



## Preliminary Roost Assessment

Lord Nelson, 54 Wood Street, Earl Shilton, Leicester, LE9 7ND

Mr Simon Hurd

Status	Issue	Name	Date
Draft	1	Meg Coates BSc (Hons), Consultant	11/03/2022
Reviewed	1.1	Katy Perry BSc (Hons) MCIEEM, Senior Consultant	16/03/2022
Final	2	Meg Coates BSc (Hons), Consultant	17/03/2022

### Arbtech Consultant's Contact Details:

Meg Coates BSc (Hons)  
Consultant

**Tel:** 07933 397 416 **Email:** [megancoates@arbtech.co.uk](mailto:megancoates@arbtech.co.uk)  
<https://arbtech.co.uk>

**Limitations and Copyright**

Arbtech Consulting Limited has prepared this report for the sole use of the above-named client or their agents in accordance with our General Terms and Conditions, under which our services are performed. It is expressly stated that no other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Limited. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by third parties. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Limited.

© This report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

## Industry Guidelines and Standards

This report has been written with due consideration to:

- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2017). Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. 2nd edition. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2018). Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine. Version 1.1. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2017). Guidelines on Ecological Report Writing. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2020). Guidelines for Accessing, Using and Sharing Biodiversity Data in the UK. 2nd Edition. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- British Standard 42020 (2013). Biodiversity – Code of Practice for Planning and Development.
- British Standard 8683:2021 (2021). Process for Designing and Implementing Biodiversity Net Gain.

## Proportionality

The work involved in preparing and implementing all ecological surveys, impact assessments and measures for avoidance, mitigation, compensation, and enhancement should be proportionate to the predicted degree of risk to biodiversity and to the nature and scale of the proposed development. Consequently, the decision-maker should only request supporting information and conservation measures that are relevant, necessary, and material to the application in question. Similarly, the decision-maker and their consultees should ensure that any comments and advice made over an application are also proportionate.

This approach is enshrined in Government planning guidance, for example, paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework for England.

The desk studies and field surveys undertaken to provide a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) might in some cases be all that is necessary.

(BS 42020, 2013)

## Executive Summary

Arbtech Consulting Limited was instructed by Mr Simon Hurd to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) at Lord Nelson, 54 Wood Street, Earl Shilton, Leicester LE9 7ND (hereafter referred to as “the site”). The survey was required to inform a planning application for the internal conversion of the existing property with additional works to the roofline (hereafter referred to as “the proposed development”).

**The following is work you will need to commission to obtain planning permission and to comply with legislation. Further information, along with opportunities for biodiversity enhancement, are outlined in Table 3 of this report.**

<b>Feature</b>	<b>Foreseen impacts</b>	<b>Recommendations</b> <i>Measures required to adhere to guidance, legislation and planning policies.</i>
Roosting bats (B1)	Bats are very unlikely to be roosting within this building and as such, there are not anticipated to be any impacts on bats in this location as a result of the proposed development.	In the unlikely event that a bat or evidence of bats is discovered during the development all work must stop and a bat licensed ecologist contacted for further advice.
Foraging and commuting bats	The proposed development will not result in the removal of any habitats which could be used by foraging or commuting bats.	None.
Nesting birds	None.	N/A
Other ecological constraints	None identified	N/A

## Contents

1.0 Introduction and Context.....	6
1.1 Background .....	6
1.2 Site Context .....	6
1.3 Scope of the Report.....	6
2.0 Methodology.....	7
2.1 Desk Study .....	7
2.2 Field Survey .....	7
2.3 Breeding Birds and Other Incidental Observations.....	7
2.4 Suitability Assessment .....	7
2.5 Limitations .....	8
3.0 Results and Evaluation.....	9
3.1 Desk Study Results .....	9
3.2 Designated Sites.....	9
3.3 Landscape .....	9
3.4 Historical Records .....	9
3.5 Field Survey Results .....	9
4.0 Conclusions, Impacts and Recommendations.....	15
4.1 Legislation and Informative Guidelines.....	15
4.2 Evaluation .....	16
5.0 Bibliography.....	20
Appendix 1: Proposed Development Plan.....	21
Appendix 2: Site Location Plan.....	22
Appendix 3: Desk Study Information .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Appendix 4: Bat Survey Plan.....	22
Appendix 5: Legislation and Planning Policy Related to Bats.....	23

## **1.0 Introduction and Context**

### **1.1 Background**

Arbtech Consulting Limited was instructed by Mr Simon Hurd to undertake a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) at Lord Nelson, 54 Wood Street, Earl Shilton, Leicester, LE9 7ND (hereafter referred to as “the site”). The survey was required to inform a planning application for the internal conversion of the property with additional work to the roofline (hereafter referred to as “the proposed development”).

