
St. Gabriel's Convent, Liverpool

Protected Species Survey Report (Bats).

Compiled by Ecology Services Ltd.

Members of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management.

on behalf of

St. Gabriel's (Liverpool) Limited

June 2015



1 Church Row Chambers
Longton
Preston
Lancashire PR4 5PN.

tel: 01772 614932
fax: 01772 614930
email: info@ecologyservices.co.uk
web: www.ecologyservices.co.uk

Written by: ZF
Checked: LES
Approved: LES

Contents	Page No
1.0 Introduction	2
2.0 Statutory and Planning Context	2
3.0 Methodology	3
4.0 Survey Results	5
5.0 Conclusion	11
6.0 Implications and Recommendations	11
7.0 References	12

Tables

Table 1: Description of Buildings

Maps

Map 1: Site Plan

Appendices

Appendix 1: Table 8.5 Minimum no. of Presence/Absence survey visits required to provide confidence in negative preliminary roost assessment results for buildings, built structures and trees in summer

Appendix 2: Site Photographs

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Ecology Services Limited was commissioned by St. Gabriel's (Liverpool) Limited in May 2015, to carry out a bat investigation of buildings at St. Gabriel's Convent, Beaconsfield Road, Liverpool, L25 6EG; National Grid Reference; (NGR) 341879, 387574. See Map 1 Showing the location of the site.
- 1.2 The aim of the survey was to:
 - Undertake an inspection and assessment survey of the buildings to ascertain if potential or evidence of use existed for any bat species.
 - And if found, to determine if more detailed surveys are required.
- 1.3 It is understood that the proposals at the site involve building residential properties in the grounds and converting the convent into apartments.
- 1.4 As part of the Local Authority's environmental policies, surveys are required to be undertaken on schemes which may have the potential to affect protected species, i.e. bats.

2.0 Statutory and Planning Context

Bats and their Requirements

- 2.1 All British bats and their roosts are afforded protection under the 1981 Wildlife & Countryside Act (as amended) and are listed in Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010 (as amended).
- 2.2 When dealing with cases where a European Protected Species (EPS) (all UK bats) may be affected, a Local Authority is a 'competent authority' within the meaning of regulation 7 of the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2010 (as amended). The Local Authority must therefore exercise their functions under the provisions made within the 2010 Regulations and planning decisions should only be made when European Protected Species are fully taken into account.
- 2.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places a clear responsibility on Local Planning Authorities to conserve and enhance biodiversity and to encourage on the consideration that should be given to Protected Species where they may be affected by development. The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) Circular 06/2005 provides administrative guidance on the application of the law in relation to planning and nature conservation. This is supported by a guide to good practice entitled 'Planning for Biodiversity and Geological Conservation: Building in Biodiversity' in which paragraphs 5.34 and 5.35 identify that species such as bats are highly dependant upon built structures for survival and that roosts can be easily incorporated into existing and new developments/conversions to benefit these species.
- 2.4 A Local Planning Authority (LPA) has a duty to ensure that protected species and habitats within the UK are a "material consideration" in the determination of a planning application. Therefore, a LPA is unlikely to determine an application until all relevant information relating to protected species or habitats is submitted in support of the application. Relevant information includes; adequate surveys and a method statement (the latter only if required) for their approval which will need to be submitted along with the planning application.
- 2.5 Where bats are affected by development then a licence to derogate from the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) would be required. European Protected Species (EPS) mitigation licence applications are processed and issued by

Natural England and the EPS licence can only be applied for, once planning permission is granted, if planning permission is required.

2.6 Natural England may grant an EPS mitigation licence for the purpose specified in paragraphs 2 of the Regulation. The purposes are:-

- 53(2)e preserving public health or safety or other imperative reason of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequence of primary importance for the environment.
- 53(2)f preventing the spread of disease.
- 53(9)a that there is no satisfactory alternative.
- 53(9)b that the action authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable status in their natural range.

2.7 A bat roost may be defined in several ways:

- a) Maternity roost
- b) Summer roost
- c) Mating roost
- d) Feeding roost
- e) Hibernation roost
- f) Transitional or temporary (night/day) roost

2.8 Roost selection is often closely correlated, to suitable foraging habitat within a reasonable commuting distance from the roost. Different sites are used throughout their active season which is dependent upon insect densities and abundance. Climatic conditions can also affect their ability to successfully forage. All British bats are insectivorous.

