**Parsonage Farm, Church Street, Ribchester PR3 3ZR**

# LICENSED BAT SURVEY AND ECOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT AND BAT MITIGATION STRATEGY

**July 2025**

**ERAP (Consultant Ecologists) Ltd Reference: 2023-250c**

ERAP (Consultant Ecologists) Ltd
Building N2
Chorley Business and Technology Centre
East Terrace
Euxton Lane
Euxton
Chorley
PR7 6TE

Tel: 01772 750502

mail@erap.co.uk
www.erap.co.uk

## CONTENTS



## List of Tables

## List of Figures



## Document Control

| **Survey Type:** | **Surveyors[1]** | **Survey Date(s)** |
|---|---|---|
| Daylight licensed bat survey and ecological assessment | Victoria Burrows B.Sc. (Hons) M.Sc. CEnv MCIEEM Principal Ecologist | 2nd October 2023 |
| Updated daytime Bat Walkover Survey | Victoria Burrows | 3rd June 2025 |
| Bat activity surveys | | 7th May 2024<br>6th June 2024<br>3rd June 2025 |
| **Reporting** | **Personnel** | **Date** |
| **Author** | Victoria Burrows B.Sc. (Hons) M.Sc. CEnv MCIEEM Principal Ecologist | 13th November 2023<br>Updated 16th July 2025 |
| **Signature(s)** | [redacted] | |
| **Checked** | Oscar Caunce BSc (Hons) | 17th July 2025 |
| **Revised and issued** | Victoria Burrows | 17th July 2025 |
| **Report issued to** | Mr. and Mrs. Gray / Sunderland Peacock Architects | |
| **Version Number** | 1 | |

[1] *Licence reference numbers*

**Bats**

Victoria Burrows, Natural England Class Survey Licence (bats, Level 2) Registration Number 2015-10390-CLS-CLS

**Barn owl**

Victoria Burrows Natural England Class Survey Licence Registration Number CL29/00061

## SUMMARY


### Introduction and Scope

i. ERAP (Consultant Ecologists) Ltd was commissioned to carry out a licensed bat survey and ecological assessment of the farmhouse and garage at Parsonage Farm, Church Street, Ribchester PR3 3ZR. The assessment was required to inform a planning application proposing the demolition and rebuild of the farmhouse.

ii. This report presents the results of a desktop study and data search, a daylight licensed bat survey and assessment, and a general ecological assessment carried out in October 2023. The surveys were updated and supplemented by bat activity surveys carried out in May and June 2024 and June 2025. The surveys were carried out by a licensed, qualified and experienced ecologist and assistants and are in accordance with standard recognised survey guidelines.

### Results of Survey and Assessment and Recommendations

iii. The site comprises the farmhouse and a detached garage bordered by hardstanding. To the south and east of the farmhouse is a garden of mown amenity grassland with shrub and flower beds bordered by low stone walls and brick elevation walls.

iv. The site and adjacent land have no statutory or non-statutory designation for nature conservation. Adverse direct and indirect effects of the proposals on designated sites for nature conservation are reasonably discounted.

v. No irreplaceable habitats or Priority Habitats are present at the site or will be impacted by the proposals. The garden area supports Wall Cotoneaster (*Cotoneaster horizontalis*), Virginia Creeper (*Parthenocissus quinquefolia*) and Montbretia (*Crocosmia crocosmiiflora*), all of which are invasive plant species listed on Schedule 9 of the *Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981* (as amended). It is an offence to spread or to cause the spread of these species in the wild; further guidance in relation to the proposals is provided in **Section 4.4**.

vi. The following roosts have been detected at the farmhouse:

- Roost 1: Soprano pipistrelle day roost (maximum 4 bats) at the eaves of the north-eastern elevation of the farmhouse; and
- Roost 2: Common pipistrelle day roost located across at least two positions beneath the ridge copings (detected by the presence of droppings only).

vii. The detached garage is assessed to be of low suitability for use by roosting bats. No evidence of use of the garage by roosting bats was detected; the garage will be retained by the proposals.

viii. In the absence of mitigation, the demolition of the farmhouse will disturb bats and destroy the detected roosts. In accordance with current Natural England guidelines this is a 'low' scale of impact.

ix. Owing to the relevant wildlife legislation and the protection afforded to bats and their roosts works at the farmhouse must only be carried out under a relevant Natural England European Protected Species Mitigation licence. **Section 5.3** of this report presents a Bat Mitigation Strategy. The strategy details the measures to be applied to ensure bats are protected during the proposed works and also to ensure there is no net loss of roosting opportunity at the site in the long-term as a consequence of the proposed development.

x. Three species of bat namely common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle and noctule were recorded flying in the survey area over the survey periods. Subject to the avoidance of lighting and / or implementation of an appropriate lighting strategy (refer to **Section 5.2**) there is minimal risk of an increase in disturbance to foraging / commuting bats at the site.

xi. The farmhouse is used by nesting birds; mandatory actions and best practice guidance to be adhered to in relation to nesting birds is outlined at **Section 5.4**.

xii. Due to the presence of habitats that are suitable for use by hedgehog (a Priority Species), guidance in relation to reasonable avoidance measures to be applied for the protection of fauna during construction and their conservation at the site in the long-term is provided in **Section 5.4**.

xiii. Appropriate and proportionate survey effort and / or assessment, in accordance with standard survey guidelines has been applied to discount adverse effects on other relevant protected species. No further surveys for other protected species are necessary to inform a planning application.

**Conclusion**

xiv. This report has demonstrated that the redevelopment of the site is feasible and acceptable in accordance with ecological considerations and relevant planning policy.

xv. The comprehensive bat mitigation strategy outlined in **Section 5.3** demonstrates that mitigation for roosting bats and conservation of roosting and foraging opportunities at the site in the long-term is entirely feasible. The 'three tests' of *The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017* (as amended) can be met. An appropriate Natural England European Protected Species Mitigation licence will be required to facilitate the works and can be applied for once planning permission is obtained.

xvi. In the presence of mandatory actions and best practice measures described in **Section 5.0** the risk of a significant impact on protected species is reasonably discounted. Appropriate and proportionate mitigation and enhancement measures to maximise the benefits for biodiversity as part of the proposals and to secure compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework are outlined in **Section 5.0**.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background and Rationale

1.1.1 ERAP (Consultant Ecologists) Ltd was commissioned to carry out a licensed bat survey and ecological assessment of the farmhouse and garage at Parsonage Farm, Church Street, Ribchester PR3 3ZR (hereafter referred to as the 'site'). The Ordnance Survey (OS) grid reference at the centre of the site is SD 64284 35086. An aerial image of the site and its surrounding habitats is appended at **Figure 1** (source image: ESRI World Imagery).

1.1.2 The assessment was required to inform a planning application proposing the demolition and rebuild of the farmhouse.

### 1.2 Scope of Works

1.2.1 The scope of ecological works undertaken between October 2023, May and June 2024 and June 2025 comprised:

a. A desktop study and data search for known ecological information at the site and the local area;

b. A licensed daylight bat survey of the farmhouse and garage and an assessment of their suitability to support roosting bat species at any time of year followed by the relevant scope of bat activity survey;

c. Survey and assessment of the habitats for use by nesting birds including species listed on Schedule 1 of the *Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981* (as amended) and Priority Species;

d. Survey and assessment of all habitats for other relevant statutorily protected species[1] and other wildlife including badger (*Meles meles*) and great crested newt (*Triturus cristatus*);

e. Provision of guidance in accordance with wildlife legislation, *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines* (4th Edition) (Collins, J. (ed), 2023) and best practice in relation to the proposed works;

f. The identification of any further surveys or precautionary actions that may be required to inform the commencement of works; and

g. Identification of any potential ecological constraints on the proposals and the specification of the scope of mitigation and ecological enhancement required in accordance with wildlife legislation, planning policy guidance and other relevant guidance.

## 2.0 METHOD OF SURVEY

### 2.1 Desktop Study and Data Search

2.1.1 The following sources of information and ecological records were consulted:

[1] In accordance with *Government Circular: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation – Statutory Obligations and Their Impact on the Planning System* (Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, 2005) developers should not be required to undertake surveys for protected species unless there is reasonable likelihood of the species being present and affected by the development. In this instance (for example) there are no water bodies or water courses within or adjacent to the site; there has been no requirement to consider water vole (*Arvicola amphibius*) or otter (*Lutra lutra*) as part of this assessment.

a. MAGiC Maps: A web-based interactive map which brings together geographic information on key environmental schemes and designations, including details of statutory nature conservation sites;

b. Ancient Tree Inventory (Woodland Trust, 2025): An online database of ancient and veteran trees;

c. Lancashire Environment Record Network (LERN); and

d. Lancashire Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP).

## 2.2 Survey Area

2.2.1 The proposed works will affect the farmhouse and its immediate surroundings only. The planning application proposes the demolition and rebuild of the farmhouse. The survey area therefore focussed on the farmhouse, although the detached garage (as shown on **Figures 1** and **2**) was examined for completeness.

## 2.3 Daylight Licensed Bat Survey and Assessment

### Surveyor and Survey Dates

2.3.1 The initial daylight licensed bat survey and assessment was carried out by Victoria Burrows, Natural England Class Survey Licence WML CL18 (Bat Survey Level 2), Registration Number 2015-10390-CLS-CLS, on 2nd October 2023. The weather conditions were overcast and dry with a light air (Beaufort scale 1) and an air temperature of 15ºC. Victoria's qualifications and experience meet the criteria as defined in the *Technical Guidance Series Competencies for Species Survey: Bats* (CIEEM, 2013).

2.3.2 An updated daylight survey and general walkover ecological assessment was carried out on 3rd June 2025 by Victoria Burrows. The weather conditions were dry and cloudy with a light air (Beaufort scale 1) and an air temperature of 11ºC.

### Survey Guidelines

2.3.3 The survey was carried out in accordance with standard methodology including the *Bat Mitigation Guidelines* (Mitchell-Jones, 2004), the *Bat Workers' Manual 3rd Edition* (Mitchell-Jones & Mcleish, 2004) and *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edn)* (Collins, J. (ed), 2023).

