



Preliminary Bat & Bird Assessment

Site:

102 Southgate Street, Redruth, Cornwall TR15 2ND

Grid Reference: SW 70543 41013

18th February 2021

Version 1



Plan for Ecology Ltd

Tremough Innovation Centre

Tremough Campus, Penryn, Cornwall, TR10 9TA

Tel: 01326 218839

www.planforecology.co.uk



Document Control:

Site Name:	102 Southgate Street, Redruth, Cornwall TR15 2ND
OS Grid Reference:	SW 70543 41013
Report Authors:	Katherine Biggs BSc (Hons) MSc ACIEEM
Document Approved by:	Dr Lucy Wright BSc (Hons) MSc PhD MCIEEM
Client:	Damian Salmon
Report Reference Number:	P4E2214
Version:	01
Date:	18 th February 2021

Declaration:

"The information, evidence and advice, which we have prepared and provided is true, and has been prepared and provided in accordance with the Chartered Institute of Ecology & Environmental Management's (CIEEM) Code of Professional Conduct. We confirm that the opinions expressed are our true and professional bona fide opinions."

Katherine Biggs	
Lucy Wright	

Report Lifespan:

Ecological features can change over time, particularly if site management/ use changes. Typically, Preliminary Bat and Bird Assessments are valid for one year (until February 2022).



CONTENTS

SUMMARY	3
1.0 INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 BACKGROUND	4
1.2 PROJECT ADMINISTRATION	4
1.3 LEGISLATION & PLANNING POLICY	4
2.0 METHODOLOGY	6
2.1 ECOLOGICAL EVALUATION	6
2.2 LIMITATIONS	6
3.0 ASSESSMENT RESULTS	7
3.1 SITE DESCRIPTION	7
3.2 BAT ASSESSMENT	7
3.3 BIRD ASSESSMENT	13
4.0 MITIGATION RECOMMENDATIONS	14
4.1 BAT MITIGATION	14
4.2 BIRD MITIGATION	14
4.3 OPPORTUNITIES FOR BIODIVERSITY ENHANCEMENT	15
5.0 REFERENCES	16



Summary

Bat evidence?	<p>102 Southgate Street and an adjacent outbuilding were visually inspected for evidence of roosting bats on 3rd February 2021. No evidence of the use of the main cottage or outbuilding by roosting bats was found. However, a number of external and internal features were noted on the buildings which provide potential roosting opportunities for bats and which also provide potential access for bats into the interiors. In addition, as it was not possible to fully inspect the interior of the main roof void other than from the loft hatch, the likely presence or absence of bats roosting within this area could not be determined by visual survey alone.</p> <p>102 Southgate Street was, therefore, assessed as being of 'moderate suitability' for roosting bats.</p>
Bat mitigation recommendations?	<p>A minimum of two bat emergence or re-entry surveys of 102 Southgate Street and its outbuilding are required between May and September to inform the planning application and subsequent building works. Bat emergence/ re-entry surveys can only be undertaken between May and September, and at least one of the emergence/ re-entry surveys should be undertaken between May and August. The results of these surveys will be required to inform the planning application, building works and associated Natural England licence (if required).</p>
Bird evidence?	<p>No evidence of nesting birds was found within the buildings, including barn owl. A dead house sparrow (<i>Passer domesticus</i>) was noted within the roof void over the main building, indicating that this species may nest within the building. The ivy growth on the outbuilding provides potential for nesting birds. The buildings were assessed as being of negligible suitability to support nesting, breeding or resting barn owls.</p>
Bird mitigation recommendations?	<p>Works to the buildings, including removal of the ivy, should be undertaken between October and February, when birds will not be nesting (provided these timings do not conflict with any subsequent bat mitigation requirements), or, alternatively, preceded with a thorough search for nesting birds (to be undertaken by an ecologist) immediately prior to works commencing.</p> <p>No further surveys for birds are recommended.</p> <p>Provisions for nesting house sparrows should be made within the proposed development, such as by incorporating prefabricated nest sites into the new dwelling. There is opportunity to enhance the site for other nesting birds post-development by installing bird boxes on the building exterior/ within the fabric of the new dwelling.</p>



1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

Damian Salmon commissioned Plan for Ecology Ltd to undertake a Preliminary Bat and Bird Assessment (sometimes referred to as a Bat and Barn Owl Assessment) of 102 Southgate Street, Redruth, Cornwall TR15 2ND (OS Grid Ref: SW 70543 41013) in January 2021. It is understood that the client proposes to renovate the building for residential use.

