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Executive Summary

1. An ecological survey and impact assessment were carried out in respect of an existing garage at Marl Hill Byre, Cow Ark, where it is proposed to convert the building to a dwelling.

2. The site is used by a small number of relatively common breeding bird species and there is a known bat roost located in a nearby building, but the building subject to this assessment has low bat roosting potential and the site is otherwise of limited ecological value.

3. During the daytime survey, no conclusive evidence of bats was found and the likelihood of bats roosting was considered to be very low. Consequently, no night-time survey was carried out or deemed necessary.

4. Whilst there is some habitat suitable for protected or otherwise important species such as barn owl, there were no conclusive signs of any such species occurring on site.

5. There is no suitable habitat for great crested newts on site and no ponds within 250m where there is direct habitat linkage, any ponds that do occur within that distance being isolated in habitat terms by the presence of buildings, hard landscaping, gardens, roads, and other inhospitable habitat.

6. There are no mature trees on site and no intact hedgerows, the majority of the site comprising hard landscaping, garden or other disturbed ground. No important habitats or vegetation communities occur on site or close enough to the site boundaries to be adversely affected by proposals.

7. It is reasonable to conclude that, with adequate mitigation to compensate for the minimal loss of habitat and the implementation of a number of relatively minor precautions, there will be no negative ecological impact of any significance resulting from proposals to develop the site.
Contextual Statement

This report must be read in conjunction with the documentation and drawings prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority in respect of current development proposals (as shown in Figure 2 of this report). The author of this report will accept no responsibility for any misunderstanding resulting from a failure to consult all relevant planning documentation or through any lack of information where responsibility for the provision of such is beyond the control of Cameron S Crook & Associates.

This report is not intended as a natural history text or scientific paper. Rather, its purpose is to inform the site owner, developer and local planning authority in accordance with current local and national planning guidance, in as clear and succinct a manner as possible. To that end, all survey and assessment works carried out in respect of current proposals are proportionate to the site and situation, and only the minimum level of information necessary has been provided. Detailed information on the respective life cycles of protected species such as the bat, badger or great crested newt, or detailed descriptions of sundry ecological scenarios that have no relevance to the site or development in question have therefore been omitted.

This report provides no planning or legal advice and no attempt has been made to interpret any respective planning or environmental laws that may apply to this case. Any such interpretation must be obtained from an appropriately qualified Planning Consultant, Planning Officer or Lawyer.

All survey works detailed within the methodology section below have been either carried out personally by the author or by appropriately qualified, licenced and/or experienced surveyors working under the supervision of the author. The author of this report takes full responsibility for the quality of data collected and any subsequent interpretation. Raw survey data and names of individual surveyors may be provided for bone fide reasons, upon request, but only where this is strictly necessary and does not otherwise conflict with client, landowner or surveyor confidentiality and privacy.

This report may not be used for any purpose other than in support of the current planning application (as per the proposals shown in Figure 2) without the prior written permission of Cameron S Crook & Associates. Copyright of this report and the intellectual property rights of all data herein shall remain with Cameron S Crook & Associates and may not be used or stored in any database without prior written permission.
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 A baseline ecological survey, site appraisal and impact assessment were carried out in respect of an existing garage proposed for conversion at the site known as Marl Hill Byre, Cow Ark, with the following aims:

1. To establish the likely presence or absence of protected or otherwise important species and evaluate the overall nature conservation status of the site
2. To assess the likely impact of proposed works to develop the site upon any protected or otherwise important species that may occur on or adjacent to the area of land concerned, and the integrity of nature conservation interest of any other sites of ecological or nature conservation importance within the vicinity
3. To provide outline mitigation and habitat aftercare proposals, as appropriate

1.2 The term site will be used in this report to refer to the area of land proposed for development as shown on the site location plan (see Figure 1 below) unless otherwise indicated within the text.

Figure 1. Site Location Plan (site edged red)
2.0 Methodology

General Ecological and Botanical Survey

2.1 This part of the survey comprised an Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey carried out on the 18th September 2014 with any evidence of birds, amphibians, reptiles and mammals being noted during the survey. The survey methodology for the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey on both visits comprised a modified version of that described in NCC (1990) and IEA (1995) incorporating, where appropriate, a scaled down version of the methodology outlined in Rodwell (1991, 1992, 1995 & 2000) for determination of any National Vegetation Classification plant communities present.