3.0 Methodology

Inspection & Assessment Survey Method

Buildings/Structures

3.1 The optimum time to investigate buildings for evidence of a bat roost is between May and August. Inspections and assessments may be conducted outside of this time and can often provide conclusive results which can save expense and time for Planning Applicants.

Buildings/Structure Roost Criteria

3.2 Roost assessment for buildings/structures follows the below system which is based upon the Bat Conservation Trust 'Bat Surveys: Good Practice Guidelines' (2012).

"Negligible" No features likely to be used by bats (roosting).

"Low" No features that could be used by bats (roosting).
Small number of potential (opportunistic) roosts, isolated habitat, isolated site that is not connected by suitable linear features.

"Moderate" Several potential roosts, habitat could be used by foraging bats and the site is connected to suitable habitat with the wider survey area.

"High" Significant features for roosting bats, high quality habitat for foraging, site is connected with the wider landscape and is close to known roost sites or bat foraging/commuting.

"Confirmed" Evidence that the building is being used by bats; bats seen roosting, droppings, carcasses, feeding remains, bats are recorded/observed, or bats are heard within the building/structure.

- 3.3 For this methodology it should be borne in mind that inspections can also be inconclusive and if potential was found or the results of the survey were undetermined, then recommendations would indicate the requirement for further detailed activity surveys. Further activity (dusk emergence/pre dawn re-entry) surveys can only be undertaken at the site, during the breeding season for bats, which is between May and August inclusive. The results, conclusions and recommendations are based upon surveyor experience and knowledge of bat ecology.
- 3.4 A thorough exterior inspection of the buildings for bat roosting and potential was undertaken. Signs surveyed for were droppings, dead bats, feeding remains (beetle, moth and butterfly remains), urine staining and grease marks around crevices and down walls, and any noises such as scratching and audible bat calls. A Clulite one million candlepower lamp and close focussing binoculars were used to check any features of interest not accessible. High resolution photographs and videos were taken for later review.
- 3.5 During the survey the surrounding area was assessed in relation to suitable habitat that may be of value to bats.
- 3.6 Surveys were conducted following "The Bat Workers Manual "(JNCC 2004), "The Bat Mitigation Guidelines" (EN 2004) and the Bat Conservation Trust Bat Survey Good Practice Guidelines (2012) recommendations.

Personnel

- 3.7 All daytime survey works were undertaken by Principal Ecologist Mrs. L. Eccles-Sargeant, who holds a Bat Class Licence (Registration number CLS00572) and experienced Ecologist Mrs. Z. Foster, soon to be Class licensed.

Timing

- 3.8 The daytime survey was conducted on the 27th of May 2015 when the buildings that will be affected by the proposed works were inspected for potential places that may be of value to bats and if evidence of use was present.
- 3.9 The daytime survey was conducted at a time when bats will be active having recently come out of hibernation. Feeding will occur on most nights and roost sites, in particular suitable maternity roosts for females, are being sought. Evidence of bat occupation is likely to be detected, should they be present at the site.

Constraints

- 3.10 Internal access into the buildings was not gained therefore a full inspection of the buildings was not completed.
- 3.11 It was not possible to visually observe all of the roof of Building 2 due to vegetation, or of the former Convent (Building 5) due to the height of the building and the shallow slope of the roof.
- 3.12 Overall, there are limitations to the survey undertaken and these have been taken into consideration when conclusions, impacts and recommendations have been made.

4.0 Survey Results

Desktop Study

UK Species of Principal Importance

- 4.1 Section 41 of the Natural Environmental and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC) lists several bat species as UK Species of Principal Importance, as follows:

- Noctule (*Nyctalus noctula*)
- Soprano Pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*)
- Brown Long-eared (*Plecotus auritus*)
- Lesser Horseshoe (*Rhinolophus hipposideros*)
- Greater Horseshoe (*Rhinolophus ferrumequinum*)
- Barbastelle (*Barbastella barbastellus*)
- Bechstein's (*Myotis bechsteinii*)

National Status

- 4.2 There are 18 species of bat that are native to the United Kingdom. Little is known about the status of most species although the available evidence suggests a general decline in populations nationally (Harris, S. et al. 1995). The commonest species of bats are the pipistrelle family (*Pipistrellus* sp), although these are also estimated to have declined in numbers by 70% between 1978 and 1993.

