



www.osecology.co.uk

Daytime Bat Risk Assessment

Sunday School, Rowrah

January 2021

Michael Froggatt



Client	Michael Froggatt
Project Name	Sunday School, Rowrah
Project Number	21001
Report Type	Daytime Bat Risk Assessment
Version	V1 (DRAFT)

	Name	Position	Date
Report Originator	Zoe Dunnett	Graduate Ecologist	6 th January 2021
Reviewed	Mandy Rackham	Senior Ecologist	8 th January 2021

This report is issued to the Client for the purpose stated in the Agreement between the Client and OS Ecology Ltd, under which this work was undertaken. The report may only be used for this aforementioned purpose and copyright remains with OS Ecology Ltd. The report is only intended for the Client and must not be relied upon or reproduced by anyone other than the Client without the express written agreement of OS Ecology Ltd. The use of this report by unauthorised persons is at their own risk. OS Ecology Ltd accepts no duty of care to any such party.

OS Ecology Ltd has exercised due care and attention in the preparation of this report. Unless specifically stated, there has been no independent verification of information provided by others. No other warranty, express or implied, is made in relation to the content of this report and OS Ecology Ltd accepts no liability for any loss or damage resulting from errors, omissions or misrepresentations of others.

The findings of the report and subsequent assessment and opinions of OS Ecology Ltd are based entirely on the facts and circumstances at the time the work was undertaken. OS Ecology Ltd have produced this report in line with best practice guidance and following the principles and requirements of British Standard BS42020. The report has been provided taking due regard of the provisions of the CIEEM Code of Professional Conduct.

It must be noted that the none of the information provided within this report constitutes legal opinion.

Where required to do so by law or regulatory authority, OS Ecology Ltd may disclose any information obtained from the Client to a third party. Should OS Ecology Ltd become aware that the Client has breached or is likely to breach legislation relating to wildlife or the environment, OS Ecology Ltd will be entitled to disclose such information to the relevant authority, including the relevant governmental body or the police.

Contents

Summary	5
1. Introduction.....	6
Site Location.....	6
Site Description	6
Objectives of the Study	6
Development Proposals	6
2. Methodology	7
Scope of Study.....	7
Desk Study	7
Field Survey.....	7
Habitats/Protected Species	7
Limitations to Survey	8
Assessment Methodology	9
3. Results	10
Desk Study	10
Designated Sites.....	10
European Protected Species Licensing.....	10
General Land Use.....	10
Data Search.....	11
Local Bat Group.....	11
Field Survey.....	11
Protected Species	11
Additional Species Groups	12
Birds.....	12
Other Protected Species.....	13
4. Site Assessment	14
Assessment of Survey Findings	14
Bats.....	14
Nesting Birds.....	14
Other Protected Species.....	14
Designated Sites.....	14
5. Impacts	15
6. Recommendations	16
Further Survey.....	16
Avoidance Measures.....	16
Mitigation Strategy	16
Compensation Scheme.....	17
Appendix 1 – Bat Suitability and Survey Effort.....	18
Appendix 2 – Policy and Legislation	20
Planning Policy	20
National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).....	20
Government Circular ODPM 06/2005 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (England only).....	22
Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006	22

Appendix 3 – Figures26

Tables

Table 1: Daytime Survey Conditions	8
Table 2: Designated Sites.....	10
Table 3: Bat Risk Assessment.....	11
Table 4: Guidelines for assessing the potential suitability of proposed development sites for bats	18
Table 5: Survey effort and timing depending on suitability of the structure or tree (Tables 7.1-7.3 in the BCT Guidelines.....	19
Table 6: Ecologically Relevant Paragraphs of the NPPF	20
Table 7: UK Priority Habitats (excl. marine habitats).....	23
Table 8: European Protected Species relevant to the UK.....	25
Table 9: Other Protected Species	25

Summary

OS Ecology Ltd were commissioned by Michael Froggatt in January 2021 to undertake a daytime bat risk assessment of a single storey brick-built garden store. Proposals include the demolition of the existing single-storey structure followed by the development of a new two-storey garden store within the same footprint.

