



Preliminary Ecological Appraisal

Land at Mill Lane, Bolsover

Dragonfly Developments Ltd.

MAN.1788.001.EC.R.002



Contact Details:

Enzygo Ltd. (Bristol Office)
The Byre
Woodend Lane
Cromhall
Gloucestershire
GL12 8AA

tel: 01454 269237
email: derek.allan@enzygo.com
www: enzygo.com

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal

Project:	Land at Mill Lane, Bolsover
For:	Dragonfly Developments Ltd.
Status:	Final
Date:	8 th April 2021
Author:	Chris Schofield MSc BSc (Hons) ACIEEM – Senior Ecologist
Reviewer:	Derek Allan MSc BSc (Hons) MCIEEM – Director of Ecology

Disclaimer:

This report has been produced by Enzygo Limited within the terms of the contract with the client and taking account of the resources devoted to it by agreement with the client.

We disclaim any responsibility to the client and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of the above.

This report is confidential to the client and we accept no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, is made known. Any such party relies on the report at their own risk.

Enzygo Limited Registered in England No. 6525159

Registered Office: Gresham House, 5-7 St. Pauls Street, Leeds, England, LS1 2JG

Contents

1.0	Introduction	4
1.1	Commission	4
1.2	Proposed Development/Identification of Impacts	4
1.3	Aims and Objectives	4
1.4	Background/Acknowledgments.....	4
1.5	Local Planning Policy	5
1.6	Site Context	6
2.0	Methodology.....	7
2.1	Desk Study.....	7
2.2	Field Survey	7
2.3	Assessment.....	10
2.4	Limitations.....	12
3.0	Baseline Ecological Conditions	13
4.0	Assessment and Mitigation	23
5.0	Enhancement and Monitoring	24
6.0	Conclusion.....	26
7.0	References	27

Tables and Figures

Figure 1 – Survey Area.....	6
Table 1 – Survey Dates and Conditions	7
Table 2 – Ecological Features	13
Table 3 – Assessment of effect and mitigation measures	23

Table 4 – Enhancement & Monitoring 24

Drawings and Appendices

Drawing MAN.1788.001.EC.D.001 – Phase I Habitat Map 29

Appendix A – Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment 30

Appendix B - Legislation and National Planning Policy 34

Non-Technical Summary

- i. In March 2020 Enzygo Ltd was commissioned by Dragonfly Developments Ltd (the client) to undertake a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) at Land at Mill Lane, Bolsover, Derbyshire, S44 6NP (central grid reference SK 47506 71316), located within the Bolsover District Council (Bolsover North West Ward) planning authority. This study will inform proposals for site clearance including building demolition and for new residential development.
- ii. The following key ecological features and associated recommendations have been identified:
 - **Bats** - (no evidence of roosting bats or significant opportunities identified; however a single existing building could not be accessed during survey) - pre-commencement survey of Building B3 required to determine the presence or absence of roosting bats; and,
 - **Birds (general nesting)** - (trees, scrub and buildings provide nesting potential for a restricted range of bird species) – Site clearance and demolition to be conducted outside of the nesting season or if necessary within the nesting season an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) to conduct nesting bird check immediately prior to commencement.
- iii. Proposals present opportunities for biodiversity enhancement in order to demonstrate an overall biodiversity net gain in accordance with national and local policies through providing enhanced opportunities for nesting birds and roosting bats, and producing a landscape scheme with native species and species which are known to be of value to wildlife.
- iv. This report has demonstrated that if the outlined mitigation measures are implemented in full then no significant residual impact could be expected, and the proposed application will result in 'no net loss in biodiversity,' whilst also providing opportunities for 'biodiversity net gain' in accordance with NPPF and Local Planning Policy.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Commission

1.1.1 In March 2020 Enzygo Ltd was commissioned by Dragonfly Developments Ltd (the client) to undertake a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) at Land at Mill Lane, Bolsover, Derbyshire, S44 6NP (central grid reference SK 47506 71316), located within the Bolsover District Council (Bolsover North West Ward) planning authority. This study will inform proposals for site clearance including building demolition and for new residential development.

1.1.2 *Note: Enzygo Ltd are not considered to act as a Principal Designer for any mitigation/enhancement strategies identified within this document in accordance with the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015 (CITB, 2016).*

1.2 Proposed Development/Identification of Impacts

1.2.1 The study will inform proposals for site clearance, including demolition of the existing buildings, and construction of a new residential development with associated infrastructure and landscape planting.

1.2.2 It is considered there is unlikely any significant increased recreational pressures (such as through an increase in dog walking and cat predation) on sites and habitats in the wider landscape considering the scale of the proposals and the extensive residential development already present in the area, as well the absence of any particularly sensitive nearby designated sites. The client will use the findings of this report to determine the final site layout, and this report can be modified once the proposals have been confirmed.

1.2.3 This report identifies ecological features, and potential impacts and effects, recommends proportionate avoidance/mitigation/compensation strategies, followed by enhancements. This information will advise the client on the potential constraints to proposals and inform the final site design. A corresponding zone of influence has been considered (this includes any transboundary effects regardless of administrative areas).

1.3 Aims and Objectives

1.3.1 The purpose of this report is to provide biodiversity information which succinctly identifies ecological features on site and within the corresponding zone of influence, identifies potential impacts resulting from the proposed application, associated effects to ecological features, recommends proportionate avoidance, mitigation and compensation strategies, and identifies enhancements that can be implemented in accordance with the British Standard for Biodiversity BS42020:2013 (BSI, 2013) to demonstrate 'no net loss in biodiversity' and a 'biodiversity net gain' in accordance with NPPF and Local Planning Policy.

1.3.2 This report has been produced with reference to current *Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal* (CIEEM, 2017a), *Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland, Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine* (CIEEM, 2018) and *Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing* (CIEEM, 2017b), *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists Good Practice Guidelines* (Collins, 2016) and British Standard BS42020:2013 (BSI, 2013).

1.4 Background/Acknowledgments

1.4.1 A search of Bolsover District Council planning website has revealed several previous applications associated with the former Council Depot site. None of these applications, including a 2011 application for "Change of use from Council Depot to Business (Class B1), General Industrial

(Class B2) and Storage or Distribution (Class B8) Uses” (planning reference 11/00016/FUL) are supported by any previous ecological survey or assessment information.

- 1.4.2 The search has identified a 2014 application on land 150m to the east for “*residential development in the region of 950 dwellings, provision of an extra care facility and an Infant School*” (planning reference 14/00080/OUTEA). This application was supported by an Ecological Assessment (Brooks Ecological, 2009), Ecological Appraisal Update (Brooks Ecological, 2013a), Hedgerow Survey (Brooks Ecological, 2013b), Bat Survey (Brooks Ecological, 2013c), Breeding Bird Survey (Brooks Ecological, 2013d) and Reptile Survey (Brooks Ecological, 2013e). These reports and subsequent related consultation responses have been reviewed and the information used to inform the appropriate part of this assessment.
- 1.4.3 The search has also identified a 2015 application on land 100m to the north “*for the erection of up to 149 dwellings*” (planning reference 15/00076/OUT) which was supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Absolute Ecology, 2013a) and a Reptile Survey (Absolute Ecology, 2013b). Again, these assessments have been reviewed and the findings used to help inform the relevant section of this report.
- 1.4.4 No further applications have been identified which have any pertinent nature conservation and biodiversity supporting information relevant to this assessment.
- 1.4.5 It is our understanding that to date there have been no further correspondence with the County Ecologist or any statutory consultees i.e. Natural England, regarding this application. Additionally, we have not been informed of any Local Validation requirements i.e. biodiversity checklist for completion or specific standards for surveys.

