild birds

There is no risk of disturbance to nesting birds.

ANNEX 1

Mitigation guidance

Action	Summary of advice / recommendations
1. Timing constraints	Not required
2. Further survey effort at this site	Not required
3. Detailed method statement	Not required
4. Licence requirement (EPSL)	Not required
5. Roofing works: Removal of roofing materials	**Minimal / low risk of disturbing roosting bats.** In the unlikely event of any bats being exposed during the removal of the roof spars, tiles, timber battens or lead flashings, building operations should cease in the area of disturbance until the property has been inspected by a licenced person.
6. Accidental disturbance to bats	**Seek advice immediately.** Cover any exposed bats to reduce any further risk of harm. Place the bats in a small dark and very secure box and leave in a cool and quiet place. Wherever possible, building / roofing contractors should try to prevent any bats from flying away in daylight. Call the surveyor for further advice before proceeding, otherwise contact the emergency help line at the BCT.

7. Legal responsibility	The onus lies with the applicant to ensure that no offence will be committed if the development goes ahead, regardless of whether planning permission is granted.
8. Emergency advice on bats	EED S … obile) email: The Ba… 28; in an emerg… arrange a site … www.b…

ANNEX 2

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 consent[1].

"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 process

Our built environment has the potential to have major negative impacts on biodiversity. However, if done sensitively, the development and refurbishment of buildings can, in fact, increase the ecological value of the site.*

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[1].

Natural England – North of England 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

Sheffield: Natural England, 1 East Parade, City Centre, S1 2ET, Sheffield.