Summary Table	
Impacts on Designated Sites	No impacts on sites designated for bats are predicted from the development.
Survey Findings	A small single storey building primarily of cut stone construction with a pitched roof covered with slate tiles. Gaps were noted under the ridge tiles and under some roofing tiles where they have lifted or slipped. Gaps were also noted around the timber batons to which the guttering is attached as well as gaps in mortar and brickwork. The client noted that a confirmed bat roost was present within the main residential structure adjacent to the garden store. Overall, the structure is considered to be of low suitability to roosting bats. Areas of grassland, woodland and hedgerows outside the site have the potential to provide suitable foraging and commuting opportunities as well as connectivity between the site and the local area.
Nesting Birds	No evidence of use by nesting birds was recorded, but the property offers opportunities within the ceramic ventilation pipes.
Impacts based on survey to date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential disturbance and harm to roosting bats, should they be present at the time of the works. • Potential destruction of bat roosts through the demolition of the current building, should any be present. • Potential harm and/or disturbance to nesting birds, should works be undertaken in the breeding bird season (March to August inclusive).
Further Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One dusk emergence survey should be undertaken within the peak survey season (May to August inclusive).

1. Introduction

Site Location

- 1.1 The site is located in Rowrah, Cumbria at approximate central grid reference of NY 0569 1855. The site location is illustrated within figure 1 in the appendices.

Site Description

- 1.2 The site comprises a small single storey outbuilding, currently in use as a garden store with an associated small patio area surrounding the building. A residential property known as the Sunday School is adjacent to the structure proposed for works.

Objectives of the Study

- 1.3 The objectives of this report are:
- To identify and describe any potential ecological receptors that may be present on site or within an identified zone of influence.
 - To identify and assess whether proposals may impact on the identified receptors.
 - To identify potential mitigation, compensation or enhancement measures if required.
 - To identify and detail further surveys if required.

Development Proposals

- 1.4 Proposals include the demolition of the existing single-storey structure followed by the development of a new two-storey garden store within the same footprint.

2. Methodology

Scope of Study

- 2.1 The site was surveyed to identify whether the following were present for legislative and planning purposes:
- Habitats of conservation value
 - Priority Habitats
 - Protected and Priority Species
- 2.2 The ecological characteristics of the site were reviewed to identify the scope of the assessment, with the zone of influence determined through professional judgement.
- 2.3 The survey area comprised the "site" defined within figure 2 (Appendix 3) and where access was available an approximate 50m buffer¹.
- 2.4 Access permitting, all potential bat roosting sites within the survey area were assessed.

Desk Study

- 2.5 Desk study was undertaken to assess the nature of the surrounding habitats and included:
- Assessment of aerial imagery and Ordnance Survey mapping.
 - A search of the MAGIC website² for designated sites and European protected species within 2km of the survey area.
 - Data searches submitted to the local Bat Group (if required).

Field Survey

Habitats/Protected Species

- 2.6 During the preliminary survey the site was checked for evidence of protected species and habitats were assessed for their potential to support such species. For this site, the development site comprises a built structure and as such the assessment focussed on the risk of bats being present within the structure.

¹ The survey buffer may be increased depending on the species present and their identified core sustenance zones.

² Multi Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (www.magic.gov.uk)

Bats

- 2.7 Survey effort has been based on the that provided by the Bat Conservation Trust Good Practice Survey Guidelines³.
- 2.8 Structures and trees within the site were inspected⁴, where access was available, for potential roosting features (PRFs) and to record any field signs, including bats, if present⁵.
- 2.9 Assessment follows the Bat Conservation Trust Guidelines⁶, which classifies the suitability (negligible, low, moderate or high) of the potential roosting, foraging and commuting habitats within the site. Full details of the classifications are provided within the table in Appendix 1.
- 2.10 Survey was undertaken by Mandy Rackham MCIEEM, an experienced bat surveyor who holds a Class 4 Natural England survey licence (2020-44857-CLS-CLS) with Zoe Dunnett QCIEEM.
- 2.11 The following equipment was utilised during survey:
- High power LED torch.
 - Binoculars.
 - Digital camera.
- 2.12 The survey was undertaken on the 5th January 2021 in the following weather conditions:

Table 1: Daytime Survey Conditions				
Date	Temperature	Cloud Cover	Precipitation	Wind Conditions
5/1/2021	0°C	10%	Dry	F0-1

Limitations to Survey

- 2.13 The loft area was inspected through an open access hatch, however a detailed inspection was not undertaken due to the structural instability of the structure and floor as noted by the client. A further dusk survey has been recommended and as such this limited access is not considered to be a significant constraint to the survey.