Local Biodiversity Action Plan

- 4.3 North Merseyside Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAP) list eight bat species as being present in North Merseyside, these are as follows:-

- Brown Long-eared
- Whiskered (*Myotis mystacinus*)
- Brandt's (*Myotis brandtii*)
- Daubenton's (*Myotis daubentonii*)
- Noctule
- Common Pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*)
- Soprano Pipistrelle
- Natterer's (*Myotis nattereri*)

- 4.4 Nine native species of bat have been recorded in North Merseyside, which include the above list, with the addition of Nathusius Pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus nathusii*). In addition to this an individual record of the non-native Savi's Pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus savii*) was recorded which is thought to have arrived in the UK on a ship bound for Liverpool.

Local Status

- 4.5 Populations of bats in many parts of North Merseyside are comparable in size and importance to some of the best areas in the country and the size and changes are believed to mirror national trends.
- 4.6 Pipistrelle bats occur in all four of the Merseyside districts and are widely distributed in North Merseyside, being the most encountered bats roosting within built structures and foraging in urban areas.
- 4.7 Brown long-eared and Noctule are found throughout North Merseyside but are less common.

- 4.8 The distribution of Daubenton's, which feed predominately over water are localised with records from Sefton, Liverpool and St Helens.
- 4.9 Whiskered/Brandt's and Natterer's are rare locally, Whiskered being recorded in Sefton and St. Helens and Natterer's only recorded in St. Helens so far.

Inspection & Assessment Survey Results

- 4.10 The site is located in a residential area to the north-west of Woolton, to the east of Calderstones and to the west of Gateacre. The convent is set in the old Knolle Park and the land directly surrounding the site is composed of landscaped flowerbeds, grassland and areas of mature trees. The site is bordered by Beaconsfield Road to the north and Church Road to the east and there are residential properties to the south and west.
- 4.11 There are a number of features that would provide suitable habitat for roosting and foraging bats within the wider survey area. There are numerous parks located to the north and north-east within 2km of the site. Lee Park Golf course is located 1.5km to the east and contains scattered trees and water-courses. The 14 acre Reynolds Park is 125m to the south-east of the site and contains a wildflower meadow. Both Woolton Wood and Allerton Tower Park are located to the south approximately 1km away. Allerton Park Golf course is 700m to the south-west and is joined to Netherley Park. Calderstones Park is approximately 775m to the west of the site, this 94 acre park contains woodlands, grasslands and a large lake. Approximately 3.75km to the west is Sefton Park, which covers 235 acres and contains numerous water-bodies, grassland and scattered trees. To the north-west there is Black Wood (400m away), Childwall Woods, which is a 39 acre woodland (c.750m away) and Hope Park which is 1.2km away.
- 4.12 Overall, habitats within the immediate and wider survey area are considered to be of high value for bat species. Where suitable habitat is present in close proximity to buildings then there is an increased use of the buildings for roost sites given the presence of suitable foraging habitat.
- 4.13 A description of the buildings can be found in the table 1 below and overleaf.

Table 1: Description of Buildings/Structures.

Building 1a and 1b
Description:
Buildings 1a & b is composed of two connected, two storey, brick-built buildings. The roofs are asymmetrical and gable-ended, they are single pitched roofs which are covered in concrete roofing tiles, ridge tiles are present. Wooden fascia and soffit boards are present. The windows and doors are composed of uPVC and the buildings are connected via a single storey flat roofed building. No access was gained internally but a previous survey had revealed a large roof void in each building.
Roost potential signs:
Where the two buildings join, there are numerous gaps at the ridge tiles and along the roof valley. The western building (B1a), has a hole and minor gaps in the brickwork mortar on the northern elevation. On the eastern elevation there is a large gap underneath the soffit which is c.2m in length. On the southern elevation of B1b there is a missing ridge tile and areas of missing mortar along the ridge. There is also a minor gaps in the concrete roofing tiles. The soffits are tight apart from a hole which is present to the western side of the southern facing gable end. On the southern gable, there is a missing section of soffit to the south-east corner of the lower gable. On the eastern elevation there is a hole in the soffit board and where the buildings join, there is a gap in the brickwork adjacent to the door, where a pipe enters the building. On the western elevation there is a louvered door which has no mesh behind the louvers thus allowing access inside.