1.5 Local Planning Policy

- 1.5.1 The following policies of the recently adopted Local Plan for Bolsover District (Bolsover District Council, 2020) are applicable to nature conservation and this assessment. These details are provided in summary only and the original Local Plan document should be viewed for details.
- **Policy SC9: Biodiversity and Geodiversity** – *Development proposals should seek to conserve and enhance the biodiversity and to provide net gains where possible. Development proposals will be supported where significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development can be avoided or, if that is not possible, adequately mitigated.*
 - **Policy SC10: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows** - *trees, woodland and hedgerows will be protected from damage and retained, unless it can be demonstrated that removal is necessary and appropriate mitigation can be achieved. Development should contribute to the protection, enhancement, and where possible expansion of woodlands, trees and hedgerows in the area. The loss of woodland, healthy trees and hedgerows with visual, historic or wildlife importance will be resisted.*
 - **Policy ITCR1: Strategic Green Infrastructure Network** - *The District’s Strategic Green Infrastructure Network will be preserved and wherever feasible enhanced. Proposals for new development will be permitted where they conserve the Strategic Green Infrastructure Network or assets within it and where feasible expand their extent and multi-functionality. New links will be supported where they enhance biodiversity and mitigate against climate change by providing opportunities for species to move or migrate.*

- 1.5.2 There are no Supplementary Planning Documents or guidance which relate to biodiversity or nature conservation.
- 1.5.3 It is confirmed the proposed development site does not form part of any wildlife corridor of stepping stone habitat (as identified by Policy SC9) nor does it lie within the Strategic Green Infrastructure Network (in accordance with Policy ITCR1) (Bolsover District Council, 2020).
- 1.5.4 Refer to Appendix B for relevant details of European and National Legislation, and National Planning Policy.

1.6 Site Context

- 1.6.1 The total approximately 1.2ha proposed development site a former Council Depot which supports buildings and hardstanding enclosed by security fencing. This site has historically been in use as Council transport depot site and more recently for industrial, storage and business use. A plot of species-poor neutral grassland lies within the site to the west and two areas of close-mown amenity grassland lie adjacent to Mill Lane to the north. The site is surrounded by residential development to the north, west and east, and Limekiln recreational ground lies to the south.
- 1.6.2 The wider landscape is characterised by the residential development of the town of Bolsover to the south and west, and open countryside and arable farmland to the north and east.
- 1.6.3 The site lies within Southern Magnesian Limestone National Character Area (Natural England, 2013) which is characterised as a *“open, rolling arable farmland enclosed by hedgerows, with plantation woodlands, historic estate properties and parkland.”*

Figure 1 – Survey Area



Image courtesy of Google Image Pro 7.3.2.5491, [Grid Ref: SK 47506 71316]. Imagery date 22nd April 2020. Image accessed 8th April 2021.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Desk Study

2.1.1 Desk study details were obtained from the following sources on the associated dates to provide background on ecological features in the vicinity of the site. In each case the search included the site and the specified area beyond the site boundary based on the expected zone of influence. Candidate and potential designations are considered too as these are also legally protected. Records search for included:

- Statutory sites designated or classified under international conventions or European legislation within a 5km radius, statutory sites designated under national legislation (including Marine), Natural England GCN Pond Surveys for District Level Licensing data and existing EPS Licence applications within a 2km radius, and Priority Habitat & Ancient Woodland Inventory within a 0.5km radius [Magic Map, 20th May 2020] (DEFRA, 2020);
- Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and Biodiversity Conservation Areas within the immediate zone of influence [Bolsover District Council website, 20th May 2020];
- Waterbodies within a 0.5km radius (Online mapping sources including: Google Maps; Magic Map; and Ordnance Survey Street View, 20th May 2020); and
- Locally designated wildlife sites & any notified Local Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Habitats, Legally protected species, any Priority species (which includes: National Biodiversity Species, Local BAP Species, Species of conservation concern and Red Data Book (RDB) species, Birds of Conservation Concern (BOCC), nationally rare and nationally scarce species, and OSPAR Commission list of threatened/declining species) and Invasive species (listed under section 14 of Schedule 9 only) within a 2km radius, and any important hedgerows/veteran trees within the immediate zone of influence [Derbyshire Biological Records Centre, 9th April 2020].

2.1.2 The Data has been edited where relevant to prevent sensitive or confidential records being made public in accordance with Guidelines for Accessing and Using Biodiversity Data (CIEEM, 2016).

2.2 Field Survey

2.2.1 Field Surveys were undertaken on the following dates by the identified staff, all of whom satisfy necessary field survey competencies as stipulated by the Chartered Institute for Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM). Weather conditions on the day of survey have been included and where relevant survey/class licence numbers referred to.

Table 1 – Survey Dates and Conditions

Survey	Date	Staff/Licence	Environmental Conditions
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal including Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment of buildings and trees	15/04/2020	Chris Schofield ACIEEM MSc. BSc. (Hons) [Senior Ecologist at Enzygo] under the guidance of Derek Allan MCIEEM MSc BSc [Hons] (Director of Ecology at Enzygo and a licensed bat surveyor (Natural England licence Level 2, 2015-14659-CLS-CLS))	Clear and sunny, (0% cloud cover), and 15°C with a light wind.

Preliminary Ecological Appraisal

2.2.2 In accordance with Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal 2nd Edition (CIEEM, 2017a) the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) survey included the following.

Mapping of Habitat Types

2.2.3 Phase I Habitat Survey (JNCC, 2010) is the most recognised published method of habitat classification. It has been used to categorise & map the main vegetation types present within the survey area using a standard set of habitat categories. Each of the main habitats has been described; including details of component plant species abundances (recorded using the DAFOR scale: D=Dominant, A=Abundant, F=Frequent, O=Occasional, R=Rare). Additionally, any stands of non-native invasive plant species were recorded. Habitat extents have been visually mapped onto a topographic plan, with approximate location/areas recorded only (a GPS unit has not been utilised to accurately recorded these).

Assessment of possible presence/likely importance for Protected & Priority Species

2.2.4 An assessment of the possible presence of protected or priority species, and the likely importance of habitat features present for such species has also been undertaken, particularly where uncommon or specialised habitats are present in accordance with current PEA guidelines (CIEEM, 2017a). However, no specific protected species survey has been undertaken unless listed under additional surveys as below. Any incidental sightings of protected or priority species, or field signs of such species has also been recorded. Species assessed include: Plants & Fungi; Terrestrial/aquatic invertebrates; Fish; Amphibians; Reptiles; Breeding, wintering and migratory birds; Bats (including potential roost sites, foraging and commuting habitats/features), Badger, and Other mammal species.

Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment

Preliminary Daylight Roost Assessment of Buildings

2.2.5 In accordance with current guidance (Collins, 2016), a systematic thorough search of the exterior and interior of the existing buildings was undertaken. This included any roof spaces, cellars, and unoccupied rooms. Equipment used to aid the survey included: ladders, low/high-powered torches and binoculars. Crawl boards and specialised PPE for confined spaces/asbestos were not utilised. Notes were made on the following:

- Type, construction and age of building (particularly if traditional materials have been used or the presence of specialist bat roosting features);
- Presence/absence of potential roost features throughout the interior (i.e. uncluttered isolated roof voids, warm and dark undisturbed spaces, gaps around ridge beams, exposed beam joints, gaps within traditional bituminous felt/wooden sarking boarding etc);
- Presence/absence of potential roost features throughout the exterior (i.e. raised ridge tiles, hanging tiles, raised/missing tiles or lead flashing that would allow access beneath roofing structures, crevices behind soffit boxing/barge boarding/ship-lap boarding, gaps around window frames and doors, boarded up windows, gaps within mortar or brickwork, access into wall cavities etc);

- Presence/absence of potential hibernation features (i.e. underground spaces or rooms that would provide an isolated stable temperature and moist conditions during the winter period etc);
- Environmental factors that would increase the probability of bat presence (i.e. dark zones with no/limited exterior lighting, south/west facing aspects, good quality foraging/commuting habitat nearby particularly prominent linear features) and those that would decrease the probability of bat presence (high light levels, dense urban areas, recent works, modern Breathable Roofing Membranes (BRMs) or other modern tight fitting roofing materials, recent timber treatment or pest control, ultrasonic rodent deterrents, draughty/exposed conditions, high levels of noise or vibration or human disturbance, poor quality foraging/commuting habitat etc); and
- Type and location of any roosting bat evidence (i.e. presence of live or dead bats, audible squeaking, droppings, feeding remains, urine stains, grease marks etc).

