



Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment

Site: 60 Hacking Drive, Longridge, PR3 3FP

29th October 2021

CLIENT: Mr David Palmer

Prepared By:

Carol Edmondson MSc MRSB
Ark Ecology
Whalley
BB7 9JQ

Date checked & released:

29th October 2021

Summary

This report presents the results of a daylight potential bat roost assessment (PRA) undertaken on October 20th 2021, at **60 Hacking Drive, Longridge, PR3 3FP**. The work has been commissioned in connection with a proposed planning application.

The scope of the survey has primarily considered roosting and hibernating bats, breeding birds and barn owls.

In summary, the survey outcome shows no evidence of historic use by bats, and has identified that there is negligible potential habitat value on site for any bat species. However, a precautionary approach should always be used when demolishing/converting buildings due to the transient nature of bats. The site is not suitable for use by barn owls, and no evidence was found on the site.

Recommendations - This is work you will need to commission to obtain planning permission or comply with legislation for other consent.

Recommendations: Bats
<p>No further surveys required. However, if bats are found during any stage of the development, work should stop immediately and a suitably qualified ecologist should be contacted to seek further advice.</p> <p>Please also see enhancement recommendations at 4.2</p>
Recommendations: Birds
<p>Any building works/tree and scrub removal should be undertaken outside the period 1st March to 31st August. If this timeframe cannot be avoided, a close inspection of the building and scrub to be removed should be undertaken by a suitably qualified ecologist, immediately prior to clearance. All active nests will need to be retained until the young have fledged.</p>

Contents

1.0 Introduction and Context	4
1.1 Background.....	4
1.2 Site Context	4
1.3 Scope of the report	4
2.0 Methodology	5
2.1 Desk Study methodology.....	5
2.2 Site Survey methodology.....	5
2.3 Breeding birds and other incidental observations	5
2.4 Suitability Assessment.....	5
2.5 Limitations – evaluation of the methodology.....	6
3.0 Results and Evaluation	7
3.1 Desk Study Results.....	7
3.2 Designated sites	7
3.3 Landscape.....	7
3.4 Historical records.....	7
3.5 Field Survey Results.....	8
3.6 Site Feature descriptions and photos	8
4.0 Conclusions, Impacts and Recommendations	11
4.1 Informative guidelines.....	11
4.2 Evaluation.....	12
5.0 Bibliography.....	13
Appendix 1: Survey Plan.....	14
Appendix 2: Proposed Site Plan	15
Appendix 3: Desk Study Information	15
Appendix 4: Legislation and Planning Policy related to bats	16

1.0 Introduction and Context

1.1 Background

The building at 60 Hacking Drive, Longridge, PR3 3FP is a semi-detached residential dwelling set in an estate of similar dwellings.

Hereafter within this report, the land encompassed by the red-line boundary of the planning application is termed '**the Site**' or '**the Application Site**'.

1.2 Site Context

A bat survey has been deemed necessary due to the nature of the proposed works and location of the site. In addition, the presence or absence of Barn owl and nesting birds has been taken into consideration, along with other local wildlife.

1.3 Scope of the report

This report provides a description of all features suitable for roosting bats, and evaluates those features in the context of the site and wider environment. It further documents any physical evidence collected or recorded during the site survey that establishes the presence of roosting bats. It provides information on constraints to the proposals as a result of roosting bats, and summarises the requirements for any further surveys, to inform subsequent mitigation proposals, achieve Planning or other statutory consent, and to comply with current wildlife legislation.

The aim of the assessment was to determine the presence or evaluate the likelihood of the presence of roosting bats, and to gain an understanding of how they could use the site. Due to the transient nature of bats, this report is not able to definitively ascertain the absence of bats, rather the absence of *evidence* of use by bats either prior to or at the time of the survey.

To achieve this, the following steps have been taken:

- A desk study has been carried out, including information from local wildlife groups & MAGiC website.
- A field survey has been undertaken, including an external survey and internal inspection where possible.
- An outline of likely impacts on any known roosts has been provided, based on current development proposals.
- Recommendations for further survey and assessment have been made, along with advice on European Protected Species Mitigation Licensing if appropriate.

A survey plan is presented in Appendix 1, the proposed Project Plan is included in Appendix 2 (where available), desk study results are provided in the Appendix 3 and a summary of relevant legislation can be found in Appendix 4.