### Habitat Assessment for Commuting / Foraging Bats

2.3.4 Habitats within and adjacent to the site were assessed for their value and suitability for commuting and foraging bats in accordance with Table 4.1 of *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edn)* (Collins, J. (ed), 2023). Reference has been made to the categories, descriptions and examples presented in **Table 2.1**

**Table 2.1: Consideration of Suitability of Foraging and Commuting Habitat for Bats**

| Suitability | Potential Flight Paths and Foraging Habitats |
|---|---|
| None | No habitat features on site likely to be used by any commuting or foraging bats at any time of the year (i.e. no habitats that provide continuous lines of shade / protection for flight-lines, or generate/shelter insect populations available to foraging bats). |
| Negligible [a] | No obvious habitat features on site likely to be used as flight-paths or by foraging bats; however, a small element of uncertainty remains in order to account for non-standard bat behaviour. |
| Low | Habitat that could be used by small numbers of bats as flight-paths such as a gappy hedgerow or unvegetated stream, but isolated, i.e. not very well connected to the surrounding landscape by other habitat. |

| Suitability | Potential Flight Paths and Foraging Habitats |
|---|---|
| | Suitable, but isolated habitat that could be used by small numbers of foraging bats such as a lone tree (not in a parkland situation) or a patch of scrub. |
| Moderate | Continuous habitat connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for flight-paths such as lines of trees and scrub or linked back gardens.<br>Habitat that is connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for foraging such as trees, scrub, grassland or water. |
| High | Continuous, high-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by bats for flight-paths such as river valleys, streams, hedgerows, lines of trees and woodland edge.<br>High-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by foraging bats such as broadleaved woodland, tree-lined watercourses and grazed parkland.<br>Site is close to and connected to known roosts. |
| [a] Negligible is defined as 'so small or unimportant as to be not worth considering, insignificant'. This category may be used where there are places that a bat could roost or forage (due to one attribute) but it is unlikely that they actually would (due to another attribute). | |

**Daylight Survey: Buildings**

2.3.5 An inspection and assessment of the external surfaces, walls and roofs of the buildings was carried out to find potential bat roosting habitat or accesses into crevices / internal areas where roosts may be present. Searches for evidence of bat presence in the form of droppings, urine stains, feeding signs, grease marks and other evidence were also carried out.

2.3.6 The internal survey involved an examination of the accessible internal areas (including the roof voids) to find roosting bats or evidence of previous use of the buildings by bats such as droppings and prey remains.

2.3.7 The suitability of each building has been assessed in accordance with Table 4.1 of *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edn)* (Collins, J. (ed), 2023), taking into account any presence of gaps suitable for access by bats, features suitable for use by roosting bats within the building (including crevice dwelling species and species which can roost in the open in roof voids), and the suitability of the surrounding habitats for use by foraging and commuting bats. The suitability of each building has been informed by the following categories as presented in **Table 2.2**.

**Table 2.2: Suitability Categories for Roosting Habitats in Buildings**

| Suitability | Description |
|---|---|
| None | No habitat features on site likely to be used by any roosting bats at any time of the year (i.e. a complete absence of crevices / suitable shelter at all ground / underground levels). |
| Negligible[a] | No obvious habitat features on site likely to be used by roosting bats; however, a small element of uncertainty remains as bats can use small and apparently unsuitable features on occasion. |
| Low | A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by individual bats opportunistically at any time of the year. However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions[b] and / or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by larger numbers of bats (i.e. unlikely to be suitable for maternity and not a classic cool/stable hibernation site, but could be used by individual hibernating bats[c]). |
| Moderate | A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions[b] and surrounding habitat but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status (with respect to roost type only, such as maternity and hibernation – the categorisation described in this table is made irrespective of species conservation status, which is established after presence is confirmed). |
| High | A structure with one or more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis and potentially for longer periods of time due to their |

| Suitability | Description |
|---|---|
| | size, shelter, protection, conditions[b] and surrounding habitat. These structures have the potential to support high conservation status roosts, e.g. maternity or classic cool / stable hibernation site. |

[a]Negligible is defined as 'so small or unimportant as to be not worth considering, insignificant'. This category may be used where there are places that a bat could roost or forage (due to one attribute) but it is unlikely that they actually would (due to another attribute).
[b]For example, in terms of temperature, humidity, height above ground level, light levels or levels of disturbance.
[c]Evidence from the Netherlands shows mass swarming events of common pipistrelle bats in the autumn followed by mass hibernation in a diverse range of building types in urban environments (Korsten *et al*., 2016 and Jansen *et al*., 2022). Common pipistrelle swarming has been observed in the UK (Bell, 2022 and Tomlinson, 2020) and winter hibernation of numbers of this species has been detected at Seaton Delaval Hall in Northumberland (National Trust, 2018). This phenomenon requires some research in the UK, but ecologists should be aware of the potential for larger numbers of this species to be present during the autumn and winter in prominent buildings in the landscape, urban or otherwise.

**Daylight Survey: Trees and Shrubs**

2.3.8 No trees or shrubs will be affected by the works.

**Equipment**

2.3.9 A list of equipment used is provided below.

**Table 2.3: Survey Equipment Used / Available for Use During Daylight Bat Survey**

| |
|---|
| Ladders |
| LED Lenser P14 torch |
| Canon Ixus digital camera |
| 8x20 binoculars |
| Ridgid Micro Inspection Camera Borescope CA-300 |

## 2.4 Presence / Absence Surveys: Dusk Emergence Bat Surveys

2.4.1 Three dusk emergence surveys, supplemented by night vision aids (NVAs), were conducted at the farmhouse in May and June 2024 and June 2025. All surveys were conducted under suitable conditions.

2.4.2 The dusk emergence surveys commenced at least 15 minutes before sunset, and continued until at least 1.5 hours after sunset.

2.4.3 Surveyors, experienced in conducting bat surveys, were positioned at suitable locations to maximise the coverage of the building to determine any entry or emergence by roosting bats. Any bat emergence or re-entry activity was recorded, with brief notes relating to bat activity at each survey position collated at the end of the survey.

2.4.4 Heterodyne detectors were used to determine any bat detected to species or group (Myotis species, for example, often cannot be reliably identified to species from their echolocation calls). Recording bat detector units[2] were also used, and echolocation calls were analysed after the survey using Anabat Insight bat call analysis software.

2.4.5 Night vision aids (NVA)[3] comprising camcorders supplemented with additional infra-red lighting (comprising Nightfox XB5 torches and infra-red floodlights) and thermal imaging cameras were used at

[2] i.e. Anabat Scout.
[3] Canon XA60 camcorders, and Guide TK612 Gen 2 thermal imaging monocular

the surveyor positions presented in **Table 2.4**. Footage was subsequently reviewed using VLC Media Player to determine any emergence / re-entry at the building.

2.4.6 Surveyor positions and NVA locations are annotated on **Figure 2**. Photographs showing each survey position from the darkest point of the surveys are appended at **Photos 33** to **35**.

**Table 2.4: Dusk Emergence Survey Dates, Weather Conditions and Surveyors**

| Date | 7th May 2024 | 6th June 2024 | 3rd June 2025 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sunset time: | 20:53 | 21:36 | 21:32 |
| Start & end time | 20:38 until 22:30 | 21:20 until 23:07 | 21:15 until 23:15 |
| Weather | 15°C throughout<br>Dry and calm<br>(Beaufort scale 0) | 12°C at 21:30 falling to 11°C at 23:00<br>Dry, calm (Beaufort scale 0) and overcast | 11°C throughout<br>Dry and cloudy with a light air (Beaufort scale 1) |
| **Survey Position** | **Surveyor, Detector and NVA** | **Surveyor, Detector and NVA** | **Surveyor, Detector and NVA** |
| 1 | Victoria Burrows<br>Anabat Scout and Canon XA60 | Victoria Burrows<br>Anabat Scout and Canon XA60 | Victoria Burrows<br>Anabat Scout and Guide TK612 Gen 2 thermal imaging monocular |
| 2 | Stuart Laverick<br>Anabat Scout and Canon XA60 | Catie Haworth<br>Anabat Scout and Canon XA60 | Ian Nelson<br>Anabat Scout and Canon XA60 |
| 3 | Leah Hart<br>Anabat Scout and Canon XA60 | Ian Nelson<br>Anabat Scout and Canon XA60 | Ciaran Rowett<br>Anabat Scout and Guide TK612 Gen 2 thermal imaging monocular |
| (NVA) 4 | Canon XA60 | - | - |

**Bird Species**

2.4.7 Bird species observed and heard during the surveys were recorded.

2.4.8 The farmhouse and garage were searched for pellets, faecal splashes and feathers which may indicate use by roosting or nesting barn owl. The survey was carried out in accordance with methods described in *The Barn Owl Conservation Handbook* (Barn Owl Trust, 2012) and *Barn Owl Tyto alba Survey Methodology and Techniques for use in Ecological Assessment. Developing Best Practice in Survey and Reporting* (Shawyer, 2011).

2.4.9 The farmhouse and garage were searched for evidence of the current and previous use by other nesting / roosting birds including species typically associated with buildings such as house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*), house martin (*Delichon urbicum*), swallow (*Hirundo rustica*) and swift (*Apus apus*).

## 2.5 Other Relevant Protected Species and Animal Life

2.5.1 For completeness, a survey and assessment of the garden habitats bordering the farmhouse for the following species was carried out.

**Badger**

2.5.2 The survey area for badger covered the land immediately bordering the farmhouse and the wider garden curtilage (as annotated on **Figure 1**).

2.5.3 The survey was conducted in accordance with guidance presented within *Badgers and Development* (Natural England, 2007) and *Badgers: advice for making planning decisions* (Natural England, 2022).

2.5.4 The following signs of badger activity were searched for:

a. Sett entrances, e.g. entrances that are normally 25 to 35cm in diameter and shaped like a 'D' on its side;

b. Large spoil heaps outside sett entrances;

c. Bedding outside sett entrances;

d. Badger footprints;

e. Badger paths;

f. Latrines;

g. Badger hairs on fences or bushes;

h. Scratching posts; and

i. Signs of digging for food.