Scoping (non-specialist) survey for roosts: individual trees and groups of trees

2.2.6 With reference to current survey guidelines BS8596:2015 (BSI, 2015), a scoping (non-specialist) survey for roosts of individual trees and groups of trees within and immediately adjacent to the site, was undertaken. Each tree was visually inspected from the ground (with the aid of binoculars and a high-powered torch) to identify Potential Roosting Features (PRFs), including checks for the presence of the following features that bats might be able to use:

- Natural holes (e.g. knot holes) arising from naturally shed branches, or branches previously pruned back to the branch collar;
- Man-made holes (e.g. cavities that have developed from flush cuts) or cavities created by branches tearing out from parent stems;
- Woodpecker holes;
- Cracks/splits in stems or branches (both vertical and horizontal);
- Partially detached or loose, platy bark;
- Cankers (caused by localised bark death) in which cavities have developed;
- Other hollows or cavities, including butt rots;
- Compression forks with included bark, forming potential cavities;
- Crossing stems or branches with suitable space between for roosting;
- Ivy stems with diameters in excess of 50mm with suitable roosting space behind (or where a roosting space can be seen where a mat of thinner stems has left a gap between the mat and the trunk);
- Bird and Bat boxes on trees; or
- Other features that offer a place of shelter.

Secondary (non-specialist) survey for roosts: individual trees and groups of trees

2.2.7 At the same time, a secondary (non-specialist) survey for roosts: individual trees and groups of trees was undertaken where potential PRFs were identified. Survey at height was undertaken with the use of telescopic ladders where access was safe and feasible, and an endoscope was used where possible to investigate suitable features. Any signs of bat use or bat presence was recorded, such as:

- The presence of bats (live or dead);
- Open cavities which extend above the opening, and that have sections which are smooth and free of debris;
- Bat droppings in, around or below the entrance (especially caught on horizontal branches below the entrance or surrounding leaves);
- Staining immediately around the opening;
- Smoothing of surfaces around the opening;
- The distinctive smell of bats or ammonia;
- Audible chattering at dusk or in warm weather for some species; and
- Accumulation of prey debris such as insect wings.

2.3 Assessment

Assessment of Suitability of Features for Roosting Bats

2.3.1 Based on the findings of the preliminary bat roost assessment survey, each building has been classified into one of the following categories in accordance with current guidance (Collins, 2016). The assessment is made irrespective of species conservation status, which is established after presence is confirmed/following further surveys:

- Known or confirmed roost – Structure with evidence of bat use or bat presence;
- High Suitability – A structure with one or more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis and potentially for longer periods of time due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat;
- Medium Suitability – A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions and surrounding habitat but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status;
- Low Suitability – A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by individual bats opportunistically. However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions, and/or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by large numbers of bats (i.e. unlikely to be suitable for maternity or hibernation); or
- Negligible Suitability – Negligible features likely to be used by roosting bats.

2.3.2 Following the preliminary assessment of trees, based on the signs present, each tree was classified as one of the following categories in accordance with current guidance BS8596:2015 (BSI, 2015):

- Known or confirmed roost – Trees with evidence of bat use or bat presence;
- High/medium risk – Trees with a suitable PRF, or with several features with some bat roost potential;
- Low risk – Trees of sufficient size and age to contain bat roosts but with no obvious PRFs seen during the scoping survey, or features seen with limited roosting potential only, e.g. small amounts of Ivy; or
- Negligible/no risk – Trees with apparently no potential to support bats.

Assessment of Potential Development Impacts

2.3.3 A level of importance has been assigned to each ecological feature, where sufficient baseline data is available to do so, in accordance with current guidance (CIEEM, 2018). This is defined within a geographical context as follows: International and European; National; Regional; Metropolitan, County, vice-county or other local authority-wide area; River Basin District; Estuarine system/Coastal cell; and Local (plus Negligible where no associated value has been identified). For example, importance of designated sites reflects the geographical context of the designation (where designated sites no longer meet designation criteria and those formally 'de-notified' or where an undesignated site meets published selection criteria must also be considered). When considering habitats and species contextual information about distribution and abundance of that habitat/species in the area must be considered (if the habitat/species status is currently in a degraded or unfavourable condition its potential value should be considered).

2.3.4 The assessment then considers potential impacts (both positive and negative) generated during the construction and operational phase of the proposed application. Only impacts that are likely to be significant are considered. Impacts that are either unlikely to occur, or if they did occur are unlikely to be significant, are not considered.

2.3.5 Cumulative impacts are then considered where the application meets criteria in accordance with national EIA screening guidance (GOV.UK, 2019), and where agreed with the competent authority during scoping. This takes into consideration existing background levels of threat or pressure, looks at critical thresholds, and assess both additive/incremental and associated/connected impacts and effects.

2.3.6 Relevant aspects of ecological structure and function are then considered when determining if identified impacts will have a significant effect upon ecological features. Where necessary, this assessment utilises information from other specialists i.e. air quality, hydrology etc, to determine the level of impact. In accordance with current guidance (CIEEM, 2018) these are described using the following characteristics, where relevant: positive or negative; extent; magnitude; duration; frequency and timing; and reversibility.

2.3.7 The mitigation hierarchy is then explored in accordance with BS42020:2013 (BSI, 2013). This seeks as a preference to avoid impacts, then to mitigate unavoidable impacts, and as a last resort, to compensate for unavoidable residual impacts that remain after avoidance and mitigation measures. Justification has been provided by the client/their planner where the mitigation hierarchy cannot be followed, or for example where compensation is a preferred approach where the competent authority has adopted a County wide strategy i.e. District Level

Licensing Schemes (GOV.UK, 2019). In this instance current national Biodiversity Offsetting guidance has also been consulted (GOV.UK, 2019). Additional information has also been provided by the client/their planner where the applicant wishes to demonstrate exceptional circumstances or where they wish to pursue alternative strategies. Any residual impacts following mitigation measures etc are then identified.

- 2.3.8 All mitigation measures follow species specific current best practice guidance and the source has been identified accordingly. Deviation from guidance has been explained by the ecologist and is proportionate to the predicted degree of risk to biodiversity and to the nature and scale of the proposed works.
- 2.3.9 It is important that planning decisions are based on up-to-date ecological data, and the specific timeframe over which survey data is considered valid follows general advice (CIEEM, 2019). Additionally, it should be noted that the presence/absence and status of protected species can change seasonally/annually. The age of data should also be assessed separately when considering the submission of an EPS Licence (i.e. Natural England may require data to be from the current season).

2.4 Limitations

- 2.4.1 Data held by consultees may not be exhaustive; the absence of evidence does not indicate evidence of absence. Enzygo cannot take responsibility for the accuracy of external data sources and as such discrepancies and inaccuracies may occur.
- 2.4.2 Natural England do not hold information of Ancient Woodland less than 2ha in size.
- 2.4.3 Records over 10 years old for transient species (as these are likely to have moved during the interim) and species protected from sale only under the W&C Act 1981 and amendments, are excluded (as these are not relevant to a planning application). Additionally, given the large number of priority species, these have only been included if identified from the desk study and/or habitats recorded on site have been assessed as providing suitable conditions.
- 2.4.4 Geological sites have only been included within this report where they have biodiversity or nature conservation components to their designation.
- 2.4.5 At certain times of year flora species may be in a state of senescence and are not readily identifiable. However, given the site conditions, April represented a suitable time to identify the majority of flora species and it was possible to easily classify the commonly occurring habitat types. The timing of the survey is not perceived as a survey limitation
- 2.4.6 This document does not contain a comprehensive list of botanical species on site. Only plant species characteristic of each habitat and incidental observations of notable plant species were recorded.
- 2.4.7 DBRC and Bolsover District Council do not supply information on Important Hedgerows.
- 2.4.8 During the April survey, access was not possible into the internal areas of the Building B3 in order to search for evidence of protected species. As a result, a precautionary approach has been adopted in respect of roosting bats and requirement for further survey. Given the precautionary approach adopted in this report, this access restriction is not viewed as a significant survey or assessment limitation.