2.2 The Phase 1 Habitat Survey was supplemented by a full vascular plant species survey using the ‘walkabout method’ as described in Kirkby (1988) and a generalized assessment of the site for suitability of habitat for animals, in particular protected species such as bats, badgers, breeding birds (including barn owls) and great crested newts. The results from the initial Phase 1 Habitat Survey were used to guide the requirement and level of detail of the more specific surveys, in this case for bats and barn owls, which are outlined below.

Bat Survey

2.3 The daytime bat survey was carried out on the 18th September 2014 and comprised a detailed inspection of the existing building that will be affected by proposals as well as any other suitable habitat such as trees, situated within or closely adjacent to the site boundaries, to check for any signs of actual or potential roosting, as well as an inspection of any vegetation, especially linear habitat, the latter evaluated for suitability in respect of foraging and commuting. As the daytime survey indicated that the building has low bat roosting potential, no night-time survey was carried out.

Barn Owls & Breeding Birds in General

2.4 This was carried out concurrently with the daytime parts of the bat survey in accordance with the recommendations of Ramsden & Ramsden (1995) and involved an inspection of the buildings in question for signs of droppings, pellets, feathers and nest debris (mainly remains of egg-shells, down and droppings since barn owls do not construct actual nests). Signs of, or the potential for other breeding birds were also sought and recorded during this part of the survey.
3.0 Existing Situation

General Site Description

3.1 The site proposed for development (the development footprint) comprises a stone-built garage situated within the curtilage of the dwelling known as Marl Hill Byre. The site is situated in a remote moorland location at a relatively high altitude off Easington Road, Cow Ark, approximately 14km to the northwest of Clitheroe. The surrounding land comprises mainly sheep-grazed moorland with occasional plantations of conifers.

3.2 There are two neighbouring properties; an attached, two-storey dwelling to the north and a detached two-storey dwelling to the south, both of traditional design. Apart from the garage in question and another similar building to the north, there are no other buildings within the near vicinity.

3.3 There is little or no semi-natural habitat on site other than the occasional ruderal plant species, primarily along the site margins or self-seeded within the small areas of mown grassland. There are no mature trees, water bodies or other significant habitat on site or close enough to the site boundaries to be affected. Otherwise, the site comprises mainly hard-standing including the existing gravelled driveway/parking area and a stone-set footpath, along with a shrub bed, a semi-mature conifer, and some small areas of mown grass.

3.4 The building and general site layout are shown in Figure 2, the various features in more detail within the photographs of Figures 3 to 5 below.

*Figure 2* Existing site layout, the garage proposed for conversion within the red line boundary
**Figure 3.** The garage proposed for conversion as viewed from Easington Road. The existing dwelling and neighbouring building are visible to the rear.

**Figure 4.** The front (north) elevation of the garage as viewed from the within the site boundaries, the gravelled driveway visible in the foreground.
Habitats and Flora

3.5 The habitats recorded during the Phase 1 Habitat Survey either on or bordering the site are summarized within Table 1 below. No Phase 1 Habitat map has been prepared due to the general lack of semi-natural habitat. Only those habitats that have been recorded within the development footprint or that will be affected by development proposals are listed below.

Table 1. Habitats & Vegetation Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCC/RSNC Habitats</th>
<th>NVC Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Grassland (lawn)</td>
<td>MG7 <em>Lolium perenne</em> ley and related grasslands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivated/disturbed land:</td>
<td>OV21 <em>Poa annua-Plantago major community</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ephemeral/short perennial</td>
<td>OV22 <em>Poa annua-Taraxacum officinale community</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OV28 <em>Agrostis stolonifera-Ranunculus repens</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Nature Conservancy Council and Royal Society for Nature Conservation habitat classification (NCC, 1990)
2 National Vegetation Classification communities (Rodwell, 1991)

3.6 No plant species list has been provided due to the very limited number of species recorded and general lack of semi-natural vegetation.

Significance of Habitats and Flora

3.7 All habitats and vegetation communities recorded on site are relatively common and widespread throughout Lancashire and Great Britain as a whole.

Mammals (Badgers)

3.8 Habitat Suitability: There is little or no habitat on site suitable for use by badgers, although the small areas of lawn may occasionally be used for foraging.

3.9 Presence/Absence: An inspection of all suitable habitat to a distance of at least 30m from the proposed development site boundaries (where accessible) revealed no conclusive signs of badger activity. Badgers are relatively unknown in the wider area and the lack of any firm evidence suggests that the site is not of significant importance to this species.

Mammals (Bats)

3.10 Habitat Suitability: There is only one building on site that will be affected by proposals, the existing garage. The building is single-storey, constructed of concrete block faced with millstone grit. There are two main sections; one enclosed by two large wooden doors, used for storage of gardening equipment, tools, a trailer and other domestic materials and equipment, the other permanently open, used as a double garage as well as the storage of firewood. There are no windows, the large doors or front opening supported on large timber lintels.