³ Collins, J. (ed) (2016) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd Edition). Bat Conservation Trust

⁴ It should be noted that assessment relates entirely on the structure or tree's suitability to support bats and or other protected species. Assessment must in no way be taken as an assessment of the structure's integrity or safety.

⁵ If bats are recorded during appropriate measures are undertaken to limit any potential disturbance

⁶ Collins, J. (ed) (2016) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd Edition). Bat Conservation Trust

Assessment Methodology

- 2.14 Guidance from the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) is utilised to provide habitat valuations.
- 2.15 The level of value of specific ecological receptors is assigned using a geographic frame of reference. For, example international value being most important (SACs, SPAs and pSPAs), then national (SSSIs), regional, county (LWS), district (LNR), local and lastly, within the immediate zone of influence of the site only (low).
- 2.16 In terms of species, for example breeding birds, should the population within the site constitute greater than 1% of the geographic population, it would be considered significant at that level. In addition, presence of designated sites, scarce species and or quality⁷/diversity of habitats are used to guide that valuation
- 2.17 Assessment methods for bats have been undertaken with reference to Wray et al. (2007)⁸, which correlates with the geographic frame of reference. Within which they define the relative rarity of each species based on the known distribution⁹ at the time and the value of the roost type, assuming that roosts such as feeding perches are of lower value that maternity roosts or sites that have a high level of fidelity.

⁷ Quality can be subjective and vary in different geographic areas. Reasoned professional judgement is therefore used to inform the assessment.

⁸ Wray et al (2007) Valuing Bats in Ecological Impact Assessment. In Practice. Based on a presentation at the Mammal Society – Specific Issues with Bats

⁹ It should be noted that there are regular changes to our understanding of distribution as further studies are undertaken.

3. Results

Desk Study

Designated Sites

- 3.1 A search of the Multi Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) Website¹⁰ indicated that there is a single National Nature Reserve and a single Site of Special Scientific Interest present within 2km of the development site.

Table 2: Designated Sites

Table 2: Designated Sites			
Designation	Site Name	Reason for Designation	Distance from Survey Area (Closest point)
NNR	High Leys	This reserve is an important remnant of a species rich meadow habitat. It supports a rich and diverse range of plants and invertebrate species. The reserve management has remained unchanged since the 1940s which has preserved the flower-rich grassland.	500m south east
SSSI	High Leys		500m south east
SSSI Impact Risk Zone (IRZ)			
The site is located within an identified SSSI impact Risk Zone for the above sites, however the small scale and nature of the works proposed do not fall into the identified risk categories.			

European Protected Species Licensing

- 3.2 A check of the MAGIC website identified no Natural England mitigation licences for bats have been granted with 2km.

General Land Use

- 3.3 A review of aerial imagery and Ordnance Survey mapping highlighted that the general land use in the surrounding area is dominated by arable fields with some woodland to the south. The site lies within the small rural village of Rowrah.

¹⁰ Multi Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) www.magic.gov.uk (Accessed January 2021)

Data Search

Local Bat Group

- 3.4 Due to the small scale of the site a data search with The Cumbrian Bat Group has not been commissioned at this preliminary stage. The requirement for a full data search will be confirmed following the results of the further recommended dusk vantage point survey.

Field Survey

Protected Species

Bats

- 3.5 The results of the bat risk assessment of the structure on site is provided below:

Table 3: Bat Risk Assessment

Overview of Roosting Opportunities

A small single storey building primarily of cut stone construction with a pitched roof covered with slate tiles. Gaps were noted under the ridge tiles and under some roosting tiles where they have lifted or slipped. Gaps were also noted around the timber batons to which the guttering is attached as well as gaps in mortar and brickwork. The client noted that a confirmed bat roost was present within the main residential structure adjacent to the garden store. Overall, the structure is considered to be of low suitability to roosting bats. Areas of grassland, woodland and hedgerows outside the site have the potential to provide suitable foraging and commuting opportunities as well as connectivity between the site and the local area.