**Great Crested Newt and Amphibians**

2.5.5 There are no ponds within the garden curtilage of the farmhouse.

2.5.6 In accordance with *Great crested newts: advice for making planning decisions* (Natural England, 2022) all ponds within an unobstructed 500 metres of a site should be considered for their suitability to support breeding great crested newts. For small scale proposals with a footprint of less than 5 hectares[4], such as this, it is generally considered (subject to each site's individual assessment) that development activities over 250 metres from a pond are highly unlikely any offence would be committed should the development proceed.

2.5.7 The search of habitats in the wider area up to a distance of 250 metres from the site boundary revealed the presence of two ponds, as detailed below.

**Table 2.5: Ponds within 250 metres of the Site**

| Pond Reference | OS Grid Reference | Distance from Site Boundary | Location (refer to Figure 1) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | SD 6410 3515 | 169 metres | Within land to the north-west of the site |
| 2 | SD 6407 3499 | 199 metres | West of the site |

***Consideration of Requirement for Further Survey***

2.5.8 The requirement for further survey at each pond was then assessed using the following criteria:

a. Presence of dispersal barriers to great crested newt movements between ponds and the site, as detected during the walkover survey;

b. The suitability of the terrestrial habitats at the site for use by sheltering / feeding / hibernating amphibians; and

[4] As confirmed by the Natural England Rapid Risk Assessment tool from *GCN Method Statement WML-A14-2 (Version April 2020* (Natural England, 2020)

c. Distance of ponds from the site, and the potential influence of the proposed development of the site on any populations of great crested newt (if present at ponds), using the Natural England rapid risk assessment tool.

2.5.9 There are no significant dispersal barriers between Ponds 1 and 2 and the site. To inform the requirement for further surveys, the Natural England Rapid Risk Assessment tool from *GCN Method Statement WML-A14-2 (Version April 2020)* (Natural England, 2020) has been completed and is presented in **Table 2.6**. The tool has been completed based on the distances of the ponds from the site, and the size of the proposed working area (0.3 hectares, or 'ha'). The rapid risk assessment tool assumes that great crested newt are present.

**Table 2.6: Rapid Risk Assessment Result**

| Component | Likely Effect | Notional Offence Probability Score |
|---|---|---|
| Great crested newt breeding pond(s) | No effect | 0 |
| Land within 100m of any breeding pond(s) | No effect | 0 |
| Land 100-250m from any breeding pond(s) | 0.1 - 0.5 ha lost or damaged | 0.1 |
| Land >250m from any breeding pond(s) | 0.1 - 0.5 ha lost or damaged | 0.005 |
| Individual great crested newts | No effect | 0 |
| | Maximum: | 0.01 |
| Rapid risk assessment result: | **GREEN: OFFENCE HIGHLY UNLIKELY** | |

2.5.10 The Natural England Rapid Risk Assessment indicates that the development activities are sufficiently small and distant from Ponds 1 and 2 that it is highly unlikely any offence would be committed should the development proceed. In addition, the habitats to be affected by the proposals comprise the hard-standing around the curtilage of the farmhouse only. The requirement for a great crested newt survey to inform this planning application is reasonably discounted.

**Other Wildlife**

2.5.11 Evidence of other wildlife, including Priority Species, observed whilst on site, but for which specific surveys were not made, was recorded and has been included in this report where it is considered of relevance to the planning application.

2.5.12 Habitats have been assessed for their suitability for Priority Species identified in the data search results where this is considered relevant to the application.

## 2.6 Survey and Reporting Limitations

2.6.1 The initial survey was carried out in October when maternity roosts have typically dispersed and the weather may have washed away droppings left over the summer around the external elevations / perimeter of a building. This limitation has been addressed by the site visits and surveys carried out in May and June 2024 and June 2025.

2.6.2 No other survey limitations on the intended and scope of survey outlined in **Section 1.2** were experienced.

2.6.3 All measurements within this report are approximate only, and have been estimated whilst on site or calculated using mapping software (QGIS) or internet-based mapping services such as MAGiC Maps and Google Earth.

## 2.7 Evaluation Methods

2.7.1 The habitats, vegetation and animal life were evaluated with reference to standard nature conservation criteria as described in *A Nature Conservation Review* (Ratcliffe, 1977). These are size (extent), diversity, naturalness, rarity, fragility, typicality, recorded history, position in an ecological or geographical unit, potential value and intrinsic appeal.

2.7.2 Habitats have been assessed to determine whether they meet those described in *UK Biodiversity Action Plan: Priority* Habitat *Descriptions* (Maddock, A (ed), 2008); these lists are used to help draw up the statutory lists of Priority Habitats, as required under Section 41 of the *Natural Environment and Rural Communities* (NERC) *Act 2006*. Where suitable, the ecological value of the habitats present has been assessed using the terms outlined in *Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine* (CIEEM, 2018). Each habitat and individual trees have been assessed to determine whether they are 'irreplaceable habitat', defined in *National Planning Policy Framework* (Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, 2024)[5] as '*Habitats which would be technically very difficult (or take a very significant time) to restore, recreate or replace once destroyed, taking into account their age, uniqueness, species diversity or rarity. They include ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees, blanket bog, limestone pavement, sand dunes, salt marsh and lowland fen'*. The further detail presented in *The Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024* (GOV.UK, 2024) has also been referred to.

2.7.3 Government advice on wildlife, as set out in the NPPF and associated government circulars has been taken into consideration. Legislation relating to protected species, such as those listed under Schedules 1, 5, 6 and 8 of the *Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981* (as amended) and *The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019*, is referenced where applicable, and any impacts to protected species are evaluated in accordance with current guidance.

2.7.4 The presence of any Priority Species, as listed under Section 41 of the *Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006* is noted, and habitats are assessed in terms of their suitability and value for these species. The presence of habitats and / or species listed by the Lancashire BAP has been taken into account in the evaluation of the site.

# 3.0 SURVEY RESULTS

## 3.1 Desktop Study and Data Search

### Statutory Designated Sites for Nature Conservation and SSSI Impact Risk Zones

3.1.1 The site lies within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) Impact Risk Zone for Red Scar Tun Brook Woods SSSI and Darwen Riven Section SSSI located 5.2 kilometres to the south-west of the site. The woodland is designated for being one of the largest areas of deciduous woodland in Lancashire, and for providing a valuable refuge for wildlife close to urban areas of Preston. Darwen Riven Section SSSI is located 6.1 kilometres to the south-west of the site and is designated for its geological interest; it provides one of the finest sections in Britain of Middle Namurian rocks of Carboniferous age.

3.1.2 The SSSI Impact Risk Zone requires the Local Planning Authority to consult with Natural England on likely risks from the following development category (Natural England, 2025):

[5]Hereafter the NPPF

- Any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 20m³/day to ground (i.e. to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream.

3.1.3 It is considered that the small scale proposals do not meet this development category. The presence of the SSSI present in the wider area is considered further in **Section 4.2**.

**Non-statutory Designated Sites for Nature Conservation**

3.1.4 The site is not and does not form part of any non-statutory designated site for nature conservation, called 'Biological Heritage Sites' or 'BHS' in Lancashire.

3.1.5 Fifteen BHS are located within a 2 kilometres radius from the centre of the site, and are summarised in **Table 3.1**.

**Table 3.1: BHS Within a 2 Kilometres Radius from the Centre of the Site**

| BHS Name | Distance and Direction from the Site | Reasons for Designation |
|---|---|---|
| River Ribble from London Road Bridge Preston, in West, to County Boundary, in East | 0.49 kilometres north-east | River Ribble and associated semi-natural habitats from the county boundary at Paythorne (SD856836) downstream to London Road Bridge, Walton-le-Dale, Preston (SD553287). The Ribble is one of the largest rivers in North West England and support a rich assemblage of plants and animals. The river is important for salmon, sea trout, otter and water vole. Along the riverbanks sandy cliffs provide nesting habitat for sand martin and kingfisher. |
| Red Bank Grassland | 0.71 kilometres west | An area of species rich grassland situated on steep south facing ground above the north bank of the River Ribble. A number of butterflies have been recorded on the site including orange tip, common blue and small heath. |
| Old Park Wood | 0.78 kilometres south-east | A large area of semi-natural woodland adjoining the south bank of the River Ribble approximately 1.5 km south of Ribchester. It includes Old Park Wood and Mire Wood. A British Red Data Book (category 1, endangered) cranefly, *Lipsothrix nigristigma*, occurs here. |
| Slaterfield Wood | 0.79 kilometres south | An ancient, semi-natural clough woodland situated on the south side of the valley of the River Ribble between Ribchester and Osbaldeston Green figwort (*Scrophularia umbrosa*), a species listed in the Provisional Lancashire Red Data List of Vascular Plants, also occurs here. |
| Flashers Wood and Long Dingle | 0.82 kilometres south | Semi-natural woodland on the valley slopes above the River Ribble flood plain. It supports a UK BAP Species of invertebrate *Lipsothrix nigristigma* Scarce Yellow Splinter. |
| Eatoughs Wood | 0.87 kilometres north-west | Semi-natural woodland. |
| Buckley Wood and Dale Hey Wood | 1.14 kilometres north | Semi-natural woodland adjoining both sides of Boyce's Brook. |
| Hothersall Wood | 1.19 kilometres west | Semi-natural woodland. |

| BHS Name | Distance and Direction from the Site | Reasons for Designation |
|---|---|---|
| Broken Brows Pastures and Woodland and Madgell Bank | 1.32 kilometres east | Three parcels of semi-natural grassland, woodland and wood pasture on the south bank of the River Ribble, approximately 1km south east of Ribchester. |
| Dobridding Wood (North) | 1.43 kilometres south-west | Semi-natural woodland. |
| Leece's Wood | 1.5 kilometres west | Semi-natural woodland. |
| Little Stydd Wood | 1.56 kilometres north-east | Semi-natural woodland adjoining Duddle Brook. |
| Dobridding Wood (South) | 1.66 kilometres south-west | Semi-natural woodland. |
| Mercyfield Wood, Sandiford Wood and Green Rid Wood | 1.72 kilometres south-west | Semi-natural woodland situated to the south of the River Ribble that supports a UK BAP Species of invertebrate *Lipsothrix nigristigma* Scarce Yellow Splinter. |
| Stydd Wood | 1.75 kilometres north-east | Semi-natural woodland on either side of Stydd Brook. |

3.1.6 The presence of the BHS is considered further at **Section 4.2**.

**Local Nature Recovery Strategy**

3.1.7 The site has no designation on the Lancashire Local Nature Recovery Strategy.

**Priority Habitats Inventory**

3.1.8 The Priority Habitats Inventory[6] was checked via MAGiC Maps. No Priority Habitats are identified within or immediately adjacent to the site.