The aim of the PRA was to determine the presence or evaluate the likelihood of the presence of roosting bats, and to gain an understanding of how bats could use the site for roosting, foraging, or commuting. This has been undertaken with due consideration to the “Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists —Good Practice Guidelines” publication (Collins, 2016).

No previous ecology reports have been produced for this site by Arbtech Consulting Ltd or, to the author’s knowledge, by any other consultancy.

### **1.2 Site Context**

The site is located at National Grid Reference SP 46285 97764 and has an area of approximately 0.1ha comprising of buildings and hardstanding. It is surrounded by urban development with a public park nearby, approximately 40m to the north.

A site location plan is provided in Appendix 1.

### **1.3 Scope of the Report**

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

To achieve this, the following steps have been taken:

- A desk study has been carried out.
- A field survey has been undertaken, including an external survey and internal inspection of built structures where possible, to determine the presence or the suitability of any features which bats could use for roosting and to assess the suitability of the site’s bat foraging and commuting habitat.
- An outline of potential impacts on any confirmed or unidentified roosts has been provided, based on the proposed development.
- Recommendations for further surveys and mitigation have been made, along with advice on the requirements for a European Protected Species Licence (EPSL) application if appropriate.
- Opportunities for the enhancement of the site for roosting, foraging and commuting bats have been set out.

## 2.0 Methodology

### 2.1 Desk Study

The desk study included a 2km radius review of statutory designated sites with bat qualifying interests and granted EPSL records for bats held on magic.gov.uk database. An assessment of the surrounding landscape structure was also completed using aerial images from Google Earth and OS maps.

### 2.2 Field Survey

The survey was undertaken by Meg Coates BSc (Hons), Consultant (Natural England Bat Licence Number: 2016-22119-CLS-CLS) on 11<sup>th</sup> March 2022.

The PRA focussed on the 1 built structure which will be affected by the proposed development as well as providing an overview of the wider site and the surrounding landscape for bat roosting, foraging and commuting habitat.

#### For any surveyed buildings

A non-intrusive visual appraisal was undertaken from the ground, using binoculars to inspect the external features of the building(s) for features which bats could use for roosting, including access or egress points and for signs of bat use including droppings, scratch marks, insect remains and urine smear marks. An internal inspection of the building(s) was also made, including the living areas and any accessible roof spaces, using a torch and ladders. The surveyor paid particular attention to the floor and flat surfaces, window frames, lintels above doors and windows, and carried out a detailed search of numerous features within the roof space. An endoscope was used to complete a close-up inspection of any accessible features, where appropriate.

### 2.3 Breeding Birds and Other Incidental Observations

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

### 2.4 Suitability Assessment

Built structures were categorised according to the likelihood of bats being present and the types of roost that the identified features could support. This is summarised in Table 1 for buildings below. Roost suitability is classified as high, moderate, low, and negligible and dictates any further surveys required before works can proceed.

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

<b>Classification</b>	<b>Feature of building and its context</b>
Moderate to high	Buildings or structures with features of particular significance for larger numbers of roosting bats e.g., mines, caves, tunnels, icehouses, and cellars. Habitat on site and surrounding landscape of high quality for foraging bats e.g., broadleaved woodland, tree-lined watercourses, and grazed parkland.

	<p>Site is connected with the wider landscape by strong linear features that would be used by commuting bats e.g., river and or stream valleys and hedgerows.</p> <p>Site is proximate to known or likely roosts (based on historical data).</p> <p>Buildings with high suitability could support roosts of high conservation value such as maternity or hibernation roosts.</p>
Low	<p>A small number of possible roost sites or features, used sporadically by individual or small numbers of bats. Potential roost features may be suboptimal for reasons such as shallow depth, poor thermal qualities, or upwards orientation with exposure to inclement weather or predators.</p> <p>Habitat suitable for foraging in close proximity, but isolated in the landscape. Or an isolated site not connected by prominent linear features.</p> <p>Few features suitable for roosting, minor foraging or commuting.</p>
Negligible	<p>Unsuitable for use by bats.</p>

### **2.5 Limitations**

It should be noted that whilst every effort has been made to describe the features on site in the context of their suitability for roosting bats, this does not provide a complete characterisation of the site. This survey provides a preliminary view of the likelihood of bats being present. This is based on suitability of the habitats on site and in the local area, the ecology and biology of bats as currently understood, and the known distribution of bats as recovered during the desk study. Bats are highly mobile creatures that switch roosts regularly and therefore the usage of a site by bats can change over a short period of time.