3.0 Baseline Ecological Conditions

3.1.1 Ecological features identified by the desk study/field survey are presented below, along with their details and associated ecological value. Refer to Drawing MAN.1788.001.EC.D.002 for the location/extent of ecological features where relevant.



Table 2 – Ecological Features



Ecological Feature	Details	Ecological Importance
Statutory sites designated or classified under international conventions or European legislation		
None	-	-
Statutory sites designated under national legislation (& Impact Risk Zones)		
SSSI Impact Risk Zone (IRZ)	The Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) in which the site lies states the LPA should consult Natural England on the likely impacts of the following development categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Airports, helipads and other aviation proposals; - Planning applications for quarries, including: new proposals, Review of Minerals Permissions (ROMP), extensions, variations to conditions etc. Oil & gas exploration/extraction; - Livestock & poultry units with floorspace > 500m², slurry lagoons > 750m² & manure stores > 3500t; and, - Any discharge of water or liquid waste of more than 20m³/day to ground (i.e. to seep away) or to surface water, such as a beck or stream (<i>NB. This does not include discharges to mains sewer which are unlikely to pose a risk at this location</i>). 	N/A Proposals do not meet the criteria for which LPA should consult Natural England.
Local Nature Reserves		
None	-	-
Other locally designated wildlife sites		
Allotment Orchard Potential Local Wildlife Site (pLWS) 240m South	No ecological feature is identified, however, assumed to represent Orchard habitat.	County
Dumble Meadows LWS 600m North-west	Noted for its broadleaved woodland.	County
Brockley Wood LWS 600m North	Noted for its Ancient woodland (plantation broad-leaved).	County


Ecological Feature	Details	Ecological Importance
Bolsover Meadow and Castle Surrounds pLWS 600m South-west	No habitat identified, however, site appears to support woodland and grassland habitats.	County
Ovencroft Lane Local Wildlife Site (LWS) 625m East	Noted for its Hedgerow habitat.	County
Hornscroft Earthwork LWS 825m South	Noted for its unimproved calcareous grassland	County
Conduit House Fields LWS 900m South	Noted for its unimproved calcareous grassland	County
Fox Covert and Hawke Brook LWS 950m North	Noted for its habitat mosaic.	County
Miss Hardwick's Orchard pLWS 1.2km North	Noted for its orchard habitat.	County
Stockley Trail pLWS 1.2km South-west	Noted for its semi-improved grassland.	County
Snipe Bog Nature Reserve and Bolsover Colliery Marsh LWS 1.4km West	Noted for its habitat mosaic.	County
Peter Fidler Reserve & The Goit Railway (east) LWS 1.4km South-west	Noted for its habitat mosaic.	County
Keepers Hollow Verge LWS 1.5km East	Noted for its unimproved calcareous grassland	County
Peter Fidler Reserve & The Goit Railway (west) LWS 1.6km South-west	Noted for its habitat mosaic.	County
Oxcroft Colliery South LWS 1.8km North	Noted for its open water pond habitats.	County
Carr Vale Sewage Works and Scrub pLWS 1.9km South-west	Noted for its habitat mosaic.	County
Carr Vale Flash LWS and DWT Nature Reserve 1.9km South-west	Noted for its reedbed habitat.	County

Ecological Feature	Details	Ecological Importance
Woodside Field Slope & Stream LWS 2km North-west	Noted for its unimproved neutral grassland.	County
Bolsover Moor Plantation pLWS 2km East	Noted for its woodland habitat	County
England HPI, Local BAP Habitats, Ancient Woodland, Important Hedgerows, Veteran Trees, TPOs and Conservation Areas		
Tree Preservations Orders and Veteran Trees	Bolsover District Council data confirms no TPOs within a 500m radius, and data from DBRC confirm no Veteran Trees within this radius. The closest TPO is associated with Brockley Wood 600m to the north.	N/A
Ancient Woodland	No Ancient Woodland within a 500m radius. Again, Brockley Wood 600m to the north represents the closest area of Ancient Woodland to the proposed development.	N/A
Green/Blue & Aquatic Infrastructure, Dark Zones, and Local Policy		
Green Infrastructure	Scattered trees, scrub and shrubs present do not provide any notable green infrastructure function, and the site does not lie within the <i>Strategic Green Infrastructure Network</i> in accordance with Policy ITCR1 of the Local Plan (Bolsover District Council, 2020).	N/A
Blue Infrastructure	No waterbodies or watercourses are present within or adjacent to the site. There is also no known hydrological connectivity between the site and any surrounding watercourses in the surrounding area.	N/A
Dark Zones	There are no known dark zones across the site. In accordance with the standard guidance specified in the <i>Guidance Notes for Reduction of Obtrusive Lighting</i> (Institution of Lighting Professionals, 2011), the application site likely falls under Environmental Zone E3 (Suburban – Medium district brightness).	N/A

Habitat Types		
<p data-bbox="203 229 376 256">Buildings (J3.6)</p>   	<p data-bbox="689 229 1794 518">The site supports three large buildings (Buildings B1, B2 and B3) as well as an additional small garage and a small storeroom building (refer to Drawing MAN.1788.001.EC.D.002 for the building locations). Building 1 (B1) is a low warehouse-type building with cinderblock walls up to 2m high with prefabricated corrugated metal sheeting walls above and extending to ground level on the building's exterior. A steel frame supports a (suspected) asbestos corrugated single-pitched roof with skylights. A small single-storey flat roof extension is present adjoined to the northern elevation which contains a former reception area. Internally, the large open space has been divided into offices, toilets, kitchen, storage etc.at the northern and eastern ends of the building, leaving a large open central warehouse area.</p> <p data-bbox="689 523 1794 715">Building 2 (B2) is also a large warehouse-type former depot shed approximately 8 to 10m in height. The building has cinderblock walls up to 3m high internally, and redbrick and mortar to 3m high externally, with prefabricated corrugated metal sheeting walls above. A steel frame supports a single-pitched metal corrugated roof with skylights. Internally, the building supports a single large open space with the exception of a small brick and mortar cluster of rooms at the north-eastern corner. The eastern and southern elevation walls of the building support large metal shutter doors.</p> <p data-bbox="689 719 1794 847">Building 3 (B3) is a low single-storey further warehouse-type shed building. The building has walls with a base of brick and mortar with prefabricated corrugated sheeting above, supporting a twice-pitched roof of corrugated sheeting with skylights. No access was possible to the interior of the building during the April 2020 field survey (refer to Survey Limitations at Section 2.4).</p> <p data-bbox="689 852 1794 943">Other than occasional young self-seeded shrubs surrounding the buildings, these buildings do not support any significant vegetation assemblages. These features do not represent UK BAP or Local BAP Habitat.</p> <p data-bbox="689 948 1794 1007">Assessment of the buildings in respect of roosting bats is provided in the protected species section below, with further description and photos provided at Appendix A.</p>	<p data-bbox="1800 229 1921 256">Negligible</p>