External

- Single storey stone-built garden store. Large cracks in stonework and the northern aspect is at risk of collapse as noted by the client.
- Pitched roof with slate tiles. Some of which are lifted or slipped creating gaps under the tiles. The ridge tiles also have gaps between the ridge tiles themselves and missing mortar.
- There are gaps in the mortar at the apex on the gable ends and some gaps in the mortar throughout, particularly at the corners and on the northern aspect and at the wall tops.
- There is a small timber hatch style window on the western aspect. The timber is in poor condition with weather damage noted.
- The timber doors are in good condition and are well sealed.
- The metal guttering is fixed to timber batons with gaps between the timber and the wall tops noted.
- Ceramic ventilation pipes are built into the walls at the gable ends provide potential access and egress points.



Internal

- The building is currently used for storage.
- The roof is supported by timber rafters which are in good condition.
- There are gaps between the timber door and timber frame.
- An internal brick divide separates the building into two compartments.
- The roof is unlined, and a small number of items were being stored within the void at the time of the survey.
- The stonework and mortar is in overall poor condition with a large crack spanning the length of the wall. Elsewhere and within the loft void daylight was visible through the holes / cracks in the walls as well as along the wall tops.
- No field signs for bats were observed internally or externally. A single mouse dropping was recorded.



Local Foraging Habitats

There are foraging opportunities associated with the neighbouring gardens and fields in the immediate surroundings of the property. Within the local area the hedgerows and woodland to the south have the potential to provide higher quality foraging habitat. There is also a large waterbody approximately 350m south east which has the potential to provide additional foraging opportunities.



Commuting Routes

A network of hedgerows to the north of the building, and scattered street trees have the potential to provide commuting opportunities within the local area.

Additional Species Groups

Birds

- 3.6 No evidence of nesting birds was recorded; however the structure has the potential to provide suitable opportunities.

Other Protected Species

3.7 It is considered that other protected species are likely to be absent from the site.

4. Site Assessment

Assessment of Survey Findings

4.1 The assessment is based on survey effort undertaken to date.

Bats

4.2 The structure on site offers potential roosting locations associated with lifted and slipped tiles, gaps in mortar and stonework and gaps between the timber batons and wall tops.

4.3 Foraging and commuting opportunities within the immediate surroundings are limited however higher quality opportunities are present within the wider area.

4.4 Overall, the structure is considered to be of low suitability to roosting bats. No evidence of a maternity roost was noted during the surveys. The potential for the structure to be used during the hibernation period cannot be ruled out.

Nesting Birds

4.5 The site provides opportunities for nesting birds, although no evidence was recorded during the survey.

Other Protected Species

4.6 Other protected species are considered likely absent.

Designated Sites

4.7 The site is found within an identified SSSI Impact Risk Zone, however the nature and scale of the proposals do not fall into any of the identified risk categories.

5. Impacts

5.1 The following impacts are based on the survey work to date and the understanding that the Client wishes to undertake the following:

- Proposals include the demolition of the current single-storey garden store followed by a rebuild of a two-storey garden store with roof lights.

5.2 As a result of the assessment completed and the nature of the proposed works, the likely impacts, without appropriate avoidance measures, mitigation and/or compensation scheme, are:

- Potential disturbance and harm to roosting bats, should they be present at the time of the works.
- Potential destruction of bat roosts through the demolition of the current building, should any be present.
- Potential harm and/or disturbance to nesting birds, should works be undertaken in the breeding bird season (March to August inclusive).

6. Recommendations

Further Survey

6.1 As detailed within the Bat Conservation Trust Bat Surveys, Good Practice Guidelines¹¹, the following additional surveys are recommended to ensure a robust assessment of bat activity at the site:

- One dusk emergence survey should be undertaken within the peak survey season (May to August inclusive).

6.2 Based on the nature of the site and the proposed works, no further survey work for other protected species or habitats (other than pre-commencement checks detailed below) are considered necessary for this site.