There was debris on the ground showing the area had not been cleaned prior to arrival. No droppings or any other evidence of the presence of bats was identified. Internal access was not gained into the building so only a thorough examination of the exterior of this building was undertaken.

The previous survey on the building in 2011 discovered multiple bat droppings in the roof void of B1b at the southern gable end. Therefore this building contains **a confirmed bat roost**.

Building 2

Description:

A single storey, rendered building located to the north of Buildings 1a and 1b. The roof is of a hipped construction and is covered in roofing slates. There are wooden soffit and fascia boards present on all elevations which are tight. The door and window frames are composed of wood.

There are two flat, corrugated asbestos roofed garages constructed of formed concrete approximately 1m to the south of Building 2. Fascia boards are present on some elevations and the garage doors are composed of metal.

No access was gained internally.

Roost potential signs:

It was difficult to see the roof of the building due to the height of the vegetation and the gentle slope of the roof. On the western elevation, there is a gap at the roofline directly below the roofing slates but above the wooden fascia board and there is a gap underneath the fascia which is approximately 30cm long.

There are gaps present at the fascia boards on the southern elevation of the garages and a gap at the north-west corner.

No droppings or any other evidence of the presence of bats was identified which suggested present or historic use. Internal access was not gained into the building or the garages so only a thorough examination of the exterior of these buildings was undertaken.

The building is considered to have **low to moderate** potential for roosting bats.

Building 3

Description:

"Woodview" is a three storey, brick-built building attached to the main convent building (B5). The majority of the roof is flat. The walls are thick, with no cavities present and the brickwork is in relative good condition. There are single-glazed, wooden sash windows and air-vents present. There are three security lights located on the southern elevation. There is a basement present which contains the boiler-room. Access can be gained into the boiler room through a louvered door which has no mesh behind the louvers.

At the eastern elevation there is a single storey brick-built extension with a gable roof covered in slate tiles.

No access was gained internally.

Roost potential signs:

The brickwork on the main building is relatively tight, there are some minor gaps in the brickwork and no mesh behind the slatted air vents on the southern elevation. On the western elevation in the porch, there is a large square hole in the wooden ceiling board which leads into a space above the porch. There was possible bird nesting material seen in the hole and on the ground below.

On the eastern single storey extension there is minor lifting of the roof slates and missing mortar along the ridge tiles. At the western gable there are gaps within the capping stones and the brickwork. There are gaps at the roof line, between the wooden roof joists and the brickwork on the northern and southern elevations, some of the gaps are cobwebbed and some are cobweb free.

There was debris on the ground showing the area had not been cleaned prior to arrival. No droppings or any other evidence of the presence of bats was identified which suggested present or historic use.