<p>Bare Ground (J4)</p> 	<p>Land surrounding the buildings comprises bare ground hardstanding habitat, which appears to have been previously used for access, storage, and car parking. This bare ground supports significantly sparse vegetation (<1% cover) which is colonising areas around the edges of the habitat, and other gaps and areas of damage. This vegetation is characterised by occasional Annual Meadow-grass (<i>Poa annua</i>), Perennial Rye-grass (<i>Lolium perenne</i>), Yorkshire-fog (<i>Holcus lanatus</i>), Dandelion (<i>Taraxacum officinale</i> agg.), Ribwort Plantain (<i>Plantago lanceolata</i>), Common Nettle (<i>Urtica dioica</i>) and Red Valerian (<i>Centranthus ruber</i>).</p> <p>This bare ground habitat does not represent any UK BAP or Local BAP Habitat.</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
<p>Dense Continuous Scrub (A2.1) and Scattered Trees (A3.1) and Shrubs (A2.2)</p> 	<p>At the boundaries of the site are strips of unmanaged dense scrub and scattered shrubs, with occasional scattered trees. This scrub/shrub habitat is characterised by abundant Bramble (<i>Rubus fruticosus</i> agg.), frequent Elder (<i>Sambucus nigra</i>), Buddleja (<i>Buddleja davidii</i>) and Common Nettle, with occasional young saplings of Silver Birch (<i>Betula pendula</i>), Grey Willow (<i>Salix cinerea</i>), Ash (<i>Fraxinus excelsior</i>) and Cherry (<i>Prunus</i> sp.), and occasional shrubs of Dog Rose (<i>Rosa canina</i>), Flowering Currant (<i>Ribes sanguineum</i>) and Wilson’s Honeysuckle (<i>Lonicera nitida</i>).</p> <p>Scattered trees across the site include Silver Birch at the northern boundary and a row of Leyland Cypress (<i>Cupressus × leylandii</i>) at the eastern boundary.</p> <p>None of these habitats represent UK BAP or Local BAP habitat.</p>	<p>Negligible</p>

<p>Tall Ruderal Herb Vegetation (C3.1)</p> 	<p>Localised areas associated with unmanaged areas of the site support tall ruderal herb vegetation. This habitat is characterised by abundant Common Nettle, frequent Cock's-foot (<i>Dactylis glomerata</i>), Yorkshire-fog, Cleavers (<i>Galium aparine</i>), Dandelion and Red Valerian, and occasional Red Dead-nettle (<i>Lamium purpureum</i>), Sun Spurge (<i>Euphorbia helioscopia</i>), Ribwort Plantain, Broad-leaved Willowherb (<i>Epilobium montanum</i>), Groundsel (<i>Senecio vulgaris</i>), Field Speedwell (<i>Veronica persica</i>), Smooth Sow-thistle (<i>Sonchus oleraceus</i>), Shepherd's Purse (<i>Capsella bursa-pastoris</i>), Common Mouse-ear (<i>Cerastium fontanum</i>), Broad-leaved Dock (<i>Rumex obtusifolius</i>), Garlic Mustard (<i>Alliaria petiolata</i>) and Cow Parsley (<i>Anthriscus sylvestris</i>). These areas do not represent UK BAP or Local BAP Habitat.</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
<p>Poor Semi-improved Grassland (B6)</p> 	<p>At western boundary of the site is an area of species-poor neutral grassland. This grassland area is characterised by abundant Perennial Rye-grass and Yorkshire-fog, with frequent Cow Parsley, Dandelion and Cock's-foot, and occasional Broad-leaved Dock, Common Nettle and White Dead-nettle (<i>Lamium album</i>), This grassland area does not represent UK BAP or Local BAP Habitat.</p>	<p>Negligible</p>

<p>Amenity Grassland (J1.2)</p> 	<p>At the northern boundary of the are two areas of mown amenity grassland habitat. These areas are characterised by dominant Perennial Rye-grass, with frequent Annual Meadow-grass, White Clover (<i>Trifolium repens</i>) and Daisy (<i>Bellis perennis</i>) and occasional Dandelion. No indicators of any more species-rich grassland are present. These grassland areas do not represent UK BAP or Local BAP Habitat</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
<p>Fence (J2.4)</p>	<p>The site has metal palisade security fencing forming the site boundaries, with some internal stretches of metal chain-link fencing. These features do not support any significant vegetation assemblages and do not represent or contribute to any UK BAP or Local BAP Habitat.</p>	<p>Negligible</p>
<p>Legally Protected & Priority Species (& Consultation Zones where applicable)</p>		
<p>Bats</p>	<p>No evidence of roosting bats was detected anywhere at the site. Buildings B1 and B2 are assessed as providing <i>Negligible</i> suitability roosting habitat for bats (Collins, 2016). The warehouse-type buildings with a construction of metal corrugated walls and roof are in good condition with no notable access locations at the building exterior, and internally, no dark enclosed voids or spaces are present with the large open internal spaces well-lit throughout by skylights. Although the internal areas of Building B3 could not be accessed during the field survey, considering the building type and condition, and when considered against the other former depot buildings present at the site, it is considered this building is also likely represents <i>Negligible</i> suitability for roosting. However, a precautionary approach is recommended through a pre-demolition check of the building, which also must cover the internal areas of the building. It is not considered any further pre-determination survey of the building is necessary considering the low assessed risk of roosting bat presence. The pre-commencement check could be the subject of a suitably worded planning condition. The additional garage and small storeroom structures are also assessed as of <i>Negligible</i> suitability for roosting bats with no notable opportunities present. Refer to Appendix A for further details of the Preliminary Roost Assessment of buildings for roosting bats.</p>	<p>Likely maximum of Local (i.e. potential for individual numbers of common species)</p>

	<p>All scattered trees present at the boundaries of the site are assessed as being of <i>Negligible</i> suitability for roosting bats with no hollows, cavities, cracks, woodpecker holes etc. present at any of the trees providing any roosting potential.</p> <p>The predominantly bare ground and building habitats represent <i>Negligible</i> foraging and commuting habitat for bats (Collins, 2016).</p> <p>The desk study has identified 13 records of bat roosts within a 2km radius, with Common Pipistrelle (<i>Pipistrellus pipistrellus</i>), Brown Long-eared Bat (<i>Plecotus auritus</i>) and unidentified bat species roosts noted. The closest is a record of an unidentified bat roost 310m south of the site recorded in 2019. The data records indicate “sightings” of Common Pipistrelle, Pipistrelle species (<i>Pipistrellus</i> sp.), Brown Long-eared Bat, Noctule (<i>Nyctalus noctula</i>), Whiskered/Brandt’s Bat (<i>Myotis mystacinus/brandtii</i>) and unidentified bats within a 2km radius. The closest a record of Common Pipistrelle 525m to the south recorded in 2018.</p> <p>The previous 2013 bat surveys on land 150m to the east found low levels of activity and concluded the site is only regularly used by Common Pipistrelle, a widespread and common species, with only individual numbers of Brown Long-eared, Noctule, and <i>Myotis</i> recorded (plus a single unconfirmed recording of Serotine (<i>Eptesicus serotinus</i>), throughout the survey season. No important foraging or commuting habitats were identified (Brooks Ecological, 2013c).</p> <p>Also, there is a single previous EPS licence record within a 2km radius, located 1.5km to the north-west from 2017 associated with Common Pipistrelle (licence reference 2016-27031-EPS-MIT).</p>	
Badger	<p>No evidence of Badger detected during the Phase I Habitat Survey either within the site or within an accessible 50m radius.</p> <p>The predominantly building and hardstanding habitats provide negligible foraging, shelter and sett creation habitat for Badger..</p> <p>The records search has identified records of Badger setts in the wider landscape, however, all are beyond 1km from the site. Surveys associated with previous applications in the area introduced earlier have also not recorded any Badger evidence in the locality ((Brooks Ecological, 2009), (Brooks Ecological, 2013a) & (Absolute Ecology, 2013a)).</p>	Negligible
Dormouse	<p>The predominantly developed habitats provide no opportunities for Dormouse.</p> <p>No records of Dormouse within a 2km radius.</p>	Negligible
Otter and Water Vole	<p>No watercourses or waterbodies present within or immediately adjacent to the site providing any opportunities for Otter or Water Vole. The records search has confirmed no records of Otter within a 2km radius and no records of Water Vole within the last 10 years. Historic Water Vole records are all beyond 1km to the west.</p>	Negligible