A biological records data search has not been undertaken. However, given the location of the site, the nature of the habitats present and the assessed suitability of the site for protected or notable species, it is not anticipated that the purchase of biological records data will add any significant weight or alter the conclusions and recommendations outlined in this report.

These limitations have been taken into account during the evaluation of the site and requirement for further surveys and mitigation.

### 3.0 Results and Evaluation

#### 3.1 Desk Study Results

A summary of desk study results is provided below.

#### 3.2 Designated Sites

There are no designated sites within 2km of the site. The site does however lie within the impact risk zones for 2 designated sites, Croft pasture Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Narborough bog SSSI. However, the proposed development is not listed as a risk to these designations.

#### 3.3 Landscape

A review of aerial photographs (Google Earth) the magic.gov.uk database and OS maps has been undertaken. Collated together, the value of the landscape for bats is described below:

The site is in an urban area of Leicestershire. The landscape is dominated by large residential developments, with the village of Earl Shilton extending adjacent surrounding the site. There are scattered tree lines around the area, which could be used by bats for roosting, foraging, and commuting.

#### 3.4 Historical Records

A search of the magic.gov.uk database for granted EPSLs within a 2km radius of the site has been completed. Displaced bats from licensed sites <2km away from the survey site will find alternative habitat either within the mitigation measures implemented as part of the licence or will relocate to other known roosts sites in close proximity to the licensed site. No EPSL records for bats have been returned within 2km of the site.

#### 3.5 Field Survey Results

The PRA focussed on the 1 built structure, B1, which will be affected by the proposed development as well as providing an overview of the wider site and the surrounding landscape for bat roosting, foraging and commuting habitat. The results of the field survey are illustrated in Appendix 2. The weather conditions recorded at the time of the survey are shown in Table 2.

*Table 2: Weather conditions during the survey*

Date: 11/03/2022	
Temperature	10°C
Humidity	26%
Cloud Cover	50%
Wind	1mph
Rain	80%

**Building B1 Exterior**

B1 – Southern elevation (pictured opposite).

B1 is a detached two-storey brick-built building with a gabled roof clad in slate roof tiles. The roof tiles are in very good condition with no raised tiles under which bats could roost. The doors and windows are UPVC/wooden framed and appear in excellent condition with no suitable bat roosting sites.

The brickwork around the building is rendered and appears in excellent condition with no gaps or cracks in which crevice-dwelling bats could roost.



B1 – Western elevation (pictured opposite).

The rendering and brickwork around the building appears to be in very good condition with no gaps or cracks in which bats could roost. There was no soffit boxes or gable end features present on the building, and the brickwork around the gable ends and adjoining the roof line looked to be in very good condition with no raised areas under which bats could roost.



B1 – Northern elevation (pictured opposite).

The slate tiles upon the roof appeared to be in very good condition, with no slipped, cracked or loose tiles under which bats could roost.

There was one chimney present on the roof of B1. The brickworks and chimney pots were in very good condition with no loose mortar or gaps that could be utilised by bats. The lead flashing around the chimney was also in good condition and appeared to be flush to the brickwork with no gaps present under which bats could roost.



B1 – Eastern elevation (pictured opposite).

There are UPVC windows present on this elevation which look to be in very good condition, with brick surrounds that also appear in very good condition with no gaps or cracks present that could be utilised by bats.

The brickwork is not rendered on this elevation, but the mortar between the bricks is in good condition.



**B1 Interior**

B1 – loft space (pictured opposite).

There is one loft space within the main roof void of B1. The roof structure is built from modern timber beams including the ridge beam. The roof is not lined, and the slate tiles are laid directly onto the roof filled with mortar. There are no gaps and no daylight entering the space which indicates the loft is well-sealed.