**Protected and Notable Species**

3.1.9 LERN hold no records of protected and notable species for the site. Reported records of protected and notable species for a 2 kilometres radius from the centre of the site are summarised in **Table 3.2**.

**Table 3.2: Records of Protected Species Within a 2 Kilometres Radius from the Centre of the Site**

| Taxon Group | Species Name and Designations[1] and Notes |
|---|---|
| **Amphibians** | Common frog (*Rana temporaria*): WCAs5 (sale only) & LBAP. 4 records, dated between 1970 and 2014. The closest record is 525 metres to the north-east, and from 2014. |
| | Great crested newt (*Triturus cristatus*): EPS, WCAs5, PS & LBAP. 1 record from 2018, located 1320 metres to the south-west. |
| | Palmate newt (*Lissotriton helveticus*): WCAs5 (sale only). 2 records, both from 1833. An accurate estimation of distance and direction of the record to the site cannot be made due to the locational data being less than a six figure grid reference. |
| **Birds – WCAs1** | Barn owl (*Tyto alba*): WCAs1. 2 records, dated 1999 and 2013. An accurate estimation of distance and direction of the record to the site cannot be made due to the locational data being less than a six figure grid reference. |
| | Kingfisher (*Alcedo atthis*): WCAs1 1 record from 1999. An accurate estimation of distance of the record to the site cannot be made due to the locational data being less than a six figure grid reference. |
| | Peregrine (*Falco peregrinus*): WCAs1 & LBAP. 2 records, both from 2019. An accurate estimation of distance and direction of the record to the site cannot be made due to the locational data being less than a six figure grid reference. |

[6] A spatial dataset that describes the geographic extent and location of Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) Section 41 habitats of principal importance.

| Taxon Group | Species Name and Designations[1] and Notes |
|---|---|
| **Birds – PS and LBAP** | **PS & LBAP:**<br>Cuckoo (*Cuculus canorus*), lesser spotted woodpecker (*Dendrocopos minor*), curlew (*Numenius arquata*), house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*), tree sparrow (*Passer montanus*), grey partridge (*Perdix perdix*), willow tit (*Poecile montana*), dunnock (*Prunella modularis*), bullfinch *(Pyrrhula pyrrhula*), starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*), song thrush (*Turdus philomelos*) and lapwing (*Vanellus vanellus*).<br>**PS Only:**<br>Linnet (*Linaria cannabina*).<br>**LBAP Only:**<br>Common sandpiper (*Actitis hypoleucos*), grey heron (*Ardea cinerea*), black-headed gull (*Chroicocephalus ridibundus*), kestrel (*Falco tinnunculus*), oystercatcher (*Haematopus ostralegus*), willow warbler (*Phylloscopus trochilus*) and redshank (*Tringa totanus*). |
| **Bony Fish** | Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*): PS & LBAP. 3 records, dated between 1967 and 2011. The closest record is 605 metres to the south, and from 2000. |
| | Brown trout (*Salmo trutta* subsp*. fario*): LBAP. 5 records, dated between 1967 and 2000. The closest record is 415 metres to the north-west, and from 1998. |
| | Brown/sea trout (*Salmo trutta*): PS & LBAP. 24 records, dated between 1998 and 2014. The closest record is 415 metres to the north-west, and from 1998. |
| | Bullhead (*Cottus gobio*): LBAP. 25 records, dated between 1963 and 2014. The closest record is 415 metres to the north-west, and from 1998. |
| | European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*): PS & LBAP. 22 records, dated between 1965 and 2014. The closest record is 415 metres to the north-west, and from 1998. |
| | Grayling (*Thymallus thymallus*): LBAP. 2 records, dated 1967 and 1972. An accurate estimation of distance and direction of the record to the site cannot be made due to the locational data being less than a six figure grid reference. |
| | Sea trout (*Salmo trutta* subsp. *trutta*): LBAP. 4 records, dated between 1965 and 2000. The closest record is 605 metres to the south, and from 2000. |
| **Flowering Plants** | **PS & LBAP:**<br>Marsh Stitchwort (*Stellaria palustris*)<br>**LBAP Only:**<br>Narrow-leaved Water-plantain (*Alisma lanceolatum*), Barberry (*Berberis vulgaris*), Musk Thistle (*Carduus nutans*), Slender Tufted-sedge (*Carex acuta*), Lily-of-the-valley (*Convallaria majalis*), Opposite-leaved Pondweed (*Groenlandia densa*), Frogbit (*Hydrocharis morsus-ranae*), Henbane (*Hyoscyamus niger*), Common Broomrape (*Orobanche minor*), Tasteless Water-pepper (*Persicaria mitis*), Buckthorn (*Rhamnus cathartica*), Northern Dock (*Rumex longifolius*) and Globeflower (*Trollius europaeus*). |
| **Insects-Butterflies** | Small heath (*Coenonympha pamphilus*): PS & LBAP. 1 record from 2010, located 755 metres to the west. |

| Taxon Group | Species Name and Designations[1] and Notes |
|---|---|
| **Insects - Moths** | **PS & LBAP:**<br>Brown-spot pinion (*Agrochola litura*), garden tiger (*Arctia caja*), sprawler (*Asteroscopus sphinx*), double dart (*Graphiphora augur*) and hedge rustic (*Tholera cespitis*).<br>**PS Only:**<br>Beaded chestnut (*Agrochola lychnidis*), green-brindled crescent (*Allophyes oxyacanthae*), ear moth (*Amphipoea oculea*), mouse moth (*Amphipyra tragopoginis*), dusky brocade (*Apamea remissa*), centre-barred sallow (*Atethmia centrago*), mottled rustic (*Caradrina morpheus*), latticed heath (*Chiasmia clathrata*), small square-spot (*Diarsia rubi*), small phoenix (*Ecliptopera silaceata*), september thorn (*Ennomos erosaria*), dusky thorn (*Ennomos fuscantaria*), grey mountain carpet (*Entephria caesiata*), autumnal rustic (*Eugnorisma glareosa*), ghost moth (*Hepialus humuli*), rosy rustic (*Hydraecia micacea*), oblique carpet (*Orthonama vittata*), powdered quaker (*Orthosia gracilis*), white ermine (*Spilosoma lubricipeda*), anomalous (*Stilbia anomala*), feathered gothic (*Tholera decimalis*), cinnabar (*Tyria jacobaeae*), oak hook-tip (*Watsonalla binaria*) and dark-barred twin-spot carpet (*Xanthorhoe ferrugata*).<br>**LBAP Only:**<br>Gold spangle (*Autographa bractea*), dusky-lemon sallow (*Cirrhia gilvago*), plain pug (*Eupithecia simpliciata*), chimney sweeper (*Odezia atrata*), lead-coloured drab (*Orthosia populeti*), wood tiger (*Parasemia plantaginis*) and brown rustic (*Rusina ferruginea*). |
| **Insects – True flies** | Northern yellow splinter (*Lipsothrix errans*): PS. 1 record from 2003, located 1960 metres to the south-west. |
| **Jawless Fish** | Brook lamprey (*Lampetra planeri*): LBAP. 2 records, both from 2010. The closest record is 1465 metres to the north-east. |
| **Reptiles** | Adder (*Vipera berus*): WCAs5, PS & LBAP 1 record from 1967. An accurate estimation of distance of the record to the site cannot be made due to the locational data being less than a six figure grid reference. |
| | Grass snake (*Natrix helvetica*): WCAs5, PS & LBAP. 2 records, dated 1936 and 1967. An accurate estimation of distance and direction of the record to the site cannot be made due to the locational data being less than a six figure grid reference. |
| **Spiders** | *Halorates distinctus*: LBAP 1 record from 1958. An accurate estimation of distance of the record to the site cannot be made due to the locational data being less than a six figure grid reference. |
| | *Moebelia penicillata*: LBAP 1 record from 1958. An accurate estimation of distance of the record to the site cannot be made due to the locational data being less than a six figure grid reference. |
| **Terrestrial Mammals** | Bat species(Order *Chiroptera*): EPS, WCAs5 & LBAP. 3 records, dated between 1989 and 2018. The closest record is 1055 metres to the south-east, and from 2018. |
| | Brown hare (*Lepus europaeus*): PS & LBAP. 4 records, dated between 1972 and 2015. The closest record is to the east of the site; an accurate estimation of distance and direction of the record to the site cannot be made due to the locational data being less than a six figure grid reference. |
| | Brown long-eared bat (*Plecotus auritus*): EPS, WCAs5, PS & LBAP. 4 records, dated between 2008 and 2017. The closest record is 1830 metres to the south-east, and from 2017. |
| | Common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*): EPS, WCAs5 & LBAP. 17 records, dated between 1991 and 2019. The closest record is 865 metres to the east, and from 1991. |
| | Eurasian badger (*Meles meles*): PBA. 5 records, dated between 1964 and 2005. The closest record is to the east of the site. |
| | Eurasian red squirrel (*Sciurus vulgaris*): WCAs5, PS & LBAP. 5 records, dated between 1938 and 1970. The closest record is to the east of the site; an accurate estimation of distance and direction of the record to the site cannot be made due to the locational data being less than a six figure grid reference. |
| | European otter (*Lutra lutra*): EPS, WCAs5, PS & LBAP. 4 records, dated between 1953 and 2017. The closest record is 605 metres to the south, and from 1953. |

| Taxon Group | Species Name and Designations[1] and Notes |
|---|---|
| | Noctule bat (*Nyctalus noctula*): EPS, WCAs5, PS & LBAP. 3 records, all from 2018. The closest record is 1055 metres to the south-east. |
| | Unidentified Pipistrelle bat species (*Pipistrellus* sp.): EPS, WCAs5 & LBAP. 4 records, dated between 2015 and 2018. The closest record is 1055 metres to the south-east, and from 2018. |
| | Soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*): EPS, WCAs5, PS & LBAP. 2 records, dated 2017 and 2018. The closest record is 1055 metres to the south-east, and from 2018. |
| | Unidentified Myotis bat (*Myotis* sp.): EPS, WCAs5 & LBAP. 3 records, dated between 2014 and 2018. The closest record is 1055 metres to the south-east, and from 2018. |
| | West European hedgehog (*Erinaceus europaeus*): PS & LBAP. 3 records, dated between 2014 and 2020. The closest record is 455 metres to the east, and from 2020. |
| **[1]Key to Designation Codes:**<br>EPS = European Protected Species under *The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019*.<br>WCAs1 = Species receives full protection under Schedule 1 of the *Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981* (as amended).<br>WCAs5 = Species receives full protection under Schedule 5 of the *Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981* (as amended).<br>PBA = Protection of Badger Act 1992.<br>PS = Priority Species listed under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006.<br>LBAP = Species listed on the Lancashire Biodiversity Action Plan Provisional Long List. | |

3.1.10 The presence of these protected and notable species within the wider area has been taken into account throughout this report.