The assessment is informed by the Bat Conservation Trust publication *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists – Good Practice Guidelines* (Collins, J. (Ed) 2016).

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Desk Study methodology

Prior to attending the Site, desk and internet based resources were used to obtain background information about known bat habitat and occurrences in an approx. 2km surrounding radius.

The resources used for the desk study were as follows:

- Google Earth Pro (<http://earth.google.co.uk>) for aerial photographs
- Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) collaborative database website (<http://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>), for information on statutory designations.
- Local bat care group for local knowledge on known roosts.

2.2 Site Survey methodology

All features that will be impacted by the project proposals were assessed for their bat roosting and/or commuting habitat. The surveyor systematically surveyed all features suitable and for signs of bat activity.

For any surveyed buildings:

A non-intrusive visual appraisal from the ground using binoculars, inspecting the external features of the building for potential access/egress points, and for signs of bat use. An internal inspection of the building was also made, including areas of derelict or abandoned buildings and the accessible roof spaces of all buildings, using an endoscope & torch. The surveyor paid particular attention to the floor and flat surfaces, window shutters and frames, lintels above doors and windows, and carried out a detailed search of numerous features within the roof space.

2.3 Breeding birds and other incidental observations

The surveyor also made note of any other ecological constraints observed during the survey, notably the likelihood of presence or signs of breeding birds, and the suitability of the site for barn owls *Tyto alba*.

2.4 Suitability Assessment

All affected survey features on site were categorised according to the likelihood of bats being present, in line with best practice guidelines (Collins, J. (ed) 2016). The features that dictate the likelihood of roosting bats are summarised in Table 1 below. Roost suitability is classified as high, moderate, low and negligible and dictates any further surveys required before works can proceed

Table 1: Features of a building that are correlated with use by bats

Likelihood of bats being present	Feature of building and its context
Higher	<p>Buildings/structures with features of particular significance for roosting bats e.g., mines, caves, tunnels, icehouses and cellars.</p> <p>Habitat on site and surrounding landscape of high quality for foraging bats e.g., broadleaved woodland, tree-lined watercourses and grazed parkland.</p> <p>Site is connected with the wider landscape by strong linear features that would be used by commuting bats e.g., river and or stream valleys and hedgerows.</p> <p>Site is proximate to known or likely roosts (based on historical data).</p>
Lower	<p>A small number of possible roost sites/features, used sporadically by more widespread species.</p> <p>Habitat suitable for foraging in close proximity, but isolated in the landscape. Or an isolated site not connected by prominent linear features.</p> <p>Few features suitable for roosting, minor foraging or commuting.</p>

2.5 Limitations – evaluation of the methodology

It should be noted that whilst every effort has been made to describe the features on site in the context of their suitability for roosting bats, this does not provide a complete characterisation of the site. This survey provides a preliminary view of the likelihood of bats being present. This is based on suitability of the habitats on the site and in the local area, the ecology and biology of bats as currently understood, and the known distribution of bats as recovered during the desk study.

The survey was carried out outside the main activity season for bats (Mid-May to September being deemed the main activity season) and the conclusions drawn are based on the range of evidence available at the time of the survey.

3.0 Results and Evaluation

3.1 Desk Study Results

The site is located at National Grid Reference SD 59864 36523

3.2 Designated sites

The site is not within the any designated areas, and will not have an impact on any Sites of Scientific interest or other designated statutory sites.

3.3 Landscape

A review of the designated sites, aerial photographs (Figure 1), the Magic database (App. 3) and OS maps has been undertaken. Collated together, the site's relevance to bat habitat is described below:

The site is located to the south Longridge within a residential area and adjacent to Shay Lane Industrial area, Set in a wider rural landscape of pasture and meadows with hedges, with small areas of deciduous woodland and the reservoirs to the east, all features which could be used for foraging and commuting by bats.




Figure 1: Aerial photo of site, showing surrounding landscape structure

3.4 Historical records

A search of the magic database shows two granted European Protected Species Mitigation Licences (EPSMLs) within a 2km radius of the survey site for the destruction of a roosting site for common pipistrelle bat species.

Local bat care group records show the presence of both common and soprano pipistrelle bats. This shows the historic presence of these bats within the survey area.

3.5 Field Survey Results

The survey was undertaken on 20/10/2021 by Carol Edmondson (Natural England bat licence number: **2015-12195** CLS-CLS), an MSc qualified ecologist with 9 years' experience in specific bat habitat surveying.