The floor of the loft space is lined with mineral wool insulation and there are timber boards in places. There are cobwebs around the ridge beam and roof to floor cobwebs which could indicate a lack of internal flying activity from void dwelling bats, such as brown long-eared bats.



B1 – loft space (pictured opposite).

The loft space is rectangular shaped and there are two gable ends. The northern gable end (pictured opposite) is brick built and in very good condition with no gaps around the bricks or mortar that bats could use to enter the building.

The presence of stored items also made the search for bat evidence easier as an accumulation of droppings would be evident in such a space.



B1 – loft space (pictured opposite).

The rear of the slate tiles could be easily viewed from within the loft space. The tiles were in good condition with no loose mortar or cracked tiles that could be utilised by bats for entry into the space.

There were significant amounts of cobwebs present which indicate a lack of activity by void dwelling bats such as brown long eared bats.

Two water tanks were present within the loft space. There was no evidence of bat activity within the tanks or elsewhere within the loft space.

Approximate internal dimensions: 8m long x 5m wide x 2m high (floor to ridge height).

Internal conditions: temperature 20°C, humidity 54%.



**B1 Evidence of bats**

No evidence was found externally although evidence can be weathered away quickly. No evidence by way of droppings, feeding remains, staining or bats themselves were observed internally and the buildings are in mostly good condition with minimal features bats could utilise for roosting or internal access.

**B1 Breeding birds and other incidental observations**

There was no evidence of nesting birds located internally or externally on the survey building.

**Foraging and Commuting Habitat**

The surrounding landscape comprises mainly of residential development within the town of Earl Shilton. The area also comprises of some scattered trees, and hedgerows all of which could be used by foraging and commuting bats in the area.

## **4.0 Conclusions, Impacts and Recommendations**

### **4.1 Informative Guidelines**

A summary of the relevant legislation and planning policies is provided in Appendix 3.

#### **Bats**

Bats are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (amended by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019).

There are three possible outcomes of this survey, each with specific recommendations. These are outlined below:

##### Confirmed bat roost

Best practice survey guidelines (Collins, 2016) recommend additional surveys for confirmed roosts. Three further surveys are required to characterise the bat roost present including species, roost type and access points to inform an EPSL application to Natural England. Surveys must be completed during the active bat season (May – September). At least two of the surveys should be completed during the optimal survey period mid-May to August, and at least one of the surveys should be a dawn re-entry survey.

##### Low, moderate, or high likelihood of a bat roost present

Best practice survey guidelines (Collins, 2016) recommend additional surveys for features assessed as having low to high suitability for roosting bats. One, two or three further surveys are required to confirm presence or likely absence of a bat roost, based on a low, medium, or high roost likelihood evaluation. Surveys must be completed during the active bat season (May – September). If more than one survey is recommended, at least one of them should be completed during the optimal survey period mid-May to August, and at least one of the surveys should be a dawn re-entry survey. If two or one further survey is recommended these surveys must be completed during the optimal survey period (mid-May to August). For low and moderate roost likelihood evaluation the survey effort recommended at this stage is iterative and if bats roosts are confirmed in the building, a further survey will be required to provide sufficient information to inform an EPSL application to Natural England.

##### Negligible likelihood of a bat roost present

Buildings assessed as comprising negligible suitability for roosting bats do not normally require further surveys. However, if bats are found during any stage of the development, work should stop immediately, and a suitably qualified ecologist should be contacted for further advice.

#### **Birds**

Legislation protects all wild birds whilst they are breeding, and prohibits the killing, injuring, or taking of any wild bird or their nests and eggs. Certain species of bird, including the barn owl, are subject to special provisions; it is an offence to disturb any bird or their young during the breeding season.

#### **4.2 Evaluation**

Taking the desk study and field survey results into account, Table 3 presents an evaluation of the value of the site for bats and also details any other ecological constraints identified such as nesting birds in relation to the proposed development which will comprise of the internal renovation of the existing property with some additional works to the roofline.