3.11 The building has a slated, pitched roof with concrete, semi-circular profiled ridge tiles, the latter sealed with mortar, including at the gable ends. There are narrow timber bargeboards to front and rear but no soffits. The bargeboards are closely fitted with no significant gaps beneath. The underside of the roof is lined with felt, the slates, the majority of which are intact are closely fitted and supported on softwood timbers, all of which are fully exposed. There is no enclosed roof void.

3.12 Whilst there are several gaps in the slates, these are relatively narrow and mostly inaccessible to bats. There are no soffits and no significant gaps behind the bargeboards or at the gable ends. There are no suitable roosting voids within the building. Overall, the building is considered to have **low roosting potential** in terms
of the Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) criteria (Hundt, 2012). Further details provided in the photographs of Figure 5 below.

**Figure 5 Features of the building**

- **Photo 5.1** Detailed view of gable end, the slates and ridge tiles sealed with mortar
- **Photo 5.2** The rear (southern) elevation
- **Photo 5.3** Detailed view of the roof with closely fitted slates and mortared ridge tiles visible
- **Photo 5.4** View of the underside of the roof showing softwood supporting timbers and lined slates
- **Photo 5.5** The large timber lintel that supports the garage access
- **Photo 5.6** An active swallow’s nest on one of the main beams in the garage

3.13 Other than the building proposed for conversion, there are no other buildings on site that will be affected, though the existing dwelling to the west, and both neighbouring buildings have high potential for bat roosting. There are no trees on site that are suitable for roosting (an existing conifer has no potential for use by bats) and there is virtually no habitat on site suitable for use as foraging habitat.

3.14 **Roosting:** During the daytime inspection, no conclusive signs of bats were found anywhere within the building and there were no external signs of bat usage such as staining at potential roost entrances, droppings or feeding remains. It is therefore reasonable to assume that bats do not currently use the building for roosting. There is
however a well established bat roost within the nearby, neighbouring dwelling as well as anecdotal evidence to suggest that bat also occasionally roost within the main dwelling. However, neither of these buildings will be in any way affected by proposals to convert the garage to a dwelling. There is therefore no likelihood of any impact upon bats or their roost site resulting from proposals to convert the garage to a dwelling.

**Birds**

3.15 *Habitat Suitability:* The building provides habitat suitable for a small number of breeding birds, including barn owls, though this is limited by the few suitable niches that are available and level of disturbance from day to day usage.

3.16 *Species Recorded/Potential Breeding:* Due to the time of year and limited scope of the survey, very few birds were recorded. *Table 2* below lists the birds that were recorded and provides an indication of those considered likely to breed on site.

*Table 2* Breeding birds recorded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Breeding Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Corvus corone</em></td>
<td>Carrion Crow</td>
<td>NoBr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Erithacus rubecula</em></td>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>CoBr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hirundo rustica</em></td>
<td>Swallow</td>
<td>CoBr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Parus caeruleus</em></td>
<td>Blue Tit</td>
<td>PoBr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Parus domesticus</em></td>
<td>House Sparrow</td>
<td>PoBr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Parus major</em></td>
<td>Great Tit</td>
<td>PoBr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pica pica</em></td>
<td>Magpie</td>
<td>NoBr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Turdus merula</em></td>
<td>Blackbird</td>
<td>PrBr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key to Breeding Qualifiers:
- CoBr - Confirmed Breeding; NoBr – Not Breeding; PrBr – Probably Breeding; PoBr – Possibly Breeding

3.17 All of the species recorded or considered likely to breed within or close to the development site boundaries are species that are relatively common and widespread in both urban and rural areas. No WCA Schedule 1 species such as barn owl were recorded or are reasonably expected to occur on site and there were no conclusive signs within the building, though the garage is marginally suitable for roosting and breeding and has apparently been previously used by tawny owl. However, there is no habitat within the development footprint suitable for hunting.

3.18 Whilst there were no confirmed indications of breeding house sparrow, which is listed as Species and of Principal Importance for Conservation, the presence of this species suggests it is reasonably likely to breed on site. Otherwise, the only two bird species confirmed to breed are robin and swallow, the latter with one nest still active during the site survey, despite the lateness of the season (September). It is also likely that blackbird breeds either within the building or within the adjacent conifer.