Other Protected Mammals	No evidence of, or specific opportunities for, any other species of protected mammal. No records of other protected mammal species within a 2km radius.	Negligible
Specially Protected Birds	No evidence of, or specific opportunities for, any specially protected bird species within the site. For instance, no evidence of, or significant opportunities for, Barn Owl (<i>Tyto alba</i>) has been identified, with an absence of any suitable roosting/nesting locations identified within the buildings, no large enough openings to provide access into the buildings, and no suitable extent of foraging habitat. The records search has revealed records of 17 Schedule 1 bird species within a 2km radius within the last 10 years including Kingfisher (<i>Alcedo atthis</i>), Peregrine (<i>Falco peregrinus</i>), Bittern (<i>Botaurus stellaris</i>) and Little Ringed-plover (<i>Charadrius dubius</i>). Records are provided at the 1km grid square accuracy only. No Schedule 1 bird species were detected during breeding bird surveys of the land to the east in 2013 (Brooks Ecological, 2013d).	Negligible
Breeding, Wintering and Migratory Birds	The trees, scrub and buildings provide a limited extent of suitable nesting habitat for a restricted range of common bird species likely to be present in the local area. No significant loss of breeding habitat anticipated. The records search has revealed records of 22 Priority Species of bird within a 2km radius including House Sparrow (<i>Passer domesticus</i>), Bullfinch (<i>Pyrrhula pyrrhula</i>), Starling (<i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>), Song Thrush (<i>Turdus philomelos</i>) and Curlew (<i>Numenius arquata</i>). The closest record is a 2015 record of Skylark 350m north-east of the site. Breeding Bird Survey conducted in 2013 on land to the east recorded Bullfinch, Dunnock (<i>Prunella modularis</i>), House Sparrow, Skylark, Song Thrush and Yellowhammer (Brooks Ecological, 2013d). None of these Priority Species were recorded at the boundary of the proposed development site assessed here.	Local importance to a restricted range of common bird species.
Common Reptiles	The predominantly building and hardstanding habitats provide negligible opportunities for reptiles, with the localised areas of scrub and tall ruderal vegetation providing a significantly limited extent of refuge and cover habitat. The site is relatively isolated within the residential-developed and is not connected to any favourable reptile habitats in the surrounding area (such as wetland or heathland). Records search has identified four records of Grass Snake within a 2km radius, with the closest record located 1.2km to the west recorded in 2010. Reptile Surveys associated with surrounding applications did not detect any reptiles, indicating their absence in the locality ((Absolute Ecology, 2013b) & (Brooks Ecological, 2013e)).	Negligible
Great Crested Newt	No waterbodies providing any potential for breeding Great Crested Newt within or immediately adjacent to the site. Aerial imagery and Magic Map (DEFRA, 2020) do not indicate any potential breeding habitat within an unobstructed 500m radius.	Negligible

	<p>Although the areas of scrub, tall ruderal vegetation and grassland provide a limited extent of suitable terrestrial habitat for GCN, the site is isolated within the developed landscape and no ponds have been identified from which GCN may disperse to the site from.</p> <p>The data search has identified 18 records of GCN within a 2km radius, however, all are beyond 1km from the site boundary and beyond extensive areas of built development.</p>	
Other Protected Herpetofauna	No suitable habitats within or immediately adjacent to the site specifically suitable for other species of protected herpetofauna. No records of other protected amphibian or reptile species within a 2km radius.	Negligible
Protected Fish/Marine	No watercourses or waterbodies within or immediately adjacent to the site. No records of any protected fish or marine species within a 2km radius.	Negligible
White-clawed Crayfish	No watercourses or waterbodies present within or immediately adjacent to the site providing any opportunities for White-clawed Crayfish. No records of White-clawed Crayfish in the wider area.	Negligible
Protected Invertebrates	Only widespread and common habitats typical of the landscape are present. No habitats present which are likely to support a range or diversity of invertebrates or likely to support any protected invertebrate species. The data records search has not revealed any protected invertebrate species within the search area.	Negligible
Protected Flora	No protected flora species detected during the Phase I Habitat survey. Only common and widespread habitats present, and unlikely to support any protected flora species. No records of any protected flora within a 2km radius of the site.	Negligible
Invasive Flora	<p>No species detected which are listed on Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).</p> <p>The data search has revealed records within a 2km radius of Japanese Knotweed (<i>Fallopia japonica</i>), Indian Balsam (<i>Impatiens glandulifera</i>), Parrot's Feather (<i>Myriophyllum aquaticum</i>) and Canadian Waterweed (<i>Elodea canadensis</i>).</p>	Negligible
Invasive Fauna	No invasive species detected during the survey, no specific opportunities for any invasive species identified, and no significant risk of the development proposal causing the spread of any invasive fauna identified. Data search has revealed a single record of American Mink (<i>Neovison vison</i>) within a 2km radius.	Negligible
Priority Species	<p>The predominantly bare ground and building habitats provide no opportunities for Priority Species such as Common Toad (<i>Bufo bufo</i>) and Hedgehog (<i>Erinaceus europaeus</i>). Only a significantly limited extent of shelter and cover is provided by localised areas of scrub and tall ruderal herb vegetation.</p> <p>The data search has identified records in the wider area of Brown Hare (<i>Lepus europaeus</i>), Hedgehog and Dingy Skipper (<i>Erynnis tages</i>) in addition to the Priority Species of bird described above.</p>	Negligible

4.0 Assessment and Mitigation

4.1.1 Assessment of impacts and the associated ecological effect to identified ecological features are presented below. Ecological features have been screened out where no likely significant impacts have been identified or where impact is unlikely to occur. Cumulative effects are also considered where applicable. This section can be updated with a confirmation of impacts, proposed mitigation and compensation measures, once a final site layout has been produced.

4.1.2 To clarify, other than the ecological features listed below, there are no perceived potential impacts on any other sites, habitats or species in the wider area. The proposals are of a type, scale and distance that any direct or indirect construction or operational impacts on the other identified ecological features are reasonably discounted (e.g. no anticipated impacts on nearby Local Wildlife Sites).

Table 3 – Assessment of effect and mitigation measures

Ecological Feature	Impact	Avoidance/Mitigation	Compensation	Significance of Residual Effect
Bats	Risk of killing/injury of roosting bats and destruction of roosts during building demolition Risk of significant adverse, permanent, irreversible impact.	A precautionary pre-commencement check of Building B3 is required prior to the demolition of Building B3. This check should include a detailed search of all internal areas of the building for evidence of roosting bats, and should be carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist in accordance with current guidance (Collins, 2016). Can be subject of a condition. No further surveys are required at other areas of the site; however, bats are transient in nature and can sometimes be found in unexpected locations, and therefore all demolition works should be undertaken with a vigilance for roosting bats. If at any point during the works a roosting bat is detected, or suspected, all works in the area must cease immediately and an Ecologist or Natural England contacted for advice on how to proceed.	None required.	No significant effect anticipated
Nesting Birds	Risk of disturbance of nesting birds during building demolition and site clearance. Minor adverse, temporary, irreversible impact. (no significant loss of habitat)	To avoid an offence being committed in respect of nesting birds, site clearance works, including building demolition, will be planned to be conducted outside of the bird nesting season (March to August inclusive) where possible. If it is necessary to undertake these works during the bird nesting season, a nesting bird survey will be conducted by a suitably trained Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds in the areas to be affected. If any active nests are detected, an appropriate protection area around the nest(s) will be established until it can be determined that the nest is longer active. Can be subject of a condition.	None required.	No significant effect anticipated

5.0 Enhancement and Monitoring

- 5.1.1 Opportunities for biodiversity enhancement (above and beyond those required to mitigate for any identified impacts) have been determined through consideration of: Ecological Features identified on site and within the zone of influence; Historical records of protected species/habitats present within the locality; National and Local planning policy including National and Local Biodiversity habitats/species; Local Development Plans including consideration of Green/Blue Infrastructure Resource; Consultation with third parties/stakeholders where applicable; and Other influencing factors such as underlying Geology/Hydrology, intended operational activities, and existing disturbance activities within the locality. This makes specific reference to Biodiversity Net Gain, Good practice principles for development (CIEEM, IEMA, CIRA, 2019).
- 5.1.2 It is confirmed that the below described enhancements, in combination with the above mitigation measures, will demonstrate an overall net gain for biodiversity. Given the negligible ecological value of the bare ground and building habitats which occupy the vast majority of the site prior to the development, it is not considered any Biodiversity Offsetting calculation metric is necessary in this instance in order to confirm this. There is no current requirement under the NPPF or relevant local policies (e.g. Policy SC9) for any demonstrable measure (i.e. a %) of net gain, and no requirement for a set number of expected bird/bat boxes per new dwelling.