There is one survey building on the site which is illustrated in the map in Appendix 1. The environmental variables recorded at the time of the survey are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Environmental variables during the survey

Date: 07/06/2021	
Temperature	12°C
Cloud Cover	80%
Wind	4 km/h
Rain	Light rain

3.6 Site Feature descriptions and photos

Building Description

The building is a two-storey brick and block cavity built residential property in a reasonable state of repair.

The uPVC windows around the property are in good repair and close fitting.

All mortar and brickwork is sound with no gaps or missing sections.

All eaves and fascia boards are close fitting uPVC and in reasonable condition.

The fascia board is well sealed to the wall, not affording any gaps for bats to roost behind.



Photo 1: East (front) elevation.

The dual-pitched roof ridge runs north to south, and is clad in man-made tiles, with a large dormer window set in.

The roofing tiles are in a good state of repair with no visible gaps or missing, slipped tiles, having recently been renewed.

The lead is in good condition, and is close fitting to all substrates.

On the north elevation is a single storey single garage with a flat felt covered roof, up and over door and uPVC fascia board



Photo 2: dual pitched roof with dormer windows

On the west elevation is a small timber framed conservatory, in a poor condition with rotting timber frames.

There is a full length dormer on the west facing roof pitch with a felted flat roof.

All leadwork around the property is sound, with no gaps or crevices suitable for roosting bats.



Photo 3: West elevation showing small conservatory to be removed.

The single height garage has a timber framed window to the west elevation. Although it is starting to rot, there are no gaps in the frames. The garage fascia boards are all close fitting and well-sealed to the brickwork behind, with no gaps or crevices suitable for roosting bats.



Photo 4: West elevation showing small conservatory to be removed.

Interior.

Internally a roof void was accessible for inspection.

The space is dry, and the roofing materials appear in an excellent state of repair.

The underside of the roofing materials is lined with foam insulation panels.

There was no daylight showing through any point at the wall cap or eaves.



Photo 5: Internal view of roof structure.

The interior of the garage was dry and appears well sealed.

All surfaces were checked for bat droppings or urine stains.




Photo 6: Internal view of garage space.

Evidence of bats

There was no evidence of bats historically or currently using this building as roosting habitat.

Breeding birds and other incidental observations

There was no evidence of nesting birds within the property, however the surrounding garden provides plentiful nesting and feeding habitat for birds.

4.0 Conclusions, Impacts and Recommendations

4.1 Informative guidelines

Bats and their roosts are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act and Conservation Regulations; see Appendix 3 for a summary of legislation protecting bats in the UK. Legislation protects all wild birds whilst they are breeding, and prohibits the killing, injuring or taking of any wild bird or their nests and eggs. Certain species of bird, including the barn owl, are subject to special provisions; it is an offence to disturb any bird or their young during the breeding season.

4.2 Evaluation

Taking the desk-based assessment and site survey results into account, the following value for roosting bats has been placed on The Site.

Table 3: Evaluation Summary for presence of bats

Survey assessment conclusions	There is suitable bat foraging habitat in the proximity of this building and bat roosts present in the area. However, the nature and condition of this building shows that it has a negligible likelihood of supporting roosting bats.
Foreseen impacts	There is a negligible risk that bats could be injured or killed during the demolition process.
Recommendations	No Further Surveys. However, if bats are found during any stage of the development, work should stop immediately and a suitably qualified ecologist should be contacted to seek further advice.
Enhancements <i>The Local Planning Authority has a duty to ask for enhancements under the NPPF and circular 06/2005: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. Para.99</i>	<p>The installation of a minimum of 1 bat box on the building when finished will provide additional roosting habitat for bats e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1FF Schwegler Bat Box • Greenwoods Ecohabitats • https://www.greenwoodsecohabitats.co.uk/bats • Kent Bat Box (timber). <p>Cavity bat boxes are also a good option in new construction available from: https://www.nhbs.com/ib-vl-05-vivara-pro-build-in-woodstone-batbox?bkfno=252213</p> <p>Bat boxes should be positioned 3-5m above ground level facing in a south/south-westerly direction with a clear flight path to and from the entrance.</p>