3.19 With respect to the wider site, the adjacent moorland is likely to support a number of other species, including Priority Species such as curlew, lapwing and possibly twite. However, these and similar species will not be affected by development proposals as the habitat in which they occur does not occur on site.
Amphibians – in particular Great Crested Newts

3.20 **Habitat Suitability**: No standing water-bodies occur on site and no habitat suitable for foraging by great crested newts occurs within the development footprint. There are no known ponds suitable for this species, or significant populations of other amphibian species, within 250m of the site boundaries where there is direct habitat linkage. A pond located to the southwest will not be directly affected and the intervening habitat is unsuitable for great crested newts due to the highly acidic, peaty conditions.

3.21 **Presence/Absence**: Due to the lack of suitable water bodies within 250m of the site boundaries where there is direct habitat linkage, it is reasonable to assume that great crested newts do not occur on site. There are no historic records of great crested newts within 500m of the site boundaries.

**Significance of Fauna**

3.22 At least two birds that are protected in general terms during the breeding season occur within the proposed development site boundaries. A number of other species recorded on site may also be expected to breed to a small extent though this does not include any WCA Schedule 1 species such as barn owl. One of the bird species, house sparrow, is listed as Species of Principal Importance for Conservation. Consequently, any site works that may affect potential breeding sites should avoid the breeding season (February to July inclusive) and any unavoidable loss of breeding habitat should be compensated for by provision of proprietary breeding boxes sited in appropriate locations on completion of site works, if not before.

3.23 There are no confirmed bat roosts on or close enough to the site boundaries to be affected, though bats do roost within at least one, possibly two of the adjacent dwellings and are known to forage around all existing buildings within the wider site. However, no habitat of importance will be affected by proposals and there will be no impact upon foraging activity.

3.24 No water bodies suitable for great crested newts occur on site or within 250m of the site boundaries where there is direct habitat linkage and there are no ditches, streams or rivers within 10m of the site boundaries. It is reasonable to assume therefore that protected species such as water voles, otters and great crested newts, which all rely on the availability of aquatic habitat will not be adversely affected by development proposals.
4.0 Potential Impacts & Mitigation

4.1 Likely Impact

4.1.1 The likely impact of the proposed site works is evaluated against the criteria laid out in the table below which is based on NATA (New Approach to Appraisal) as described in Byron H. (2000). This evaluation is based on the assumption that no mitigation works will be implemented.

*Table 3. Impact Assessment Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Magnitude</th>
<th>Nature Conservation Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficial Effect</td>
<td>Non Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil Effect</td>
<td>Non Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor (short term or reversible effects)</td>
<td>Non Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (deterioration of feature)</td>
<td>Non Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (loss of feature)</td>
<td>Non Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2 The evaluation criteria for nature conservation importance are as follows:

**European**

*Habitats* which are listed in Annexe 1 of the Habitats Directive and are included as candidate or proposed Special Areas of Conservation (cSAC, pSAC)

*Species* which are listed under Schedule 2 of the Habitats Directive and form a population which would qualify the site for consideration as a Special Protection Area (SPA) or Special Area of Conservation

**National**

*Habitats* that meet the criteria for designation of, or occur within, a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

*Species* that are protected under national wildlife legislation such as the Wildlife & Countryside act, are listed in a national Red Data Book, or that are part of a population or assemblage of species that would meet the criteria for the site being designated a site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

**County**

*Habitats* which are rare or uncommon in the County would meet the criteria for inclusion or are included within a second tier nature conservation site (SINC), or are Habitats of Principal Importance for Conservation

*Species* which are rare or uncommon within the County, form part of a population or assemblage of species which would meet the criteria for inclusion or are included as part of a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) or are Species of Principal Importance for Conservation
Local

*Habitats* that are uncommon or threatened within the Cow Ark area

*Species* that are uncommon or threatened within the Cow Ark area

Negligible

*Habitats or Species* that fit into none of the above categories

### 4.2 Likely Impact of the Development and Outline Mitigation

#### 4.2.1 The current ecological impacts resulting from the proposed site development works, based on the criteria outlined above and taking into account the mitigation required to negate any impacts, are summarized within the following respective tables.