## 3.2 General Description / Vegetation and Habitats

3.2.1 Refer to **Figure 1**. Parsonage Farm is accessed via a long narrow lane leading from the west of Church Street in Ribchester. The site comprises the farmhouse and a detached garage bordered by hardstanding.

3.2.2 Land bordering the farmhouse comprises large fields of improved and semi-improved pasture bordered by sparse hedgerows with scattered trees. Approximately 550 metres to the south of the site is the River Ribble corridor and a tree-lined tributary of the Ribble meanders 142 metres to the east of the site.

3.2.3 To the south and east of the farmhouse is a garden of mown amenity grassland characterised by abundant Perennial Rye-grass (*Lolium perenne*) and frequent Creeping Buttercup (*Ranunculus repens*) and White Clover (*Trifolium repens*) and occasional Cuckooflower (*Cardamine pratensis*) with borders of non-native shrubs and ornamental plants. The garden is bordered by low stone walls and brick elevation walls.

3.2.4 Refer to **Photos 2** and **3.** The garden area supports Wall Cotoneaster (*Cotoneaster horizontalis*), Virginia Creeper (*Parthenocissus quinquefolia*) and Montbretia (*Crocosmia crocosmiiflora*), all of which are invasive plant species listed on Schedule 9 of the *Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981* (as amended). It is an offence to spread or to cause the spread of these species in the wild; further guidance in relation to the proposals is provided in **Section 4.4**.

3.2.5 The updated survey in June 2025 confirmed that the managed garden habitats are in a similar condition to that recorded in 2023 and 2024.

## 3.3 Daylight Licensed Bat Survey and Assessment

### Habitat Assessment for Commuting / Foraging Bats

3.3.1 The land within the site comprises buildings and hard-standing assessed to be of 'low' suitability for use by commuting and foraging bats.

3.3.2 The site lies within a rural area and is surrounded by a variety of grasslands with hedgerows and wooded copses with proximity to the River Ribble corridor and its tributaries. The habitats in the wider area surrounding the site are assessed to be of 'low' suitability for use by foraging and commuting bat species.

**Farmhouse**

3.3.3 Refer to **Photos 4** to **22** and **Photos 27** to **30**. The main farmhouse was built in 1888 and has since had alterations and extensions added. The farmhouse is a two-storey building with a single storey utility extension at its north-western corner and a PVC framed conservatory attached to the south-western elevation. The farmhouse has roughcast render covered walls with pitched slate covered roofs. Two chimney stacks are present with lead flashing at the base. Timber soffits and fascia are present around the roofline and the windows are PVC framed.

3.3.4 The farmhouse appears to be well-maintained and the roof is intact. Gaps / opportunities for bat access were detected in the following positions:

a. Behind the fascia boards, particularly behind the decorative fascia over the window lintels on the south-eastern elevation of the eastern extension area (refer to **Photo 12**);

b. At lifted sections of lead flashing at the base of the chimney stacks and also at the point where the single storey conservation meets the south-western elevation of the main house (refer to **Photo 11**); and

c. At sections of missing bedding mortar at the ridge copings, both on the main house and the single storey utility extension (refer to **Photo 8**).

3.3.5 Inspection of the exterior detected scattered bat droppings (approximately 10) on garden chairs positioned where the two storey extension meets the north-eastern elevation of the main house (refer to **Figure 2**).

3.3.6 The internal inspection confirmed an absence of a cellar. There is no roof void at the single storey utility extension; the room has a vaulted and board-leaved and plastered ceiling.

3.3.7 Two roof voids cover the two-storey section of the building; both were accessed and inspected in October 2023 and again in June 2025. The roof void over the main / older section of the farmhouse, at its western end, is split into two sections with a brick partition wall and a crawl-through between. The voids have no undertile felt and have fibreglass insulation over the floor. No bats were found in the western void in October 2023, however bat droppings were detected in the following locations:

a. Approximately 50 droppings were found scattered over the surface of a hot water tank in the roof void (refer to **Photo 18**); the location of these droppings coincides the location of the droppings found on the garden chairs outside. DNA analysis of a dropping sample (Sample 1) has confirmed the species is common pipistrelle (the results of the DNA analysis are presented at **Appendix 2**); and

b. Two piles of approximately 30 bat droppings were found beneath the ridgeboard (which is clear of cobwebs). DNA analysis of a dropping sample (Sample 2) has confirmed common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*).

3.3.8 The updated inspection of the roof void in June 2025 did not detect any bats; no additional accumulations of bat droppings were found.

3.3.9 Inspection of the 1.4 metres high roof void over the two-storey extension at the eastern end of the building confirmed a more modern fabrication which concrete blocks (rather than bricks) and the presence of bitumastic hessian backed felt under the slates and fibreglass insulation over the floor of the

void. No bats were found in the eastern void in October 2023, and droppings were found in the following location:

a. One pile of approximately 20 bat droppings was found beneath the ridgeboard roughly in the centre of the roof void.

3.3.10 The updated inspection of the roof void in June 2025 did not detect any bats; no additional accumulations of bat droppings were found.

3.3.11 Based on the evidence and field signs found in October 2023 and June 2025, the farmhouse supports confirmed common pipistrelle roosts at the ridge copings of the eastern and western sections of roof void.

**Detached Garage**

3.3.12 Refer to **Photos 23** to **25** and **31** and **32**. The detached garage lies to the north-west of the farmhouse and is a single storey concrete block structure with a pitched roof of slate with terracotta ridge copings and timber fascia boards at all roof lines.

3.3.13 No bats or bat droppings were found around the external elevations of the garage. The render is in good condition; no opportunities for bat access are present at the elevation walls.

3.3.14 The slates appear to be well-fitted although gaps suitable for bat access were found at the roof verges at the gable ends where the bedding mortar is missing and also behind the timber fascia boards.

3.3.15 The detached garage is assessed to be of 'moderate' suitability for use by roosting bats.

### 3.4 Dusk Emergence Surveys for Bat Activity

3.4.1 The survey data collated during the bat activity surveys is appended at **Section 8.3**.

**Survey 1: 7th May 2024**

3.4.2 An updated inspection of the exterior of the farmhouse prior to the dusk emergence survey detected the presence of 8 bat droppings on a garden table beneath the detected roost / suspected access.

3.4.3 Four soprano pipistrelle emerged from the north-east facing eaves of the farmhouse (above the location of the 8 droppings referenced above) between 21:22 (29 minutes after sunset) and 21:26.

3.4.4 No bat emergence was detected elsewhere at the farmhouse. Subsequent review of the NVA footage did not detect any emergence.

3.4.5 Common pipistrelle were detected between 21:19 and 22:28 with the first bat detected 26 minutes after sunset. A total of 317 call sequences were recorded during the survey.

**Survey 2: 6th June 2024**

3.4.6 An updated inspection of the exterior of the farmhouse prior to the dusk emergence survey did not detect any droppings.

3.4.7 No bat emergence activity was recorded by the surveyors. Subsequent review of the NVA footage did not detect any emergence.

3.4.8 The following specie(s) were recorded:

- Noctule were detected between 21:55 and 22:39 with the first bat detected 23 minutes after sunset. A total of 25 call sequences were recorded during the survey.
- Common pipistrelle were detected between 21:45 and 23:06 with the first bat detected 14 minutes after sunset. A total of 257 call sequences were recorded during the survey.

**Survey 3: 3rd June 2025**

3.4.9 An updated inspection of the exterior of the farmhouse prior to the dusk emergence survey did not detect any droppings.

3.4.10 No bat emergence activity was recorded by the surveyors. Subsequent review of the NVA footage did not detect any emergence.

3.4.11 The following specie(s) were recorded:

- One *Myotis* bat call sequence was detected at 22:40, 1 hour and 4 minutes after sunset.
- Noctule were detected between 21:59 and 22:59 with the first bat detected 28 minutes after sunset. A total of 88 call sequences were recorded during the survey.
- Common pipistrelle were detected between 21:41 and 23:04 with the first bat detected 9 minutes after sunset. A total of 224 call sequences were recorded during the survey.

3.4.12 A bird was recorded entering the previously recorded access t Roost 1 at 21:30. The bird was not observed leaving so it is assumed that the bird entered the gap to roost. The use of the roost access by roosting bird may be impacting its use by roosting bats.

## 3.5 Other Relevant Protected Species and Animal Life

**Badger**

3.5.1 The hard-standing and building habitats at the site are unsuitable for use by badger. No signs of badger such as setts, snuffle holes, tracks, hairs or burrows were detected at the wider garden and survey area. The presence of badger / adverse impacts of the development proposals on badger is reasonably discounted.

**Bird Species and Barn Owl**

3.5.2 No evidence of the use of the farmhouse or garage by nesting or roosting barn owl was detected. Barn owl are known to be present in the off-site farm buildings to the south-west.

3.5.3 One old bird nest was found beneath the canopy attached to the south-western elevation of the farmhouse (refer to **Photo 26**). No other evidence of previous use of the farmhouse and garage by nesting birds was found.

**Other Wildlife**

3.5.4 The garden habitats are suitable for use by breeding and foraging hedgehog (*Erinaceus europaeus*), a Priority Species; this is discussed further in **Section 4.4**.