No access was gained internally.
The building is considered to have low to moderate potential for roosting bats.
Building 4a and 4b
Description:
<p>Building 4a is a single storey, flat roofed, single garage with rendered walls and a metal door. There is a bricked up window located on the eastern elevation.</p> <p>Building 4b is a single storey, pitched roof workshop located next to Building 4a. The roof is covered in felt, the walls are constructed of concrete panels and there is a metal garage door in the western elevation. The doors and window frames are composed of wood.</p>
Roost potential signs:
<p>Building 4a has a pipe leading inside the wall on the western elevation.</p> <p>There are gaps at the roof line of Building 4b but they did not recede and were heavily cobwebbed.</p> <p>There was debris on the ground showing the area had not been cleaned prior to arrival. No droppings or any other evidence of the presence of bats was identified which suggested present or historic use.</p> <p>No internal access was gained in to either building 4a or 4b.</p> <p>The building is considered to have negligible to low potential for roosting bats.</p>
Building 5
Description:
<p>A grand two storey, Grade II listed, former convent building. The main roof is not visible from the ground due to the height of the building and the shallow slope of the roof. From reviewing aerial images, the roof appears to comprise of three main ridges that are hipped at either end, with sections of flat roof. The roof line on the south-eastern elevation is covered in bitumen roofing felt. There are ornamental stone fascias present and areas of flat, vertical lead flashing. The walls are rendered and painted. There is a colonnaded porch located on the north-western elevation. The sash windows and doors are wooden-framed. There is a large bay window on the south-eastern elevation. On the north-western elevation there is a lower basement and to the north there is a carved stone 'grotto' area. On the south-eastern elevation there is a flat-roofed extension which contains a cellar.</p> <p>Building 5 is attached to Building 3 by a three storey brick-built structure (possibly housing a lift) with fascia boards at the roof line, wooden framed windows and air vents.</p>
Roost potential signs:
<p>The western part of the building is relatively tight, but there are gaps present in the brickwork of the three storey 'lift' structure. On the north-eastern elevation there is a gap under the wooden fascia board at the roof line and there are gaps above the windows.</p> <p>The chimney on the south-eastern elevation has render missing and there are gaps in the brickwork beneath. There are gaps present in the louvered air vents and underneath the fascia boards on the south-eastern elevation. There are some minor gaps underneath the ornamental, stone fascias.</p> <p>On the eastern elevation there are gaps at the roof line underneath the bitumastic felt and where the lead flashing has lifted. There are also gaps where the air vent covers are absent. In the flat roofed extension there are gaps under the lifted lead flashing and there is a large gap in the door leading into the cellar.</p> <p>It was difficult to see parts of the northern elevation due to trees.</p> <p>There was debris on the ground showing the area had not been cleaned prior to arrival. No droppings or any other evidence of the presence of bats was identified which suggested present or historic use.</p> <p>No internal access was gained.</p> <p>The building is considered to have low to moderate potential for roosting bats.</p>
Building 6

Description:
<p>A brick-built building which varies in height between one and two storeys. It has a flat, felt-covered roof with a metal trim around the edge and a wooden structure located on the roof which may be a water tower. There are wooden fascia boards and weather boards present. The windows are framed in wood and have concrete slabs above them.</p> <p>On the south-western elevation there is a small lean to porch, joined to a covered, flat roofed walkway which links the building to Building 5.</p>
Roost potential signs:
<p>The fascia and weather boards are rotting though in places, the metal trim may restrict the access underneath the weather boards.</p> <p>There are several gaps above the windows along the south-western elevation and above the upper window on the western elevation. Some of the gaps were cobwebbed but some were cobweb free.</p> <p>On the south-western elevation there are gaps between the upper floor concrete slab and the window panel.</p> <p>There was debris on the ground showing the area had not been cleaned prior to arrival. No droppings or any other evidence of the presence of bats was identified which suggested present or historic use.</p> <p>Internal access was not gained.</p> <p>The building is considered to have low to moderate potential for roosting bats.</p>
Building 7
Description:
<p>A single storey, brick-built double garage and storage building. The roof is of slate and has bitumastic felt underneath and is open to the sun. There are two metal doors located in the northern elevation. The southern and eastern walls are covered by thick ivy.</p>
Roost potential signs:
<p>There are slipped, lifted and broken roofing slates. There is a small gap to the east of the eastern metal door that recedes at least 10cm into the brickwork.</p> <p>There was debris on the ground showing the area had not been cleaned prior to arrival. No droppings or any other evidence of the presence of bats was identified which suggested present or historic use.</p> <p>Internal access was not gained.</p> <p>The building is considered to have low to moderate potential for roosting bats.</p>
Building 8
Description:
<p>'The Lodge' is located at the north-eastern corner of the site and is a small rendered folly-type structure. The ridged gable roof is covered in slate tiles. There are stone columns at the front, as well as boarded-up windows and doors. A small extension is attached to the western elevation of the Lodge.</p> <p>Parts of this building have collapsed and the roof is missing.</p>
Roost potential signs:
<p>There are lifted ridge tiles and areas of missing mortar on the roof. There is a crack in the stonework on the eastern elevation where part of the outer stonework bulges. The metal sheeting which is covering the windows and doors on the western elevation has slipped and there is a large gap at the top allowing access into the building.</p> <p>There was debris on the ground showing the area had not been cleaned prior to arrival. No droppings or any other evidence of the presence of bats was identified which suggested present or historic use. There is evidence of nesting birds in the entrance porch to the Lodge.</p> <p>Internal access was not gained.</p>