Avoidance Measures

6.3 The following measures should be incorporated into the design of the scheme to avoid impacts on wildlife:

- External lighting that may affect the site's suitability for bats will be avoided. If required this will be limited to low level, avoiding use of high intensity security lighting. The final lighting strategy will be determined by the results of the bat activity survey work detailed above.
- Alternatives to timber treatments that are injurious to mammals will be sought and used on site (see http://www.jncc.gov.uk/pdf/batwork_manualpt4.pdf).
- Demolition works will not be undertaken during the nesting bird season (March to August inclusive) unless the site is checked by an appropriately experienced ecologist and nests are confirmed to be absent.

Mitigation Strategy

6.4 A detailed mitigation strategy cannot be produced until further survey work, highlighted above is completed, however key elements of this strategy are likely to include:

- Application for a mitigation licence should a bat roost be present.
- Removal of key features around potential bat roosting features by hand.
- Supervision of the removal of key features by a suitably qualified ecologist (should a roost be present).

¹¹ Collins, J. (ed) (2016) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd Edition). Bat Conservation Trust

Compensation Scheme

- 6.5 A detailed compensation scheme cannot be completed until the further survey work, highlighted above is completed however key elements of this strategy are likely to include:
- The incorporation of opportunities for roosting bats and nesting birds within the development.

Appendix 1 – Bat Suitability and Survey Effort

Classifications of suitability are based on those provided within the Bat Conservation Trust Good Practice Survey Guidelines¹², with the table below taken from page 35 of the guidelines (table 4.1).

Table 4: Guidelines for assessing the potential suitability of proposed development sites for bats (based on the presence of habitat features within the landscape, to be applied using professional judgement)		
Suitability	Description	
	Roosting Habitats	Commuting and foraging habitats
Negligible	Negligible habitat features on site, likely to be used by roosting bats	Negligible habitat features on site, likely to be used by commuting and foraging bats
Low	<p>A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by individual bats opportunistically.</p> <p>However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions^a 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 or hibernation^b).</p> <p>A tree of sufficient size and age to contain PRFs but with none seen from the ground or features seen with only very limited roosting potential^c.</p>	<p>Habitat that could be used by small numbers of commuting bats such as gappy hedgerow or unvegetated stream, but isolated, i.e not very well connected to the surrounding landscape by other habitat.</p> <p>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.</p>
Moderate	A structure or tree with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions ^a and surrounding habitat but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status (with respect to roost type only – the assessments in this table are made irrespective of species conservation status, which is established after presence is confirmed).	<p>Continuous habitat connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for commuting such as lines of trees and scrub or linked back gardens.</p> <p>Habitat that is connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for foraging such as trees, scrub, grassland or water.</p>
High	A structure or tree 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 size, shelter, protection, conditions ^a and surrounding habitat	<p>Continuous high-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by commuting bats such as river valleys, streams, hedgerows, lines of trees and woodland edge.</p> <p>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 watercourse and grazed parkland.</p>

¹² Collins, J. (ed) (2016) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd Edition). Bat Conservation Trust

		Site is close to and connected to known roosts.
<p>a. For example in terms of temperature, humidity, height above ground level, light levels or levels of disturbance.</p> <p>b. 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., 2015). This phenomenon requires some research in the UK but ecologists should be aware of potential for larger numbers of this species to be present during the autumn and winter in larger buildings in highly urbanised environments.</p> <p>c. The system of categorisation aligns with BS 8596:2015 Surveying for bats in trees and woodland (BSI, 2015)</p>		

The classification of the suitability relates to the level of further survey recommended.