## 4.0 EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT

### 4.1 Introduction and Description of Proposals

4.1.1 The proposals as illustrated on the *Proposed Site Plan Parsonage Farm, Ribchester Drawing 6908-SK1* (Sunderland Peacock Architects, 2025)***Invalid source specified.,*** comprise the demolition of the farmhouse and the construction of a replacement dwelling. The garage will remain.

4.1.2 **Section 4.2** provides an assessment of any impacts of the proposed development on the designated sites for nature conservation present in the wider area. The presence of the confirmed bat roosts is discussed in **Section 4.3**, and other relevant protected and notable species and ecological considerations of the proposals are discussed in **Section 4.4**.

### 4.2 Designated Sites for Nature Conservation

4.2.1 It is considered that the site is sufficiently small and distant from the known statutory and non-statutory designated sites for nature conservation that the proposed development will have no direct or indirect impact on the designated sites in the local area and their features of special interest.

### 4.3 Bat Species

4.3.1 The survey data indicate that farmhouse supports two roosts which are summarised below:

a. Roost 1: Soprano pipistrelle day roost (maximum 4 bats) at the eaves of the north-eastern elevation of the farmhouse; and

b. Roost 2: Common pipistrelle day roost located across at least two positions beneath the ridge copings (detected by the presence of droppings only).

4.3.2 In relation to Roost 2, in accordance with Natural England guidance, "*To be considered the same roost, the locations need to have the same functional and qualitative (e.g. physical) characteristics, be used by the same species for the same purpose (e.g. day roosting) and be within the same building / structure*". This is considered to be relevant to the common pipistrelle droppings beneath the ridge copings and have therefore been classed as one roost. The number of droppings has been used at this roost to characterise the roost type.

4.3.3 Based on the data collated, particularly the bat activity surveys carried out in May and June 2024 and June 2025 which maternity roosts are reported to have gatherer locally, there is no evidence of use of the farmhouse by a roost of greater conservation significance such as a maternity roost or a roost of a rare bat species.

4.3.4 No further signs of roosting bats were detected. It is not considered that the farmhouse supports any features typically associated with hibernating bats; the heated and occupied building is unlikely to provide the low temperatures and thermal stability typically required by hibernating bats.

4.3.5 In the absence of mitigation, the demolition works will disturb bats and will destroy Roosts 1 and 2.

4.3.6 Works at the farmhouse must only be carried out under a relevant Natural England European Protected Species Mitigation licence issued under Regulation 55 of *The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019*). In accordance with the *Bat Mitigation Guidelines* (Mitchell-

Jones, 2004) the destruction of a day roosts used by a common and widespread[7] species of bats is a 'low' scale impact.

4.3.7 The proposals will not sever or fragment habitats suitable for use by foraging / commuting bats nor cause the isolation of a roost.

4.3.8 It is advised that appropriate mitigation in accordance with relevant Natural England guidance and licensing requirements is feasible within the remit of the proposals. A comprehensive Bat Mitigation Strategy is presented in **Section 5.3**; the strategy details the measures to be applied to ensure bats are protected during the proposed works and also to ensure there is no net loss of roosting opportunity at the site in the long-term as a consequence of the proposed development.

4.3.9 In consideration of post-development interference impacts, the site will continue to be occupied by one family at the post-development stage. Subject to the avoidance lighting and / or implementation of an appropriate lighting strategy as recommended at **Section 5.2**, there is minimal risk of an increase in disturbance to roosting / foraging bats associated with human activity at the property.

### 4.4 Other Relevant Protected Species and Considerations

4.4.1 Use of the farmhouse by nesting birds (i.e. the old nest at the canopy on the south-western elevation) is a consideration. The demolition of the farmhouse will remove the features used by nesting birds. **Section 5.4** describes the mandatory actions for the protection of nesting birds during the construction period describes how the proposals will ensure there is no net loss of opportunities for use by nesting birds as a result of the proposals.

4.4.2 Appropriate and proportionate survey effort and / or assessment, in accordance with standard survey guidelines has been applied to discount adverse effects on other relevant protected species. No further surveys for other protected species are necessary to support a planning application.

4.4.3 The presence of Wall Cotoneaster, Virginia Creeper and Montbretia in the garden habitats is a consideration of the works; each of these species list an invasive plant species listed under Schedule 9 of the *Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981* (as amended). It is considered that, provided the best practice guidance in relation to the works described in **Section 5.5** is implemented, there is minimal risk of an offence under relevant wildlife legislation.

**Hedgehog**

4.4.4 Due to the presence of habitats that are suitable for use by hedgehog (a Priority Species), guidance in relation to reasonable avoidance measures to be applied for the protection of fauna during construction and their conservation at the site in the long-term is provided in **Section 5.4**.

**Other Animal Life**

4.4.5 Appropriate and proportionate survey effort and / or assessment, in accordance with standard survey guidelines, has been applied to discount adverse effects on other relevant protected species. No further surveys for other protected species are necessary to inform a planning application.

[7] The conservation status of soprano and common pipistrelle species is reported to be favourable in the *European Community Directive on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (92/43/EEC) Fourth Report by the United Kingdom under Article 17 on the implementation of the Directive from January 2013 to December 2018.*

### 4.5 Consideration of Statutory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

4.5.1 In accordance with *The Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024*[8] it is understood that the proposals / planning application meet the self-build and custom build criteria and are therefore exempt from the requirements of Statutory Biodiversity Net Gain.

4.5.2 The criteria are provided below for ease of reference:

**Table 4.1: Assessment of the Site in Relation to the Relevant Conditions Relating to Exemption from BNG**

| **The biodiversity gain planning condition does not apply in relation to planning permission for development which:** | |
|---|---|
| ***Criteria*** | ***Site Assessment*** |
| (a) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;<br>(b) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and<br>(c) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding[A] | One 1 dwelling is proposed.<br>The site area is 0.3ha.<br>Comprises a self-build and custom built house for use by the site owner and their family. |
| [A] For the purposes of this regulation—<br>'In this regulation "self-build or custom housebuilding" has the same meaning as in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 | |

4.5.3 Based on the above information it is advised that the self-build and custom house building exemption applies at the redline boundary for the proposals, and that the general Biodiversity Gain Condition (as set out in Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A of the *Town and Country Planning Act 1990* (as amended)) does not apply.

4.5.4 No further assessment in accordance with the BNG Metric is required to inform the planning application at the site.

4.5.5 Notwithstanding the above, the recommendations outlined below aim to secure measurable gains for biodiversity / ecological enhancement to satisfy the requirements of the NPPF, *Biodiversity Net Gain: Good Practice Principles for Development* (CIEEM, 2016) and best practice.

## 5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS AND ECOLOGICAL ENHANCEMENT

### 5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 The recommendations described below are appropriate and proportionate to the scale of demolition and rebuild proposals and aim to ensure that the proposals are implemented in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy, relevant wildlife legislation, Natural England guidance, the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, 2024), local planning policy and best practice.

5.1.2 The recommendations aim to ensure compliance with Chapter 15, paragraph 193(d) of the NPPF which states:

[8] As presented at https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain-exempt-developments

*'opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate'.*

## 5.2 Site Design

### Appropriate Use of Lighting

5.2.1 Paragraph 198(c) in Chapter 15 (conserving and enhancing the natural environment) of the NPPF states that development should:

"*limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation*"

5.2.2 It is advised that any external lighting to be installed at the property and surrounds must involve the use of appropriate products and screening, where necessary, to ensure no excessive artificial lighting shines over the proposed bat boxes, retained garden habitats and habitats outside the curtilage of the residential property and areas of planting / habitat creation, as lighting overspill may deter use by wildlife such as foraging bats.

5.2.3 The lighting scheme will be designed with reference to current guidance, namely:

a. *Guidance Note 08/23: Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night***Invalid source specified.**; and

b. Bats and lighting: Overview of current evidence and mitigation guidance (Stone, 2014).

## 5.3 Bat Mitigation Strategy

### Natural England Licence

5.3.1 Once planning permission is obtained works that will affect the roosts must only be carried out in the presence of an appropriate European Protected Species Mitigation (EPSM) licence issued by Natural England.

5.3.2 To achieve the licence / registration of the site the applicant must be able to demonstrate to Natural England that the following three tests of Regulation 55 of *The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019* will be satisfied.

**Test 1:** That the action authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range [Regulation 55 (9)(b)];

**Test 2:** Demonstration that the proposals for which a licence is sought are for the purposes of 'preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment' [Regulation 55(2)(e)]; and

**Test 3:** Consideration of '*There is no satisfactory alternative*' including the implications of the '*do-nothing*' option [Regulation 55(9)(a)].

5.3.3 The Bat Mitigation Strategy outlined below aims to demonstrate that compliance with Test 1 and demonstrates how bats will be accommodated at the site and is considered to be appropriate to inform the planning decision. Tests 2 and 3 are also considered.

**Resources**

5.3.4 This mitigation strategy draws on the following resources:

a. Current Natural England guidance;

b. Information presented in the *BCT Mitigation Conference Proceedings* ***Invalid source specified.*** and the *Mitigation Case Studies Forum* ***Invalid source specified.***;

c. Implemented and monitored activities / specifications carried out by ERAP (Consultant Ecologists) Ltd at other sites / properties;

d. *UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines 2023* ***Invalid source specified.***; and

e. Information presented on the 'Roost' website provided by the Bat Conservation Trust.

**Licensed Works**

5.3.5 The licensed works comprise actions that will directly affect (or have the risk of impacting) the detected roosts only. Where there is no risk of an offence under wildlife legislation other works can be carried out outside the licence, as required, subject to consideration of nesting birds, planning guidelines and restrictions imposed by the planning consent.

**Overview of the Mitigation Approach**

5.3.6 The mitigation approach is as follows:

a. Compensation will be provided for the loss of Roosts 1 and 2 (day roosts) via the installation of a bat boxes on the detached garage (note these will be installed prior to the commencement of works);

b. Works will be completed under the supervision of a licensed bat works; and

c. Measures will be put in place to ensure any bats found during works are appropriately cared for and protected.

5.3.7 These measures are described in detail below.

**Provisions for Use by Roosting Bats**

***Compensatory Provision to be Provided Prior to Works***

5.3.8 Prior to the commencement of licensed actions to ensure there is no net loss of roost opportunity at the site, and to ensure suitable features are present at the site to receive any bats found during the works, two bat boxes will be installed on detached garage (one on the western elevation and one on the northern elevation).