The building is considered to have low potential for roosting bats.
--

5.0 Conclusion

- 5.1 The previous inspection and assessment undertaken in 2011, found Buildings (1a & 1b) 1b to contain to **a confirmed common pipistrelle roost**. The initial inspection survey undertaken in 2015, revealed that the potential was still present for the buildings to still be used by roosting bats, but unfortunately internal access was not possible so evidence of recent use of the buildings by bats could not be viewed.
- 5.2 The inspection and assessment survey found the buildings contain varying levels of potential, as follows:-
- Buildings 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7 were found to contain **low to moderate** bat roost potential.
 - Building 8 was found to contain **low** bat roost potential.
 - Buildings 4a and 4b were found to contain **negligible to low** bat roost potential.
- 5.3 No evidence of past or present use of the building by roosting bats was identified.

6.0 Implications and Recommendations

Buildings

- 6.1 Buildings (1a&b) 1b contains a confirmed common pipistrelle roost and Buildings 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7 contain low to moderate potential to support roosting bat species, with Building 8 containing low potential to support roosting bats. Therefore there may be implications with regard to bats and the proposed development and further activity surveys are required to establish if bats are using these buildings.
- 6.2 The Bat Surveys Good Practice Guidelines produced by the Bat Conservation Trust (2012), recommends a minimum number of presence/absence activity surveys which are required to provide confidence in negative preliminary roost assessments results from buildings and built structures in summer. These are determined for each building by the level of potential assigned to the individual structure. See Appendix 1 for the full table.
- 6.3 For building 1a&b, containing the confirmed roost, three dusk emergence and/or pre-dawn re-entry surveys are required to be undertaken during May to September. The optimum time period is May to August. This level of survey should be sufficient to advise upon mitigation and follows Natural England's guidance for survey levels.
- 6.4 For buildings with low to moderate roost potential, two dusk emergence and/or pre-dawn re-entry surveys are recommended during May to September. The optimum time period is May to August. This level of survey is deemed sufficient to prove presence or absence.
- 6.5 For buildings with low roost potential, one dusk emergence or dawn re-entry survey is recommended during May to September. The optimum time period is May to August. This level of survey is deemed sufficient to prove presence or absence.
- 6.6 If bats are discovered emerging from any of the buildings containing low to moderate or low potential during the surveys, then the survey schedule should be appropriately adjusted to increase the survey effort so that sufficient information can be collected.

- 6.7 Activity surveys are required to gather specific information over the active bat season. Several visits are required as bats, particularly pipistrelle, often have more than one roost and do not necessarily occupy a single roost over the entire active season. Therefore the survey visits will need to be spaced out over the active season.
- 6.8 If the works require planning approval, the Local Planning Authority will require the results of the activity surveys in support of any Planning Application, in line with current Planning Policy for both a presence or absent result.
- 6.9 If bats or evidence of a roost/s is/are located during the activity survey work then a method statement will also be required to support a planning application to ensure that there is no detrimental affect upon roosting bats.
- 6.10 If a bat roost/s is/are located during the activity surveys, then the work at the site would be delayed until such time that a European Protected Species Licence (EPSL) is applied for and granted to legally permit work to commence which would affect bats or their roost.
- 6.11 A European Protected Species Licence can only be applied for once planning permission is gained, if planning permission is required. Natural England, the licensing authority, will require the species, numbers and use of a roost to be ascertained before granting a licence and there may be delays in obtaining and EPSL and time constraints as to when mitigation can be undertaken.
- 6.12 For buildings 4a & 4b with negligible to low potential, not further surveys are considered to be required, due to the very low level of potential. As a precautionary approach, it is advised that if at any time a bat/s or evidence of bat/s is/are suspected or found, all works must cease immediately and advice should be sought from either Natural England or the acting Consultant.
- 6.13 As bats are mobile creatures and can form new roosts at any time if works are not started within one year of this report then it may be necessary to repeat certain surveys.