Table 5: Survey effort and timing depending on suitability of the structure or tree (Tables 7.1-7.3 in the BCT Guidelines)			
	Low roost suitability	Moderate suitability	High roost suitability
Survey Effort	<p>One survey visit</p> <p>One dusk emergence or dawn re-entry survey</p>	<p>Two separate visits</p> <p>One dusk emergence and a separate dawn re-entry survey</p>	<p>Three separate visits</p> <p>At least one dusk emergence and a separate dawn re-entry survey. The third can be either dusk or dawn.</p>
Timings	<p>May-August (structures)</p> <p>No further survey (trees)</p>	<p>May to September. At least one must be in the optimum period (May to August)</p>	<p>May to September. two must be in the optimum period (May to August)</p>
If bats are recorded	<p>If bats emerge during surveys, the survey schedule will be adjusted to increase the survey effort so that enough information can be collected to characterise the roost and provide data should a Natural England Licence be required.</p>		

Appendix 2 – Policy and Legislation

Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)¹³

The revised National Planning Policy Framework sets out the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. It provides a framework within which locally-prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan. The key paragraphs from the relating to the natural environment are detailed below:

Table 6: Ecologically Relevant Paragraphs of the NPPF	
Paragraph	Statement
170	<p>Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan); b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland; c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate; d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures; e) preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.
171	Plans should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework ¹⁴ ; take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure; and plan for the enhancement of natural capital at a catchment or landscape scale across local authority boundaries.
172	Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads ¹⁵ . The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited. Planning permission should be refused for major

¹³ NPPF February 2019 (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>)

¹⁴ Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality.

¹⁵ English National Parks and the Broads: UK Government Vision and Circular 2010 provides further guidance and information about their statutory purposes, management and other matters.

Table 6: Ecologically Relevant Paragraphs of the NPPF	
Paragraph	Statement
	<p>development¹⁶ other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy; b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and <p>any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.</p>
173	<p>Within areas defined as Heritage Coast (and that do not already fall within one of the designated areas mentioned in paragraph 172), planning policies and decisions should be consistent with the special character of the area and the importance of its conservation. Major development within a Heritage Coast is unlikely to be appropriate, unless it is compatible with its special character.</p>
174	<p>To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity¹⁷; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation¹⁸; and promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.
175	<p>When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), b) adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused; c) development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest; d) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons¹⁹ and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be

¹⁶ For the purposes of paragraphs 172 and 173, whether a proposal is 'major development' is a matter for the decision maker, taking into account its nature, scale and setting, and whether it could have a significant adverse impact on the purposes for which the area has been designated or defined.

¹⁷ Circular 06/2005 provides further guidance in respect of statutory obligations for biodiversity and geological conservation and their impact within the planning system.

¹⁸ Where areas that are part of the Nature Recovery Network are identified in plans, it may be appropriate to specify the types of development that may be suitable within them.

¹⁹ For example, infrastructure projects (including nationally significant infrastructure projects, orders under the Transport and Works Act and hybrid bills), where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat.

Table 6: Ecologically Relevant Paragraphs of the NPPF	
Paragraph	Statement
	supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity.
176	The following should be given the same protection as habitats sites: a) potential Special Protection Areas and possible Special Areas of Conservation; b) listed or proposed Ramsar sites ²⁰ ; and sites identified, or required, as compensatory measures for adverse effects on habitats sites, potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation, and listed or proposed Ramsar sites.
177	The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where the plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a habitats site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects), unless an appropriate assessment has concluded that the plan or project will not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site.

Government Circular ODPM 06/2005 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation²¹ (England only)

This Circular provides administrative guidance on the application of the law relating to planning and nature conservation as it applies in England.

Part IV - Conservation of Species protected by Law details that the presence of a protected species is a material consideration when considering a development proposal that may result in harm to the species or its habitat and that planning authorities must have regard to species protected under the Habitat Regulations.

It goes on to say that: *it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision. The need to ensure ecological surveys are carried out should therefore only be left to coverage under planning conditions in exceptional circumstances, with the result that the surveys are carried out after planning permission has been granted.*

Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006^{22 23}

Section 40 – To conserve biodiversity

Section 40 puts a duty on public authorities to conserve biodiversity when undertaking its duties and functions,

²⁰ Potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation and proposed Ramsar sites are sites on which Government has initiated public consultation on the scientific case for designation as a Special Protection Area, candidate Special Area of Conservation or Ramsar site.