5.3.9 Suitable box specifications are detailed below:


**Insert 1:** Schwegler 1FF and Greenwood Ecohabitat's single cavity bat boxes

**Timing of Works**

5.3.10 Based on the presence of day roosts, there is no timing restriction on the date of the commencement of works (provided the planning consent and the Natural England licence are in place and the mandatory actions in relation to nesting birds is adhered to).

**Toolbox Talk**

5.3.11 Prior to the commencement of works the licensed ecologist will inform all contractors of the following:

a. The wildlife legislation and protection afforded to bats and their roosts;

b. The presence of the licence and the associated method statement and the need to abide by the content;

c. The licensable actions;

d. Good working practices (i.e. lifting (rather than sliding) of ridge copings and roof tiles and turning to check for the presence of bats before discard or stacking);

e. The presence of any provisions for roosting bats installed in advance of the works and the need for them to remain undisturbed; and

f. The protocol to be followed if a bat is discovered when the licensed ecologist is not on site.

**Capture and Exclusion During Works**

5.3.12 Under the Natural England licence the fascia boards, roof coverings and lead flashing will be removed carefully by hand and under the supervision of the licensed ecologist. The underside of the boards, slates and ridge copings will be checked for bats prior to discard or stacking.

5.3.13 If at any time during the works a bat is discovered or suspected when the licensed bat surveyor is not on site all contractors must withdraw from the area and ERAP (Consultant Ecologists) Ltd (01772 750502) or the Bat Conservation Trust must be contacted for further guidance.

**Mechanism for Ensuring Implementation / Success**

5.3.14 If the licensed ecologist has any concerns regarding the quality of workmanship or there is non-compliance with the Natural England licence, the Mitigation Strategy and / or guidance provided by the licensed ecologist then this will result in additional site visits to make inspections.

5.3.15 It is always the intention to ensure all parties are aware of the importance of the Natural England licence and compliance with the Mitigation Strategy and this is achieved through good communication. However,

in extreme / significant cases of non-compliance the licensed bat surveyor will report the issue to Natural England and further action may be taken.

**Post-development Interference Impacts and Mitigation**

5.3.16 The risk of post-development interference impacts has been minimised by designing in the provisions for roosting bats in liaison with the property owners and by providing guidance to the property owners on the protection afforded to bats and their roosts.

*Consideration of Tests 2 and 3*

5.3.17 In consideration of the demonstration that the proposals are for imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment [Regulation 55(2)(e)] the following information is of relevance:

a. The replacement dwelling is a self-build and custom build property that has been designed to meet the needs of the family whilst working within the planning considerations at the site and local area. The construction of a dwelling that is suitable for use will maintain the presence of a dwelling at the site.

b. In addition, it is proposed to use local professional and construction resources during the works which will be of benefit to the local economy.

c. In consideration of alternative ways to meets the identified need it has been advised that that condition of the farmhouse and its insulative qualities are so poor that conversion / renovation to retain the building would require extensive works and would likely have a similar impact on the known roosts. The demolition and re-build of the house to a sustainable specification is considered to be more appropriate and feasible.

5.3.18 The 'do-nothing option' is not feasible as this would not enable the applicant to meet their identified needs and to satisfy the requirements imposed by the planning application.

## 5.4 Nesting Birds and Hedgehog

**Nesting Birds**

5.4.1 All wild birds are protected under the *Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981* (as amended) while they are nesting. All contractors must be advised on the possible future use of the farmhouse by nesting birds and the protection afforded to nesting birds. The bird breeding season typically extends between March to August inclusive.

5.4.2 If breeding birds are detected / present it is recommended that the area is left undisturbed until it is confirmed that the young birds have fledged / the nest is no longer active. Guidance from an ecologist should be sought, as needed.

5.4.3 It is advised that the established garden habitats bordering the farmhouse provide a number of alternative opportunities for use by nesting passerine birds, although in accordance with best practice it is advised that one open-fronted bird box is installed amongst the Virginia Creeper / other climbing plants / dense vegetation on the brick wall in the rear garden. A suitable box is recommended in **Insert 2**.

**Insert 2:** Open-fronted Bird Box Example (available from www.NHBS.com)[9]

**Protection of Hedgehog**

5.4.4 The following Reasonable Avoidance Measures Method Statement (RAMMS) will be applied prior to the construction phase of the development:

a. All construction site personnel must be made aware of this RAMMS;

b. To avoid the loss of habitats used by hedgehog as much of the existing garden habitats as possible, particularly the dense shrubs, should be retained and must remain undisturbed;

c. To minimise the risk of killing or injuring a hedgehog, during the clearance of the site care must be taken to search for hedgehog. If a hedgehog is found then advice must be sought;

d. During works all arising waste must be either removed from the area or placed in a skip to avoid the accumulation of materials that may create suitable habitat and shelter for hedgehog and other wildlife;

e. During construction, bricks etc. must ideally be stored on pallets or raised from the ground in another suitable manner in order that no suitable habitat for hedgehog is created;

f. Deep trenches / excavations must not be left open overnight. Trenches or holes must be fitted with a means of escape (such as ramped edge or a sloping plank of timber). This will ensure that any inquisitive animals do not become trapped;

e. Any pipes must be stored with caps on (to prevent animal entry);

f. No fires must be lit at the site; and

g. The use of chemicals (such as fertilisers and herbicides) harmful to wildlife should be avoided wherever possible.

## 5.5 Invasive Plant Species

5.5.1 It is an offence under the *Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981* (as amended) to cause the spread of Wall Cotoneaster, Virginia Creeper and Montbretia in the wild. It is concluded that the preparation of an Invasive Species Management Plan is not necessary in this case, rather, it is proportionate and appropriate

[9] This type of box must not be hung on a conspicuous tree or bush. Small predators can enter through the unprotected opening. By hanging on a wall, predators will not be able to reach the box. Alternatively the box can be hidden in Ivy, Honeysuckle or other climbing plants.

to advise all contractors of the presence of the invasive plants and the need to avoid the removal of plant material and materials that may contain invasive species from the site.

## 6.0 CONCLUSION

6.1 This report has demonstrated that the redevelopment of the site is feasible and acceptable in accordance with ecological considerations and relevant planning policy.

6.2 The comprehensive bat mitigation strategy outlined in **Section 5.3** demonstrates that mitigation for roosting bats and conservation of roosting and foraging opportunities at the site in the long-term is entirely feasible. The 'three tests' of *The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017* (as amended) can be met. An appropriate Natural England European Protected Species Mitigation licence will be required to facilitate the works and can be applied for once planning permission is obtained.

6.3 In the presence of mandatory actions and best practice measures described in **Section 5.0** the risk of a significant impact on protected species is reasonably discounted. Appropriate and proportionate mitigation and enhancement measures to maximise the benefits for biodiversity as part of the proposals and to secure compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework are outlined in **Section 5.0**.

## 7.0 REFERENCES


Barn Owl Trust, 2012. *Barn Owl Conservation Handbook.* Exeter: Pelagic Publishing.

CIEEM, 2013. *Technical Guidance Series Competencies for Species: Bats.* Winchester: Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management.

CIEEM, 2016. *Biodiversity Net Gain: Good Practice Principles for Development,* Winchester: CIEEM.

CIEEM, 2018. *Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine version 1.1,* Winchester: Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management.

Collins, J. (ed), 2023. *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edn).* London: The Bat Conservation Trust.

GOV.UK, 2024. *The Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-biodiversity-gain-requirements-irreplaceable-habitat-regulations-2024
[Accessed 2025].

Institution of Lighting Professionals & Bat Conservation Trust, 2023. *Guidance Note 08/23: Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night.* [Online]
Available at: https://theilp.org.uk/publication/guidance-note-8-bats-and-artificial-lighting/
[Accessed 2025].

Legislation.gov.uk, 1981. *Wildlife and Countryside Act.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1981/69
[Accessed 2025].

Legislation.gov.uk, 2006. *Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/16/contents
[Accessed 2025].

Legislation.gov.uk, 2019. *The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukdsi/2019/9780111176573
[Accessed 2025].

Maddock, A (ed), 2008. *UK Biodiversity Action Plan: Priority Habitat Descriptions.* [Online]
Available at: http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-5718

Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, 2024. *National Planning Policy Framework.* London: H.M.S.O.

Mitchell-Jones, A., 2004. *Bat Mitigation Guidelines.* Peterborough: English Nature.

Mitchell-Jones, A. J. & Mcleish, A. P., 2004. *Bat Workers' Manual, 3rd Edition.* Peterborough: Joint Nature Conservation Committee.

Natural England, 2007. *Badgers and Development,* Peterborough: Natural England.

Natural England, 2020. *GCN Method Statement WML-A14-2 (Version April 2020).* [Online]
Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/great-crested-newts-apply-for-a-mitigation-licence

Natural England, 2022. *Great crested newts: advice for making planning decisions.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/great-crested-newts-advice-for-making-planning-decisions
[Accessed 2025].

Natural England, 2022. *Otters: advice for making planning decisions.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/otters-advice-for-making-planning-decisions
[Accessed 2025].

Natural England, 2025. *Impact Risk Zones for Sites of Special Scientific Interest.* [Online]
Available at:
https://irz.geodata.org.uk/IRZ/step2.html?irzcode=0101000322302&notes=&location=370149,421625%20(IRZ%20polygon%20centre)
[Accessed 2025].

Ratcliffe, D. A., 1977. *A Nature Conservation Review.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shawyer, C., 2011. *Barn Owl Tyto alba Survey Methodology and Techniques for use in Ecological Assessment. Developing Best Practice in Survey and Reporting,* Winchester: IEEM.

Stone, E. L., 2014. *Bats and Lighting: Overview of current evidence and mitigation guidance.* Bristol: University of Bristol.

Sunderland Peacock Architects, 2025. *Proposed Site Plan Parsonage Farm, Ribchester Drawing 6908-SK1 ,* Clitheroe: Sunderland Peacock Architects.

Woodland Trust, 2025. *Ancient Tree Inventory.* [Online]
Available at: https://ati.woodlandtrust.org.uk/
[Accessed 2025].