Table 3: Evaluation of the site for bats and any other ecological constraints

<b>Feature</b>	<b>Survey conclusions (with justification)</b>	<b>Foreseen impacts</b>	<b>Recommendations</b> <i>Measures required to adhere to guidance, legislation and planning policies.</i>	<b>Biodiversity Enhancements</b> <i>The Local Planning Authority has a duty to ask for enhancements under the NPPF (2021)</i>
Roosting bats	The building has negligible value for roosting bats due to a lack of potential roost features.	Bats are very unlikely to be roosting within this building and as such, there are not anticipated to be any impacts on bats in this location as a result of the proposed development.	In the unlikely event that a bat or evidence of bats is discovered during the development all work must stop and a bat licensed ecologist contacted for further advice.	<p>The installation of a minimum of two bat boxes around the site boundaries or on retained buildings will provide additional roosting habitat for bats e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2F Schwegler Bat Box (trees)</li> <li>1FF Schwegler Bat Box (trees)</li> <li>2FN Schwegler Bat Box (trees)</li> <li>Beaumaris Bat Box (buildings)</li> <li>Vivara Pro Woodstone Bat Box (buildings)</li> </ul> <p>Or a similar alternative brand.</p> <p>Bat boxes should be positioned 3-5m above ground level facing in a south or south-westerly direction with a clear flight path to and from the entrance, away from artificial light.</p> <p>Alternatively, bat boxes could be incorporated into new buildings on the site e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Habibat Bat Box</li> </ul>


				Schwegler 1FR Bat Tubes Bat tubes should be inserted into the fabric of the building during construction, positioned 3-5m above ground level facing in a south or south-westerly direction with a clear flight path to and from the entrance and facing landscapes areas, away from artificial light.
Foraging and commuting bats	There are no habitats on the site which could be used by bats for foraging or commuting.	The proposed development will not result in the removal of any habitats which could be used by foraging or commuting bats.	None.	None.
Nesting birds	The building offers no opportunities for nesting birds.	None.	None.	The installation of a minimum of two bird boxes on retained buildings will provide additional nesting habitat for birds e.g. Schwegler No 17 Swift Nest Box (buildings) Schwegler 1SP Sparrow Terrace (buildings) Or a similar alternative brand. Tree boxes should be positioned approximately 3m above ground level where they will be sheltered from prevailing wind, rain, and strong sunlight. Small-hole boxes are best placed approximately 1-3m above ground on an area

				of the tree trunk where foliage will not obscure the entrance hole. Swift and sparrow boxes should be positioned at the eaves of a building and can be incorporated into the fabric of the building during construction.
Other ecological constraints	None identified.	N/A	N/A	N/A

## 5.0 Bibliography

- British Standard 42020 (2013). Biodiversity – Code of Practice for Planning and Development.
- British Standard 8683:2021 (2021). Process for Designing and Implementing Biodiversity Net Gain.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2017). Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. 2nd edition. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2017). Guidelines on Ecological Report Writing. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2018). Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine. Version 1.1. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (2020). Guidelines for Accessing, Using and Sharing Biodiversity Data in the UK. 2nd Edition. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- Collins, J. (2016). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists —Good Practice Guidelines, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Bat Conservation Trust, London.
- Garland, L. & Markham, S. (2008) Is Important Bat Foraging and Commuting Habitat Legally Protected? <http://biodiversitybydesign.co.uk/cmsAdmin/uploads/protection-for-bat-habitat-sep-2007.pdf>
- Google Earth. Accessed on 15/03/2022.
- Institution of Lighting Professionals (2018). Guidance Note 08/18 Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK. Bats and the Built Environment Series Publication: [http://www.bats.org.uk/news.php/406/new\\_guidance\\_on\\_bats\\_and\\_lighting](http://www.bats.org.uk/news.php/406/new_guidance_on_bats_and_lighting).
- Magic Database. <http://www.magic.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx> Accessed on 15/03/2022.
- Mitchell-Jones, A.J. (2004). Bat Mitigation Guidelines. English Nature, Peterborough.
- National Planning Policy Framework (2021) <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>
- Natural England Designated Sites View. <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk/SiteSearch.aspx> Accessed on 15/03/2022..
- Wray, S., Wells, D., Long, E., Mitchell-Jones, T (2010) Valuing Bats in Ecological Impact Assessment. IEEM In-Practice. Number 70 (December 2010). Pp. 23-25.

### Appendix 1: Site Location Plan



### Appendix 2: Bat Survey Plan



### Appendix 3: Legislation and Planning Policy Related to Bats

#### LEGAL PROTECTION

All species of bat are fully protected under *The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017* (as amended) through their inclusion on Schedule 2.