1.2 Project Administration

Property Address:	102 Southgate Street, Redruth, Cornwall TR15 2ND
OS Grid Reference:	SW 70543 41013
Client:	Damian Salmon
Planning Authority:	West 2
Planning Reference Number:	Unknown
Report Reference Number:	P4E2122
Proposed work:	Renovate for residential use
Survey Date:	3 rd February 2021
Ecologist & Licence Number:	Katherine Biggs BSc (Hons) MSc ACIEEM; Bat licence No. 2016-22188-CLS-CLS; Barn owl licence no. CL29/00552

1.3 Legislation & Planning Policy

Planning: The local planning authority has a statutory obligation to consider impacts upon protected species resulting from development. Planning permission will not be granted with outstanding ecological surveys, and if applicable an appropriate mitigation plan.

Bats: In the UK all bat species are listed on Annex IV(a) of the European Communities Habitats Directive and as such are European Protected Species (EPS). In Britain protection of bats is achieved through their inclusion on Schedule 2 of the Conservation and Habitats Regulations 2010, Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and Schedule 12 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (HM Government, 1981, 2000 & 2010).

As a result of this statutory legislation it is an offence to:

- Deliberately capture, injure or kill a bat;
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat/s in its roost;
- Intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy or obstruct access to a bat roost (even if bats are not occupying the roost at the time);
- Possess or sell or exchange a bat (dead or alive) or part of a bat.

Works with potential to cause significant disturbance to roosting bats may require a European Protected Species (EPSL) licence or Bat Mitigation Class Licence (CL21) from Natural England before works can legally commence. Works likely to result in less significant disturbance may be



carried out under a Bat Mitigation Method Statement. The magnitude of disturbance and therefore the requirement for an EPSL, Bat Mitigation Class Licence or method statement is assessed on a case by case basis by the bat ecologist. The Bat Mitigation Method Statement or EPSL must be prepared and/or applied for by a suitably experienced and licenced bat ecologist. Where planning permission is required, the appropriate licence cannot be obtained until planning permission has been granted.

Birds: In Britain the nests (whilst in use or being built) and eggs of wild birds are protected against taking, damage and destruction under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) (HM Government, 1981). The barn owl (*Tyto alba*) is listed on Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (HM Government, 1981); this legislation makes it an offence to:

- Intentionally capture, injure or kill a barn owl;
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb a barn owl whilst nesting;
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb a dependent young barn owl.



2.0 Methodology

The ecologist (Katherine Biggs) assessed the suitability of the building and the surrounding habitat to support bats and birds. A high-power torch was used to illuminate all accessible areas of the building with potential to support roosting bats and roosting/ nesting birds. The ecologist searched for signs of bats and birds including droppings, staining, feeding remains, bird nests, barn owl pellets and liming.

The assessment was carried out in accordance with the 'Bat Survey for Professional Ecologists - Good Practice Guidelines' produced by the Bat Conservation Trust (Collins, 2016).

2.1 Ecological Evaluation

Potential bat roosts identified during the visual inspection of the building were categorised as to their suitability in accordance with the Bat Conservation Trust's (BCT) Good Practice Guidelines (Collins, 2016) as described below:

Negligible: negligible features with potential to support roosting bats.

Low: one or more features with potential to support individual bats on an occasional basis. Unlikely to support large numbers of bats.

Moderate: one or more features with potential to support roosting bats but unlikely to be of high conservation status.

High: one or more features with potential to support large numbers of bats on a regular basis.

2.2 Limitations

All areas of the building were fully accessible, with the exception of the roof void which could only be inspected from the loft hatch due to the ceilings appearing to be unstable from below. Weather during the survey was in line with seasonal norms i.e. sunny dry, with part cloud, a moderate breeze and a temperature of 10°C. There are no limitations associated with weather conditions. 102 Southgate Street supports exterior features that could not be fully inspected and provide potential roosting locations for bats.



3.0 Assessment Results

3.1 Site Description

The property '102 Southgate Street' is located in an urban setting in the south east of Redruth c. 1.5 km north west of Lanner in Cornwall. The property is set within an unmanaged garden, including a large field of unmanaged grassland to the east, with residential properties and mature gardens beyond on all sides. The cottage is slightly sunken below the level of the field along its north eastern elevation. Southgate Street runs parallel with the site to the west of the property. The wider countryside consists of open farmland laid to pasture or managed for arable crop production to the east and west, enclosed with vegetated Cornish hedgebanks, with fragments of scrub and broadleaved woodland. Buildings in the wider area comprise a mixture of period and modern properties, outbuildings and agricultural barns. In combination, these features provide potential foraging and roosting habitat for bats, and suitable nest sites, roosts and foraging habitat for birds.