Table 4: Evaluation Summary for presence of breeding birds


Survey assessment conclusions	The site includes suitable habitat for nesting birds.
Foreseen impacts	<p>Active nests could be destroyed during vegetation removal.</p> <p>Any works which affect The Site could have an impact on nesting birds.</p>
Recommendations	Any building/tree and scrub removal should be undertaken outside the period 1st March to 31st August. If this timeframe cannot be avoided, a close inspection of the building and scrub to be removed should be undertaken by

	a suitably qualified ecologist, immediately prior to clearance. All active nests will need to be retained until the young have fledged.
Enhancements <i>The Local Planning Authority has a duty to ask for enhancements under the NPPF and circular 06/2005: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. Para.99</i>	<p>Install a minimum of two bird boxes on retained trees/buildings on site e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WoodStone® range of nest cups, placed under the eaves • Schwegler 1SP Sparrow Terrace • Schwegler 1B nest boxes • Schwegler 2H Robin Boxes <p>Nest boxes should be positioned approximately 3m above ground level where they will be sheltered from prevailing wind, rain and strong sunlight. House martin boxes should be placed under the eaves with clear entrance/exit paths.</p>

5.0 Bibliography

- Bat Conservation Trust: <http://www.bats.org.uk/>
- British Trust for Ornithology (2016) www.bto.org/about-birds/nbw/putting-up-a-nest-box
- Collins, J. (ed.) (2016). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists —Good Practice Guidelines, 3rd edition, Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- Garland & Markham (2008) Is important bat foraging and commuting habitat legally protected?
- Google Earth Pro (2020)
- Magic database (2019) <http://www.magic.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>
- Mitchell-Jones, A.J. (2004). Bat Mitigation Guidelines. English Nature, Peterborough.

Appendix 1: Survey Plan




Appendix 2: Proposed Site Plan

Not supplied

Appendix 3: Desk Study Information

MAGiC

Priority Habitats and EPSML sites



Appendix 4: Legislation and Planning Policy related to bats

LEGAL PROTECTION

All species of bat are fully protected under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) through their inclusion on Schedule 2.

Regulation 41 prohibits:

- Deliberate killing, injuring or capturing of Schedule 2 species (e.g. all bats)
- Deliberate disturbance of bat species as:
 - a) to impair their ability:
 - (i) to survive, breed, or reproduce, or to rear or nurture young
 - (ii) to hibernate or migrate
 - b) to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species
- Damage or destruction of a breeding site or resting place

Bats are also protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) through their inclusion on Schedule 5. Under this Act, they are additionally protected from:

- Intentional or reckless disturbance (at any level)
- Intentional or reckless obstruction of access to any place of shelter or protection
- Selling, offering or exposing for sale, possession or transporting for purpose of sale

Effect on development works:

A European Protected Species Mitigation (EPSM) Licence issued by the relevant statutory authority (e.g. Natural England) will be required for works likely to affect a bat roost or for operations likely to result in a level of disturbance which might impair their ability to undertake those activities mentioned above (e.g. survive, breed, rear young and hibernate). The licence is to allow derogation from the relevant legislation but also to enable appropriate mitigation measures to be put in place and their efficiency/success to be monitored.

The legislation may also be interpreted such that, in certain circumstances, important foraging areas and/or commuting routes can be regarded as being afforded *de facto* protection, for example, where it can be proven that the continued usage of such areas is crucial to maintaining the integrity and long-term viability of a bat roost (Garland & Markham, 2008).

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY (ENGLAND)

National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework promotes sustainable development. The Framework specifies the need for protection of designated sites and priority habitats and species. An emphasis is also made on the need for ecological infrastructure through protection, restoration and re-creation. The protection and

recovery of priority species (considered likely to be those listed as UK Biodiversity Action Plan priority species) is also listed as a requirement of planning policy.

In determining a planning application, planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by ensuring that: designated sites are protected from harm; there is appropriate mitigation or compensation where significant harm cannot be avoided; opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments are encouraged; and planning permission is refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including aged or veteran trees and also ancient woodland.

The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and the Biodiversity Duty

Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act, 2006, requires all public bodies to have regard to biodiversity conservation when carrying out their functions. This is commonly referred to as the 'biodiversity duty'.

Section 41 of the Act (Section 42 in Wales) requires the Secretary of State to publish a list of habitats and species which are of 'principal importance for the conservation of biodiversity.' This list is intended to assist decision makers such as public bodies in implementing their duty under Section 40 of the Act. Under the Act these habitats and species are regarded as a material consideration in determining planning applications. A developer must show that their protection has been adequately addressed within a development proposal.