Other: Breeding Birds

- 6.14 The site also contains suitable breeding bird habitat within the buildings.
- 6.15 The Wildlife and Countryside Act (WCA) 1981 (as amended) states that all wild birds are protected at all times against killing or injury. Under the WCA, it is an offence to kill, injure or take any wild bird, to take damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird, or to take or destroy the egg of any wild bird. It is good practice to carry out any works outside of the breeding bird season that might affect nests and result in an offence being committed. The breeding bird season is generally considered to be between March and August inclusive.
- 6.16 If suitable breeding bird habitat is affected during the breeding bird season, then an assessment by an Ecologist for breeding birds should be undertaken prior to works. If breeding birds are found, it is likely that works will have to be delayed until breeding has ceased.

7.0 References

Department for Communities and Local Government (2012). *National Planning Policy Framework*. Online - available from;
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2116950.pdf>.

Accessed April 2012

Google Maps

Government Circular: *Biodiversity & Geological Conservation – Statutory Obligations and their impact within the Planning System*. ODPM Circular 06/2005, Defra Circular 01/2005. Online - available from; <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/147570.pdf> Accessed April 2012

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) (March 2006). *Planning for Biodiversity and Geological Conservation: A Guide to Good Practice*. ODPM, London. Online – available from; <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/143792.pdf> Accessed April 2012

Harris, S. et al. (1995) A review of British mammals: population estimates and conservation status of British Mammals other than cetaceans. JNCC, Peterborough.

Hundt L (2012) Bat Surveys: Good Practice Guidelines, 2nd edition, Bat Conservation Trust

Marnell, F. & Presetnik, P. (2010) Protection of overground roosts for bats (particularly roosts in buildings of cultural heritage importance). EUROBATs Publication Series No. 4 (English Version). UNEP/EUROBATs secretariat, Bonn, Germany

Mitchell-Jones, A.J. (2004). The Bat Workers Manual (3rd Edition) JNCC. The Bat Mitigation Guidelines (English Nature 2004)

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010) as amended)

The EEC Directive 1992 (European Legislation)

The Environmental Damage Regulations 2009

The Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)

UK Biodiversity Steering Group (1995) Biodiversity – the UK Steering Group Report. Volume 2: Action Plans. P89 SAP for Pipistrelle. London, HMSO.

Species Population Trends, Bat Conservation Trust, Online – available from - http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/species_population_trends.html – Accessed January 2014

Individual Species Reports – 3rd UK Habitats Directive Reporting 2013, JNCC. Online – available from - <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-6391> – Accessed January 2014

Map 1:
Site Plan



Appendix 1:

Table 8.5 Minimum Number of Presence/Absence survey visits required to provide confidence in negative preliminary roost assessment results for buildings, built structures and trees in summer. (Taken from the Bat Conservation Trust Bat Survey Good Practice Guidelines (2012))

High roost potential	Low to moderate roost potential	Low roost potential
3 dusk emergence and/or pre-dawn re-entry surveys during May to September. Optimum period May to August.	2 dusk emergence and/or pre dawn re-entry surveys during May to September. Optimum period May to August.	1 dusk emergence and/or pre-dawn re-entry survey during May to September. Optimum period May to August.
If bats are discovered emerging from any of the buildings during the surveys, the survey schedule should be appropriately adjusted to increase the survey effort so that sufficient information can be collected.		
Note: two surveys carried out within the same 24 hours period constitutes as 1 survey.		

The information within the above Table 8.5 is guidance and it is up to the acting consultant to determine in their expert judgement the overall level of survey that is required, this is based upon their knowledge, experience and is site specific i.e. taking into account the site conditions.

Appendix 2: Site Photographs

Building 1a & 1b



Southern elevation of Building 1b location of confirmed roost



Confirmed roost location



Rotted wooden soffit



Buildings 1a and 1b



Missing ridge tile on 1b

Building 2



Building 2



Building 2 with garages

Building 3



Building 3 of western elevation

Building 3 cont.



Building 3 southern elevation with single storey extension



Gaps at the roofline



Gaps in the brickwork



Gaps at the capping stones

Building 4a and 4b



Buildings 4a and 4b

Building 5



Building 5 western elevation



Building 5 eastern elevation



Gaps under felt



Gaps under lead flashing



Door leading to cellar

Building 6



Building 6 from southern elevation



Lifted fascias on eastern elevation



Building 6 of northern elevation

Building 7



Building 7



Gaps at lifted & slipped roof slates

Building 8



Building 8 north-western elevation



Eastern elevation 8 with slipped metal sheeting