3.2 Bat Assessment

The assessment was undertaken on 3rd February 2021.

102 Southgate Street comprises a stone built two-storey cottage with a pitched scantle slate roof, which extends in a slight lean-to projection at the rear (north eastern elevation) (Figs. 1-7). The external walls are either bare stone or they have been rendered with cement. There are three brick chimneys on the roof, which are rendered with cement. There is a large hole in the roof on the north eastern elevation approx. 1 m wide x 0.6 m high which enables potential access for bats into the interior of the roof void (Fig. 5). The building features timber fascias, glazed windows with timber frames and slate/ granite sills, timber doors and metal gutters and downpipes. There are ridge tiles present, although their composition could not be determined due to the cement covering. The windows on the north eastern elevation of the property have been boarded up (Fig. 2).

There is a single-storey lean-to with a mono-pitched roof part covered with corrugated metal and part with scantle slate on the north western elevation of the property (Figs. 3-4). At the rear of the property is a small, detached outbuilding to the north east with a pitched scantle slate roof (Figs. 5 & 7). It is partially built into an earth bank that forms part of the field surrounding the property. The outbuilding is constructed from stone which is rendered with cement externally and features a timber door and two windows, one of which is open and unglazed. There is ivy growth on the roof which may obscure potential bat roost features.

On the main building there are notable gaps behind the fascia boards, underneath lifted slates, under the ridge tiles and lead flashing, all of which provide potential roosting opportunities for crevice-dwelling bats and potential access into the building interior. There are also gaps underneath lifted slates on the outbuilding which provide potential for roosting bats. The unglazed window on this building and broken window on the lean-to provide potential access for bats into the interior of both buildings. The wall tops on the gable ends of the main building appear well-sealed with no notable gaps.

Internally there is a single roof void over the main building, which is light and very draughty due to the presence of the large hole in the roof. The floor is covered with mineral fibre loft insulation, the roof is partly lined with a plastic roof membrane and partly unlined and there are crossing timbers present (Fig. 8). The internal rooms of the cottage are disused and have fallen into disrepair and are open to one another. On the first floor at the rear the rooms are built into the underside of the lean-to projection, the underside of which is boarded. Most of these rooms are



light and open with negligible potential for roosting bats, although there are a number of features such as cupboards within the bathroom and under the stairs which are dark and partially enclosed, providing potential opportunities for roosting bats (Fig. 9). There appears to be a narrow roof void underneath the slate roof of the lean-to, although this could not be accessed.

The interior of the outbuilding is light and draughty and is open from the concrete floor to the underside of the roof, which is unlined. The interior stone walls have been whitewashed and there is ivy growth coming through the roof and down the walls. The wall tops appear well-sealed and enclosed (Fig. 10). The light, draughty nature of the outbuilding is likely to have reduced the overall likelihood of bats day roosting within the interior, although it has potential to be used for night roosting by bats.



Figure 1: South western elevation of 102 Southgate Street



Figure 2: North eastern and north western elevations of 102 Southgate Street



Figure 3: North western elevation of lean-to on 102 Southgate Street, showing broken windows (red arrows)



Figure 4: Gaps under lifted slates and lead flashing on lean-to at 102 Southgate Street (viewed towards the south east)



Figure 5: North eastern elevation of 102 Southgate Street and detached outbuilding, showing hole in the roof of the cottage (red arrow)



Figure 6: Gap behind fascia board on south western elevation of 102 Southgate Street (red arrow)



Figure 7: North western elevation of detached outbuilding at 102 Southgate Street



Figure 8: Interior of roof void at 102 Southgate Street, showing hole in the roof (viewed towards the north west)



Figure 9: Bathroom cupboards on first floor of 102 Southgate Street (viewed towards the south)



Figure 10: Interior of detached outbuilding at 102 Southgate Street (viewed towards the east)

No evidence of the use of the main cottage or outbuilding by roosting bats was found. However, a number of external and internal features were noted on the buildings which provide potential roosting opportunities for bats and which also provide potential access for bats into the interiors. In addition, as it was not possible to fully inspect the interior of the main roof void other than from the loft hatch, the likely presence or absence of bats roosting within this area could not be determined by visual survey alone.

102 Southgate Street was, therefore, assessed as being of '**moderate suitability**' for roosting bats.

3.3 Bird Assessment

No evidence of the use of the buildings by nesting birds was found. A dead house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*) was noted within the roof void over the main building close to the hole in the roof, which indicates that birds may use the building for nesting. In addition, the ivy growth on the outbuilding provides potential nesting habitat for birds.