#### 4.2.2 Bats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Likely Impacts</th>
<th>Required Mitigation and Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The current survey indicates that bats <em>do not currently roost</em> within the building proposed for conversion to a dwelling and the site has little or no habitat suitable for foraging and commuting</td>
<td>There will be no impact upon any bat roosting and no impact upon any significant roosting sites, foraging areas or commuting routes</td>
<td>No specific mitigation should be required. However, as the building has at least some potential for roosting and there is at least one known bat roost nearby, as a precautionary measure any works to the roof should be undertaken with care, especially when removing ridge tiles or slates. Similarly, prior to pointing up stonework or filling any other gaps in the building structure, visual checks should be made to check for any bats that may be roosting within any holes, gaps or crevices with openings that are equal to or greater than 15 x 80mm and are greater than 50mm deep. Should there be any signs of roosting bats or any doubts in that respect, all works should cease and a licence bat worker consulted. To avoid any disturbance of bats using the adjacent sites, any new external lighting should be directed away from existing dwellings and all external lighting should have a low UV component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Conservation Importance: European</td>
<td>Impact Magnitude: <em>Nil Effect</em></td>
<td>Residual Impact: <em>Nil Effect</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Impact: <em>(Nil Effect: European) Non Significant</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.2.3 Badgers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Likely Impacts</th>
<th>Required Mitigation and Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No badger setts found on site and badgers are relatively unknown in the wider area due to the inhospitable moorland conditions</td>
<td>No significant impact likely</td>
<td>No specific mitigation required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature Conservation Importance: National</th>
<th>Impact Magnitude:</th>
<th>Residual Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Impact: (Nil effect: National)</td>
<td>Nil Effect</td>
<td>Nil Effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.4 Breeding Birds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Likely Impacts</th>
<th>Required Mitigation and Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The building provides a small number of suitable niches for breeding swallow and other species including robin and house sparrow. However, there is no potential for ground nesting birds on site and there were no conclusive signs of any WCA Schedule 1 species such as Barn Owl roosting or nesting in the garage. Important species may occur on adjacent sites, in particular the moorland, but these will not be affected.</td>
<td>Dismantling or modification of the existing building during the breeding season (March-September inclusive) may result in disturbance to breeding birds and loss of breeding habitat. Encroachment onto the adjacent moorland habitat (beyond the site boundaries) may affect ground-nesting birds.</td>
<td>No mature vegetation and no buildings to be dismantled or otherwise affected during the breeding season (March to September inclusive) until or unless checked for breeding birds by an ecologist. Loss of roosting and breeding sites within the building proposed for conversion and any removed vegetation to be compensated for by siting of proprietary nesting boxes and swallow cups (where possible) on either the converted building or existing dwelling. Alternatively, nesting boxes may be fitted to trees in the rear garden of the existing dwelling. Nest boxes to include designs suitable for house sparrows, and swallows, the latter fitted with splashguards as appropriate. Measures should be taken to ensure that there is no encroachment of works onto the adjacent moorland habitat, beyond the site boundaries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature Conservation Importance: National</th>
<th>Impact Magnitude:</th>
<th>Residual Impact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Impact: (Minor: National) Moderate (where works are carried out during the breeding season)</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Nil Effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.5 Amphibians (in particular great crested newts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Likely Impacts</th>
<th>Required Mitigation and Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No ponds or other water bodies suitable for use by great crested newts or significant populations of other amphibian occur on site or within 250m of the site boundaries where there is direct habitat linkage and no suitable habitat for either species occurs on site</td>
<td>No impact likely</td>
<td>No specific mitigation required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nature Conservation Importance: European

Impact Magnitude: Nil Effect

Overall Impact: (Nil Effect: European) Non Significant

Residual Impact: Nil Effect

4.2.6 Botany/Vegetation Communities/Habitats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Likely Impacts</th>
<th>Required Mitigation and Residual Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no vegetation of any significance on site or that will be adversely affected by proposals</td>
<td>Most of the vegetation within the development footprint will be lost. However, there will be little or no significant impact upon any semi-natural vegetation of importance.</td>
<td>No specific mitigation required within the development footprint.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nature Conservation Importance: Negligible

Impact Magnitude: Nil Effect

Overall Impact: (High: Negligible) Nil Effect

Residual Impact: Nil Effect
5.0 Conclusion

5.1 There was no evidence of any specifically protected or otherwise important species occurring within the development footprint and no important habitats were identified that will be adversely affected.

5.2 A small number of breeding birds do occur on site. One of the species recorded, house sparrow, is a Species of Principal Importance for Conservation, and all breeding birds are protected in general terms during the breeding season. Consequently, there will be an initial but relatively minor loss of breeding habitat.

5.3 There were no confirmed signs of roosting bats using the building and whilst there is at least one known bat roost in an adjacent building, there is little or no habitat suitable foraging and commuting on the site proposed for development or that will be otherwise affected.

5.4 Implementation of a number of relatively minor precautions as outlined above will result in negligible ecological impact and no detriment to the favourable conservation status of any protected species such as bats and breeding birds.

6.0 References