## 8.0 APPENDIX 1: TABLES AND FIGURES

### 8.1 Photographs Taken in October 2023

**Photo 1:** South-eastern elevation of the farmhouse

**Photo 2:** Wall Cotoneaster at the south-western elevation of the farmhouse

**Photo 3:** Virginia Creeper and Montbretia in the wider garden

**Photo 4:** South-western and south-eastern elevations of the farmhouse

**Photo 5:** South-eastern and north-eastern elevations of the farmhouse

**Photo 6:** North-eastern and north-western elevations of the farmhouse

**Photo 7:** North-western elevation of the farmhouse showing single storey utility section

**Photo 8:** Slate roof over utility area with sections of missing bedding mortar beneath the ridge copings

**Photo 9:** South-western elevation of the farmhouse

**Photo 10:** PVC framed conservation at south-western elevation of the farmhouse

**Photo 11:** Gap at lead flashing at PVC conservatory

**Photo 12:** Gaps behind timber fascia at eastern section of farmhouse

**Photo 13:** Scattered bat droppings over chairs below access to Roost 1

**Photo 14:** Scattered bat droppings over chairs beneath the north-eastern elevation of the western section of the farmhouse and assumed roost access to Roost 1

**Photo 15:** Roof void at north-eastern end of the western section of the farmhouse

**Photo 15:** Roof void at north-eastern end of the western section of the farmhouse

**Photo 17:** Roof void at the south-western end of the western section of the farmhouse

**Photo 18:** Bat droppings over hot water tank on internal side of fascia and wall at Roost 1

**Photo 19:** Bat droppings (common pipistrelle) on fibreglass insulation on floor of roof void at western section of farmhouse

**Photo 20:** Roof void at eastern section of farmhouse

**Photo 21:** Internal side of north-east facing gable elevation wall of the farmhouse

**Photo 22:** Bat droppings (common pipistrelle) on fibreglass insulation on floor of eastern election of roof void

**Photo 23:** Eastern elevation of garage

**Photo 24:** Northern and western elevations of garage

**Photo 25:** Gaps at roof verge on western elevation of garage

**Photo 26:** Old bird's nest beneath canopy at farmhouse

## 8.2 Photographs Taken 3rd June 2025

**Photo 27:** South-eastern elevation of the farmhouse

**Photo 28:** North-western elevation of the farmhouse

**Photo 29:** Roof void at farmhouse

**Photo 30:** Roof void at farmhouse

**Photo 31:** Eastern and northern elevations of the garage

**Photo 32:** Northern and western elevations of the garage


**Photo 33:** NVA view at Surveyor 1

**Photo 34:** NVA view at Surveyor 2


**Photo 35:** NVA view at Surveyor 3

## 8.3 Data from Bat Activity Surveys

**Table 8.1: Activity Survey 1, 7th May 2024, Sunset Time 20:53, Start Time 20:38**

**Survey Position 1: Victoria Burrows**

| Time | Species | Notes |
|---|---|---|
| 21:22 | Soprano pipistrelle x1 | Emerged from eaves at north-eastern elevation of farmhouse (Roost 1) |
| 21:24 | Soprano pipistrelle x1 | Emerged from eaves at north-eastern elevation of farmhouse (Roost 1) |
| 21:25 | Soprano pipistrelle x1 | Emerged from eaves at north-eastern elevation of farmhouse (Roost 1) |
| 21:26 | Soprano pipistrelle x1 | Emerged from eaves at north-eastern elevation of farmhouse (Roost 1) |
| 21:33 | Noctule | Overhead |
| The Anabat Scout made the following recordings:<br>86 call sequences of common pipistrelle between 21:29 and 22:23.<br>131 call sequences of soprano pipistrelle between 21:19 and 22:24. | | |

**Survey Position 2: Stuart Laverick**

| Time | Species | Notes |
|---|---|---|
| - | - | No emergence detected. |
| The Anabat Scout made the following recordings:<br>71 call sequences of common pipistrelle between 21:29 and 22:17.<br>101 call sequences of soprano pipistrelle between 21:19 and 22:23. | | |

**Survey Position 3: Leah Hart**

| Time | Species | Notes |
|---|---|---|
| - | - | No emergence detected. |
| The Anabat Scout made the following recordings:<br>102 call sequences of common pipistrelle between 21:19 and 22:25<br>145 call sequences of soprano pipistrelle between 21:19 and 22:25. | | |

**Table 8.2: Activity Survey 2, 6th June 2024, Sunset Time 21:36, Start Time 21:20**

**Survey Position 1: Victoria Burrows**

| Time | Species | Notes |
|---|---|---|
| 22:19 | Noctule | Pass overhead |
| 22:24 | Noctule | Pass overhead |
| 22:38 | Noctule | Pass overhead |
| | | No emergence detected |
| The Anabat Scout made the following recordings:<br>8 call sequences of noctule between 21:55 and 22:38.<br>129 call sequences of common pipistrelle between 21:51 and 23:06.<br>36 call sequences of soprano pipistrelle between 22:11 and 23:05. | | |

**Survey Position 2: Catie Haworth**

| Time | Species | Notes |
|---|---|---|
| - | - | No emergence detected |
| The Anabat Scout made the following recordings:<br>9 call sequences of noctule between 22:15 and 22:38.<br>40 call sequences of common pipistrelle between 21:45 and 22:59.<br>10 call sequences of soprano pipistrelle between 22:11 and 23:03. | | |

**Survey Position 3: Ian Nelson**

| Time | Species | Notes |
|---|---|---|
| - | - | No emergence detected. |
| The Anabat Scout made the following recordings:<br>8 call sequences of noctule between 22:13 and 22:39.<br>88 call sequences of common pipistrelle between 21:50 and 22:47.<br>19 call sequences of soprano pipistrelle between 21:50 and 22:54. | | |

**Table 8.3: Activity Survey 3, 3rd June 2025, Sunset Time 21:32, Start Time 21:15**

**Survey Position 1: Victoria Burrows**

| Time | Species | Notes |
|---|---|---|
| 21:30 | Bird | Entered previously recorded access to Roost 1 to roost |
| - | - | No bat emergence detected |
| The Anabat Scout made the following recordings:<br>1 call sequence of Daubenton's bat at 22:40.<br>20 call sequences of noctule between 22:01 and 22:35.<br>99 call sequences of common pipistrelle between 21:52 and 22:57.<br>22 call sequences of soprano pipistrelle between 22:01 and 22:39. | | |

**Survey Position 2: Ian Nelson**

| Time | Species | Notes |
|---|---|---|
| - | - | No emergence detected. |
| The Anabat Scout made the following recordings:<br>38 call sequences of noctule between 22:00:00 and 22:59:17.<br>95 call sequences of common pipistrelle between 22:04:58 and 23:04:30.<br>25 call sequences of soprano pipistrelle between 22:01:33 and 23:00:27. | | |

**Survey Position 3: Ciaran Rowett**

| Time | Species | Notes |
|---|---|---|
| - | - | No emergence detected. |
| The Anabat Scout made the following recordings:<br>30 call sequences of noctule between 21:59 and 22:17.<br>30 call sequences of common pipistrelle between 21:41 and 22:55.<br>22 call sequences of soprano pipistrelle between 21:51 and 22:55. | | |

## 8.4 Figures

**Figure 1: Aerial Image of the Site and its Surroundings**



**Figure 2:** **Plan to Show Locations of Surveyors and NVAs during Bat Activity Surveys and Results of Surveys**



## 9.0 APPENDIX 2: RESULTS OF DNA ANALYSIS

### 9.1 Sample 1: Common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*)

WARWICK
THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

EcoWarwicker
Ecological Forensics

30 October 23

Re: Identification Results for Victoria Burrows, ERAP Ltd

Job number 20354, received 16 October 2023
Sample labelled: 2023-250 Parsonage Farm Sample 1
PCR amplification successful. DNA sequence:
CCAAACAGATGCCTAATACGGGACCCAAAATTTCATCATGCTGAATGTTTGATGGAG
CTGGTAGATCAATGAATGAGTTATTGATGATTTTGATCAGGGGGTGGGACTTTCGAA
TGTTTGTCAT

Phylogenetic analysis identification: *Pipistrellus pipistrellus*

Confirmed by maximum likelihood, maximum parsimony, bootstrap 100%.

Best regards,

Professor Robin Allaby

The results and conclusions in this report are based on an investigation of mtDNA sequence analysis. The results obtained have been reported with accuracy. The interpretation represents the most probable conclusion for the DNA sequence obtained rather than the sample provided given current levels of species data. It should be borne in mind that different circumstances might produce different results. Therefore, care must be taken with interpretation of the results especially if they are used as the basis for commercial recommendations.

**Professor Robin Allaby**

School of Life Sciences,
Gibbet Hill Campus,
University of Warwick,
Coventry CV4 7AL
Tel: 02476575059
Fax: 02476574500
Email: r.g.allaby@warwick.ac.uk

## 9.2 Sample 2: Common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*)

WARWICK
THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK

EcoWarwicker
Ecological Forensics

30 October 23

Re: Identification Results for Victoria Burrows, ERAP Ltd

Job number 20355, received 16 October 2023
Sample labelled: 2023-250 Parsonage Farm Sample 2
PCR amplification successful. DNA sequence:
CCAAACAGATGCCTAATAGGGACCCAAAATTTCATCATGCTGAAATGTTTGATGGAG
CTGGTAGATCAATGAATGAGTTATGATGATTTGATCAGGGGGTGGGACTTTCGAATG
TTTGTCAT

Phylogenetic analysis identification: *Pipistrellus pipistrellus*

Confirmed by maximum likelihood, maximum parsimony, bootstrap 100%.

Best regards,

Professor Robin Allaby

The results and conclusions in this report are based on an investigation of mtDNA sequence analysis. The results obtained have been reported with accuracy. The interpretation represents the most probable conclusion for the DNA sequence obtained rather than the sample provided given current levels of species data. It should be borne in mind that different circumstances might produce different results. Therefore, care must be taken with interpretation of the results especially if they are used as the basis for commercial recommendations.

**Professor Robin Allaby**

School of Life Sciences,
Gibbet Hill Campus,
University of Warwick,
Coventry CV4 7AL
Tel: 02476575059
Fax: 02476574500
Email: r.g.allaby@warwick.ac.uk