Table 4 – Enhancement & Monitoring

Ecological Feature	Enhancement & Monitoring	Significance of Residual Effect
Landscape Planting	It is recommended the final landscape scheme incorporates a wide range of native species and species which are known to be of value to wildlife. Where possible, planting should be focussed on a linear design to provide enhanced habitat connectivity and wildlife corridor function across and around the site.	Minor positive effect
Nesting Birds	To provide enhancement opportunities for nesting birds it is recommended the development incorporates a range of bird nest boxes suitable for a range of species likely to present at the developed site (e.g. House Sparrow, Starling etc.). Boxes should be positioned at least 3 metres above ground level, away from major sources of human disturbance and should face onto suitable foraging habitats (e.g. surrounding trees and gardens). Boxes should also avoid south-facing elevations where excessive sunlight can cause chicks to overheat in the nest.	Minor positive effect
Roosting Bats	To provide enhancement opportunities for roosting bats it is recommended the development incorporates provision of bat roosting boxes. Boxes should be positioned at least 4 metres above ground level, away from major sources of human disturbance and artificial lighting and should face onto suitable foraging and commuting habitats (e.g. tree lines).	Minor positive effect
Informal Hibernacula	It is also recommended that informal deadwood hibernacula are created at the boundaries of the site. The woody arisings from any proposed clearance of trees and shrubs will provide ideal material for these deadwood piles. This will provide enhanced shelter, refuge and hibernation potential for a wide range of wildlife, including small mammals, amphibians, reptiles and invertebrates.	Minor positive effect

5.1.3 No post-determination monitoring is perceived necessary. To comply with guidance set out in BS42020:2013, a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP) which includes consideration of biodiversity would normally be produced prior to the commencement of construction activities, including site clearance works. However, due to the limited number of ecological features identified, this report (specifically the mitigation details outlined within section 4.0) will sufficiently serve to advise site contractors of any measures necessary to avoid/mitigate impacts to any protected habitat/species.

6.0 Conclusion

6.1.1 This assessment has confirmed the site and proposals provide opportunity to incorporate appropriate measures to mitigate any potential impacts to ecological features and to demonstrate 'biodiversity net gain in accordance with NPPF and local planning policy (even in a 'worst case scenario' should further surveys identify the presence of protected species). As such, no significant residual impact can be expected which would prevent determination of a planning application or development of this site.

7.0 References












- Absolute Ecology. (2013a). *Preliminary Ecological Appraisal - Oxcroft, Chesterfield*. Cheadle: Absolute Ecology.
- Absolute Ecology. (2013b). *Reptile Survey - Bolsover, Oxcroft Lane*. Cheadle: Absolute Ecology.
- Bolsover District Council. (2020). *Local Plan for Bolsover District*. Chesterfield: Bolsover District Council.
- Brooks Ecological. (2009). *Ecological Assessment - Marlpit Lane, Bolsover*. Leeds: Brooks Ecological Ltd.
- Brooks Ecological. (2013a). *Ecological Appraisal Update - Marlpit Lane, Bolsover*. Leeds: Brooks Ecological Ltd.
- Brooks Ecological. (2013b). *Hedgerow Survey - Marlpit Lane, Bolsover*. Leeds: Brooks Ecological Ltd.
- Brooks Ecological. (2013c). *Bat Survey - Marlpit Lane, Bolsover*. Leeds: Brooks Ecological Ltd.
- Brooks Ecological. (2013d). *Breeding Bird Survey - Marlpit Lane, Bolsover*. Leeds: Brooks Ecological Ltd.
- Brooks Ecological. (2013e). *Reptile Survey - Marlpit Lane, Bolsover*. Leeds: Brooks Ecological Ltd.
- BSI. (2013). *Biodiversity - Code of practice for planning and development BS 42020:2013*. London: BSI Standards Limited.
- BSI. (2015). *BS 8596:2015 - Surveying for bats in trees and woodland - Guide*. London: BSI Standards Limited .
- BSI. (2015). *BS 8596:2015 - Surveying for bats in trees and woodland - Guide*. London: BSI Standards Ltd.
- CIEEM. (2016). *Guidelines for Assessing and Using Biodiversity Data* . Winchester: Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management .
- CIEEM. (2017a). *Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal*. Winchester: Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management.
- CIEEM. (2017b). *Guidelines on Ecological Report Writing*. Winchester: Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management.
- CIEEM. (2018). *Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, coastal and Marine*. Winchester: Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management .
- CIEEM. (2019). *Advice Note on the lifespan of ecological reports & surveys*. Winchester: Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management.

- CIEEM, IEMA, CIRA. (2019). *Biodiversity Net Gain: Good practice principles for development*. CIEEM, CIRA & IEMA.
- CITB. (2016). *Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015*. Norfolk: Construction Industry Training Board . Retrieved from <https://www.citb.co.uk/Documents/CDM%20Regs/2015/cdm-2015-designers-printer-friendly.pdf>
- Collins, J. (2016). *Bat surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edn)*. London: The Bat Conservation Trust.
- DEFRA. (2020). *MAGIC*. Retrieved from <https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>
- GOV.UK. (2019). *Collection on Biodiversity Offsetting*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/biodiversity-offsetting>
- GOV.UK. (2019). *Guidance on Environmental Impact Assessment*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/environmental-impact-assessment#Screening-Schedule-2-projects>
- GOV.UK. (2019). *Guidance on GCN District Level Licensing Schemes*. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/great-crested-newts-district-level-licensing-schemes?utm_source=987533b2-4ba3-44e7-9707-93f5189921d8&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=govuk-notifications&utm_content=immediate
- Institution of Lighting Professionals. (2011). *Guidance Notes for Reduction of Obtrusive Lighting*. Rugby: Institution of Lighting Professionals.
- JNCC. (2010). *Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey: A Technique for Environmental Audit*. Peterborough: Joint Nature Conservation Committee.
- Maddock, A. (2008). *UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitat Descriptions* . Retrieved from http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/PDF/UKBAP_PriorityHabitatDesc-Rev2011.pdf
- Natural England. (2013). *NCA Profile: 35 Lancashire Valleys (NE452)*. Retrieved from <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5733629942562816>

Drawing MAN.1788.001.EC.D.002 – Phase I Habitat Map



Key

-  Site Boundary
-  Broadleaf Trees (A3.1)
-  Coniferous Trees (A3.2)
-  Dense/Continuous Scrub (A2.1)
-  Scattered Shrubs (A2.2)
-  Poor Semi-improved Grassland (B6)
-  Tall Ruderal Herb Vegetation (C3.1)
-  Amenity Grassland (J1.2)
-  Fence (J2.4)
-  Buildings (J3.6)
-  Bare Ground (J4)