²¹ ODPM Circular 06/2005 Office of the Deputy Prime Minister Eland House, Bressenden Place, London SW1E 5DU Government Circular: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation – Statutory Obligations and their Impact within the Planning System

²² <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/16/section/40>

²³ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/16/section/41>

Section 41 – Biodiversity list and Action

Section 41 – Requires the Secretary of State to publish a list of the living organisms and types of habitat which in the Secretary of State's opinion are of principal importance for the purpose of conserving biodiversity. They must also take such steps as appear to the Secretary of State to be reasonably practicable to further the conservation of the living organisms and types of habitat included in any list published under this section or promote the taking by others of such steps.

The 2007 lists were superseded by the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework.

Table 7: UK Priority Habitats (excl. marine habitats)²⁴	
UK BAP broad habitat	UK BAP priority habitat
Rivers and Streams	Rivers
Standing Open Waters and Canals	Oligotrophic and Dystrophic Lakes
	Ponds
	Mesotrophic Lakes
	Eutrophic Standing Waters
	Aquifer Fed Naturally Fluctuating Water Bodies
Arable and Horticultural	Arable Field Margins
Boundary and Linear Features	Hedgerows
Broadleaved, Mixed and Yew Woodland	Traditional Orchards
	Wood-Pasture and Parkland
	Upland Oakwood
	Lowland Beech and Yew Woodland
	Upland Mixed Ashwoods
	Wet Woodland
	Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland
	Upland Birchwoods
Coniferous Woodland	Native Pine Woodlands
Acid Grassland	Lowland Dry Acid Grassland
Calcareous Grassland	Lowland Calcareous Grassland
	Upland Calcareous Grassland
Neutral Grassland	Lowland Meadows
	Upland Hay Meadows
Improved Grassland	Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh
Dwarf Shrub Heath	Lowland Heathland
	Upland Heathland
Fen, Marsh and Swamp	Upland Flushes, Fens and Swamps
	Purple Moor Grass and Rush Pastures

²⁴ <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-5706>

	Lowland Fens
	Reedbeds
Bogs	Lowland Raised Bog
	Blanket Bog
Montane Habitats	Mountain Heaths and Willow Scrub
Inland Rock	Inland Rock Outcrop and Scree Habitats
	Calaminarian Grasslands
	Open Mosaic Habitats on Previously Developed Land
	Limestone Pavements
Supralittoral Rock	Maritime Cliff and Slopes
Supralittoral Sediment	Coastal Vegetated Shingle
	Machair
	Coastal Sand Dunes

Protected Species Legislation

European Protected Species

European Protected Species (EPS) are species of plants and animals (other than birds) protected by law throughout the European Union. They are listed in Annexes II and IV of the European Habitats Directive and receive full protection under The Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017 (as amended). This make it an offence to:

- deliberately capture, injure or kill any European Protected Species (EPS)
- to deliberately disturb any European Protected Species (EPS);
- to damage or destroy a breeding site or place of rest or shelter used by any European Protected Species (EPS).

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) adds further protection by making it an offence to intentionally or recklessly²⁵ disturb an EPS while it is occupying a structure or place which it uses for shelter or protection, or to obstruct access to any structure or place the species uses for shelter or protection.

²⁵ Under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act) extended the protection to cover reckless damage or disturbance

Table 8: European Protected Species relevant to the UK			
Animals		Plants	
All bat species	Great Crested Newt	Shore dock	Creeping marshwort
Large blue butterfly	Otter	Killarney fern	Slender naiad
Wild cat	Smooth snake	Early gentian	Fen Orchid
Dolphins, porpoises and whales (all species)	Sturgeon fish	Lady's slipper	Floating-leaved water plantain
Dormouse	Natterjack toad	Yellow marsh saxifrage	
Sand lizard	Pool Frog		
Fisher's Estuarine Moth	Snail, Lesser Whirlpool Ram's-horn		
Marine turtles			

Other Protected Species

Table 9: Other Protected Species		
Species	Legislation	Level of Protection
Birds	Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)	<p>Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) it is an offence if any person:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> intentionally kills, injures or takes any wild bird intentionally takes, damages or destroys the nest of any wild bird whilst that nest is in use or being built; intentionally takes, damages or destroys eggs of any wild bird; <p>Wild birds listed on Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) are protected from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> intentional or reckless disturbance whilst it is building a nest or is in, on or near a nest containing eggs or young; disturbance of dependent young

Appendix 3 – Figures