No evidence of barn owls nesting within the buildings was found. The buildings were assessed as being of **negligible suitability** to support nesting, breeding or resting barn owls.



4.0 Mitigation Recommendations

4.1 Bat Mitigation

No evidence of the use of the main building or outbuilding by roosting bats was found. However, a number of external and internal features were noted on the buildings which provide potential roosting opportunities for bats and which also provide potential access for bats into the interiors. This includes gaps behind the fascia boards, underneath lifted slates, under the ridge tiles and lead flashing, all of which provide potential roosting opportunities for crevice-dwelling bats and potential access into the building interiors. Broken windows on the lean-to and outbuilding provide further potential access for bats into the interiors and within the main building, partially enclosed cupboards on the first floor and ground floor provide potential opportunities for roosting bats.

In addition, as it was not possible to fully inspect the interior of the main roof void over the main building, other than from the loft hatch, the likely presence or absence of bats roosting within this area could not be determined by visual survey alone. 102 Southgate Street was, therefore, assessed as being of **'moderate suitability'** for roosting bats.

Works to 102 Southgate Street and its outbuilding must be informed with two bat emergence or re-entry surveys undertaken between May and September; one of which should be carried out between May and August. The survey information will be required to inform the planning application and subsequent works. These surveys will determine whether bats are present and, if so, the species, number of individuals, bat access points and timings of usage.

Please note that planning permission is unlikely to be granted with outstanding ecological surveys. This report must be updated with the results of the recommended further surveys or superseded with a standalone bat survey report, following provision of the final site plan and prior to submission of the planning application.

4.2 Bird Mitigation

No evidence of the use of the buildings by nesting birds was found. A dead house sparrow was noted within the roof void over the main building, indicating that this species may nest within the building. The ivy growth on the outbuilding provides potential nesting opportunities for birds.

No evidence of the use of the building by barn owls was found and the building was assessed as being of **negligible potential** to support barn owl.

Works to the buildings, including removal of the ivy, should be undertaken between October and February, when birds will not be nesting (provided these timings do not conflict with subsequent bat mitigation requirements, to be confirmed following the further bat surveys), or, alternatively, preceded with a thorough search for nesting birds (to be undertaken by a suitably experienced ecologist). If, during construction works, an active bird nest is uncovered, works within at least 5m of the nest must stop immediately (as soon as it is safe to do so) and delayed until nesting activity has ceased. Works are most likely to be delayed between April and July.

Alternative provision should be made for nesting house sparrows within the new dwelling post-development. This should be in the form of prefabricated house sparrow nest boxes, which should be located under the eaves on either a north or west facing elevation. Suitable products are available from www.nhbs.com and www.wildcare.co.uk and include the 1SP Schwegler sparrow terrace. This is in addition to the biodiversity enhancements recommended in section 4.3 below.

Further surveys for birds are not recommended as part of this assessment.



4.3 Opportunities for Biodiversity Enhancement

Net gain is described as a measurable target(s) for development projects where impacts on biodiversity are outweighed by the mitigation hierarchy approach to first avoid, and then minimise, impact including through restoration and/ or compensation (Baker *et al.*, 2019).

The biodiversity value of the site for nesting birds post-development could be enhanced by installing bird boxes within the fabric of the new dwelling, on the building exterior or within the garden of the property. The value of the site for invertebrates could be enhanced by installing deadwood piles within garden habitat, or bee bricks within the new dwelling. In accordance with the Cornwall Planning for Biodiversity Guide (2018), one bat box or one bird box is required per new residential unit, and one brick is required in 50% of units. Suitable products for birds include 1SP Schwegler sparrow terrace, WoodStone swift nest box, and 1MR Schwegler Avianex. Plan for Ecology Ltd can provide detailed recommendations upon request.

NB: suitable products are available from www.nhbs.com, www.wildcareshop.com and www.greenandblue.co.uk



5.0 References

Baker *et al.*, (2019) Biodiversity Net Gain: Good Practice Principles for Development.

British Standard Institution (2013) BS42020: 2013 Biodiversity – A Code of Practice for Planning and Development. BSI Standards Limited 2013. ISBN 978 0 580 77917 6.

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

Cornwall Council (2018) Cornwall Planning for Biodiversity Guide. Cornwall Council. Truro.

HM Government (2010) The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. HMSO, London.

HM Government (2006) The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. HMSO, London.

HM Government (1981) The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). HMSO, London.

HM Government (2000) The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. HMSO, London.