Samuel House, 5 Fox Valley Way, Stocksbridge, Sheffield, S36 2AA

CLIENT:
Dragonfly Developments Limited

SCALE: **1:1,000@A3** PROJECT REF: **MAN.1788.001**


DRAWN: **MG** CHECKED: **CS** DATE: **April 2021**

PROJECT:
Land at Mill Lane, Bolsover


TITLE:
Phase I Habitat Map


DRAWING NO:
MAN.1788.001.EC.D.002

Appendix A – Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment

Ref	Photos & Description	Assessment (Suitability for Roosting Bats)
B1	 <p>Building 1 (B1) is a low warehouse-type building with cinderblock walls up to 2m high with prefabricated corrugated metal sheeting walls above and extending to ground level on the building’s exterior. A steel frame supports a (suspected) asbestos corrugated single-pitched roof with skylights. A small single-storey flat roof extension is present adjoined to the northern elevation which contains a former reception area. Internally, the large open space has been divided into offices, toilets, kitchen, storage etc. at the northern and eastern ends of the building, leaving a large open central warehouse area.</p> <p>No evidence of roosting bats was detected anywhere internally or externally at the building. In addition, no significant potential roosting opportunities were noted, considering building construction type, absence of suitable enclosed dark voids or other spaces, and the high levels of lighting throughout as a result of the skylights and windows. Very limited and poor-quality roosting potential is noted associated with some loose-fitting corrugated sheeting at the walls. However, overall, the building is in good condition and shows little evidence of damage providing any notable opportunities for roosting bats. Due to the construction-type, building condition and surrounding habitats, the presence of roosting bats is reasonably discounted.</p>	<p>Negligible</p>

Ref	Photos & Description	Assessment (Suitability for Roosting Bats)
B2	 <p>Building 2 (B2) is a large warehouse-type former depot shed approximately 8 to 10m in height. The building has cinderblock walls up to 3m high internally, and redbrick and mortar to 3m high externally, with prefabricated corrugated metal sheeting walls above. A steel frame supports a single-pitched metal corrugated roof with skylights. Internally, the building is open plan and is open to the roof throughout, with no dark enclosed undisturbed spaces or roof voids present. A small brick and mortar cluster of rooms at the north-eastern corner are well-lit through windows and no enclosed voids are present.</p> <p>No evidence of roosting bats was detected anywhere internally or externally at the building. In addition, no significant potential roosting opportunities were noted, considering building construction type, absence of suitable enclosed dark voids or other spaces, and the high levels of lighting throughout as a result of the skylights. The building is in notably good condition with an absence of any signs of damage providing any opportunities for roosting bats. There are no features at the building where the presence of roosting bats could be expected to be anything more than significantly unlikely.</p>	<p>Negligible</p>

Ref	Photos & Description	Assessment (Suitability for Roosting Bats)
B3	 <p>Building 3 (B3) is a low single-storey warehouse-type shed building. The building has walls with a base of brick and mortar with prefabricated corrugated sheeting above, supporting a twice-pitched roof of corrugated sheeting with skylights. A single-storey flat-roof extension is present at the northern elevation of the building.</p> <p>No access was possible to the interior of the building during the April 2020 field survey.</p> <p>Although predominantly in good condition, there are localised areas of lifted corrugated sheeting wall which could potentially provide low-quality roosting features and access into internal areas of the building.</p> <p>It is considered likely through assessing the construction type, conditions, surrounding landscape, and when considered in comparison to the other depot buildings, that roosting bats are unlikely to be present. However, as the internal areas of the building could not be accessed, a precautionary approach has been adopted with the recommendation for further pre-commencement survey to confirm the suspected absence of roosting bats.</p>	<p>Negligible (however precautionary approach required)</p>

Ref	Photos & Description	Assessment (Suitability for Roosting Bats)
Other Minor Structures	 <p>Within the western are also a small flat-roof storeroom structure, a small corrugated metal garage (of which the door has been broken illuminating the interior).</p> <p>Neither of these structures provide any opportunities for roosting bats.</p>	Negligible

Appendix B - Legislation and National Planning Policy

Legislation

Wildlife legislation and policy relevant (or potentially relevant pending further survey) to the proposed works, based on the findings of the desk study and field survey are set out below. This legal information is a summary only, and the original legal documents should be consulted for definitive information.

Legislation Protection Afforded to Sites/Habitats that could Potentially be Affected by the Proposed Works

Designated Site/Habitat	Legal Status
None	-

Legislation Protection Afforded to Species that could Potentially be Affected by the Proposed Works

Species	Legal Status
European Protected	
Bats	<p>These animal species and their breeding sites or resting places are protected under Regulation 41 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) Regulations 2012, which makes it illegal to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliberately capture, injure or kill any such animal or to deliberately take or destroy their eggs; • Deliberately disturb such an animal; • Damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of such an animal. <p>European Protected Species (EPS) licences can be granted by Natural England in respect of development to permit activities that would otherwise be unlawful under the Conservation Regulations, providing that the following 3 tests (set out in the EC Habitats Directive) are passed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development is for reasons of overriding public interest; • There is no satisfactory alternative; and • The favourable conservation status of the species concerned will be maintained and/or enhanced. <p>Under Regulation 9(5) of the Conservation Regulations, Planning Authorities have a legal duty to 'have regard to the requirements of the EC Habitats Directive in the exercise of their functions'. This means that they must consider the above 3 tests when determining whether Planning Permission should be granted for developments likely to cause an offence under the Conservation Regulations. As a consequence, Planning Applications for such developments must demonstrate that the 3 tests will be passed.</p>
Nationally Protected	
Bats	<p>These animals receive full protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000), which makes it illegal (subject to exceptions) to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intentionally kill, injure or take any such animal; • Intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy or obstruct any place used for shelter or protection by any such animal; and <p>Intentionally or recklessly disturb such animals while they occupy a place used for shelter or protection.</p>
Nesting Birds (general)	<p>All wild birds are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000), which makes it illegal (subject to exceptions) to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird;

Species	Legal Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Take, damage or destroy the nest (whilst being built or in use) or eggs of any wild bird.
Wild Mammals	The Wild Mammals (Protection) Act 1996 makes it illegal to mutilate, kick, beat, nail, or otherwise impale, stab, burn, stone, drown, crush, drag or asphyxiate any wild mammal with intent to inflict unnecessary suffering.
<i>Invasive Species</i>	
None	-

Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (the NERC Act) places a legal duty on public bodies, including planning authorities, to 'have regard' to the conservation of biodiversity when carrying out their normal functions, which includes consideration of planning applications.

In compliance with Section 41 of the NERC Act, the Secretary of State has published a list of species and habitats considered to be of principal importance for conserving biodiversity in England under the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework. This is known as the list of Habitats and Species of Principal Importance (HPI/SPI), of which there are 56 habitats and 943 species. The HPI/SPI list is used to guide planning authorities in implementing their duty under the NERC Act.

National Planning Policy

The NPPF (2019) set out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This presumption does not apply where development requiring Appropriate Assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered, planned or determined.

The NPPF states that:

'When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

- if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;
- development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it (either individually or in combination with other developments), should not normally be permitted. The only exception is where the benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both its likely impact on the features of the site that make it of special scientific interest, and any broader impacts on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest;
- development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists;
- development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity
- the following wildlife sites should be given the same protection as European sites: potential Special Protection Areas (SPA) and possible Special Areas of Conservation (SAC); listed or proposed Ramsar sites; and sites identified, or required, as compensatory measures for adverse effects on European sites, potential SPAs, possible SACs, and listed or proposed Ramsar sites.'

Under the NPPF, the Planning Authority has a responsibility to promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.

Also, under the NPPF, the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and sites of biodiversity (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan) and to minimise impacts on, and provide net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing a coherent ecological network that are more resilient to current and future pressures



Enzygo specialise in a wide range of technical services:

- Property and Sites**
- Waste and Mineral Planning**
- Flooding, Drainage and Hydrology**
- Landscape Architecture**
- Arboriculture**
- Permitting and Regulation**
- Waste Technologies and Renewables**
- Waste Contract Procurement**
- Noise and Vibration**
- Ecology Services**
- Contaminated Land and Geotechnical**
- Traffic and Transportation**
- Planning Services**

BRISTOL OFFICE

The Byre
Woodend Lane
Cromhall
Gloucestershire GL12 8AA
Tel: 01454 269 237

SHEFFIELD OFFICE

Samuel House
5 Fox Valley Way
Stocksbridge
Sheffield S36 2AA
Tel: 0114 321 5151

MANCHESTER OFFICE

Ducie House
Ducie Street
Manchester
M1 2JW
Tel: 0161 413 6444

Please visit our website for more information.

enzygo.com