#### **Regulation 43: Protection of certain wild animals - offences**

(1) A person is guilty of an offence if they:

- (a) Deliberately captures, injures or kills any wild animal of a European protected species,
- (b) Deliberately disturbs wild animals of any such species,
- (c) Deliberately takes or destroys the eggs of such an animal, or
- (d) Damages or destroys a breeding site or resting place of such an animal,

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1) (b), disturbance of animals includes in particular any disturbance which is likely—

- (a) To impair their ability:
  - (i) To survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young; or
  - (ii) In the case of animals of a hibernating or migratory species, to hibernate or migrate; or
- (b) To affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong.

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

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

#### NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY (ENGLAND)

#### **National Planning Policy Framework 2021**

The National Planning Policy Framework promotes sustainable development. The Framework specifies the need for protection of designated sites and priority habitats and species. An emphasis is also made on the need for ecological infrastructure through protection, restoration and re-creation. The protection and recovery of priority species (considered likely to be those listed as species of principal importance under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006) is also listed as a requirement of planning policy.

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

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

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

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

### **LOCAL PLANNING POLICY**

#### ***Hinkley and Bosworth borough council local development framework Core strategy (Adopted 2009)***

The Hinkley and Bosworth borough council local development framework Core strategy can be viewed here: <https://www.hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk/localplandocs>

The following planning policies have implications for developers in relation to bats:

- Policy 20: Green Infrastructure
- Policy 21: National Forest

#### ***Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland BAP***

The Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland BAP can be viewed here:

[https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2017/1/25/LLR\\_BAP\\_Space\\_for\\_Wildlife\\_2016-26\\_part\\_1.pdf](https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/sites/default/files/field/pdf/2017/1/25/LLR_BAP_Space_for_Wildlife_2016-26_part_1.pdf)

The following bat species are included in the plan:

- Common: Soprano Pipistrelle, Common Pipistrelle, Daubenton's, Brown Long-eared
- Uncommon: Brandt's, Whiskered, Natterer's, Noctule.
- Rare: Leisler's, Barbastelle, Serotine
- Vagrant: Greater Horseshoe, Grey Long-eared

## **EFFECT OF LEGISLATION AND POLICY ON DEVELOPMENT WORKS**

A European Protected Species Licence (EPSL) issued by Natural England will be required for works likely to affect a bat roost or for operations likely to result in a level of disturbance which might impair their ability to undertake those activities mentioned above (e.g. survive, breed, rear young and hibernate). The licence is to allow derogation from the relevant legislation but also to enable appropriate mitigation measures to be put in place and their efficiency/success to be monitored. The legislation may also be interpreted such that, in certain circumstances, important foraging areas and/or commuting routes can be regarded as being afforded *de facto* protection, for example, where it can be proven that the continued usage of such areas is crucial to maintaining the integrity and long-term viability of a bat roost (Garland & Markham, 2008).

There are 17 species of bat breeding in England and Natural England issues licences under Regulation 55 of the Habitats Regulations to allow you to work within the law.

Licences are issued for specific purposes stated in the Regulations, if the following three tests are met:

- The purpose of the work meets one of those listed in the Habitats Regulations (see below);
- That there is no satisfactory alternative;
- That the action authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status (FCS) in their natural range

The Habitats Regulations permits licences to be issued for a specific set of purposes including:

1. include preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of over-riding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment;
2. scientific and educational purposes;
3. ringing or marking; and,
4. conserving wild animals.

Development works fall under the first purpose and Natural England issues bat mitigation licences for developments.

## **EUROPEAN PROTECTED SPECIES POLICIES**

In December 2016 Natural England officially introduced the four licensing policies throughout England. The four policies seek to achieve better outcomes for European Protected Species (EPS) and reduce unnecessary costs, delays and uncertainty that can be inherent in the current standard EPS licensing system. The policies are summarised as follows:

- Policy 1; provides greater flexibility in exclusion and relocation activities, where there is investment in habitat provision;
- Policy 2; provides greater flexibility in the location of compensatory habitat;
- Policy 3; provides greater flexibility on exclusion measures where this will allow EPS to use temporary habitat; and,

- Policy 4; provides a reduced survey effort in circumstances where the impacts of development can be confidently predicted.

The four policies have been designed to have a net benefit for EPS by improving populations overall and not just protecting individuals within development sites. Most notably Natural England now recognises that the Habitats Regulations legal framework now applies to 'local populations' of EPS and not individuals/site populations.