

ECOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
TRERAVEN, ST CLETHER



August 2020

COMMISSIONED BY MR & MRS RISDON

PREPARED BY JOSEPH LANE, ECOLOGIST BSc [HONS] MCIEEM
NATURAL ENGLAND BAT LICENCE (NO. 2015-11493-CLS-CLS)

J.L Ecology Ltd

info@jlecolgy.co.uk
www.jlecolgy.co.uk

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
INTRODUCTION	4
SITE DESCRIPTION	4
METHODOLOGY	4
LIMITATIONS	5
RESULTS	5
LEGISLATION	6
RECOMMENDATION AND MITIGATION	6
APPENDIX	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- J.L Ecology Ltd was commissioned by Mr & Mrs Risdon to carry out an Ecological Impact Assessment of two barns and associated habitats at Treraven, St Clether, Cornwall, PL15 8PX.
- The survey was commissioned to inform any possible ecological impacts resulting from a planning application for the conversion of the barns to residential use and proposed new access; and was carried out on the 18th August 2020 by Joseph Lane BSc [Hons], who is a full member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management and holder of a Natural England bat licence.
- Survey methodology comprised an internal and external building inspection and ecological assessment of the associated land.
- The proposed development will not affect the favourable conservation status of any local bat population. A light scattering of droppings [<10] characteristic of *Pipistrellus* sp. were observed within the two-storey barn. No inaccessible crevice dwelling opportunities were identified and with high internal light levels, the building is deemed unsuitable as a day roost; indicating the occasional use of the building by light sampling bats. The suggested swallow mitigation below would provide continued opportunities for light sampling bats; no further surveys are deemed necessary.
- Swallows had previously nested within the barns. Commencement of works would best be undertaken outside the nesting bird season [March – August]. Alternatively, the buildings should be made inaccessible or unsuitable for this purpose during the same period. A simple opening to a garage / lean-to / wood store or access to an open dark sheltered void would benefit swallows. Dark nesting ledges away from predators [cats typically] should be c.260mm x 100mm; access to the building should be a minimum of 50mm x 150mm.

INTRODUCTION

J.L Ecology Ltd was commissioned by Mr & Mrs Risdon to carry out an Ecological Impact Assessment of two barns and associated habitats at Treraven, St Clether, Cornwall, PL15 8PX.

The survey was commissioned to inform any possible ecological impacts resulting from a planning application for the conversion of the barns to residential use and proposed new access; and was carried out on the 18th August 2020 by Joseph Lane BSc [Hons], who is a full member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management and holder of a Natural England bat licence.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The survey area comprised a two-storey stone barn with a pitched unlined slate roof and attached single-storey block extensions [corrugated-tin / box-profile sheet roof]; a single-storey stone barn with a slate roof; and habitats associated with proposed new access. The buildings were situated to the south-west of St Clether; the wider landscape was dominated by pasture set within a hedgebank network.



Figure 1. Barns viewed from the east

The site is located at Ordnance Survey Grid Reference SX 197 840.

METHODOLOGY

DESK STUDY

A desktop data search to identify statutory designated sites and records of protected species within 1km of the site was carried out using the government's MAGIC *Nature on the Map* website. Aerial photographs were also interpreted.

BATS

BUILDING INSPECTION:

A daytime site visit was carried out to identify potential roost sites associated with the buildings to be affected by the proposed development. The exterior and interior of the buildings were examined for signs of occupation by bats (urine staining, fur rubbing and droppings) and suitable crevices and features noted. *A high-powered torch, endoscope and ladder were available.*

BIRDS

The exterior and interior of the buildings were surveyed for signs of use by nesting birds and the associated habitats assessed for their breeding bird suitability.

HABITATS

The associated habitats were assessed for their ecological value and potential to support protected species.

LIMITATIONS

It should be noted that this survey takes no account of seasonal differences and a lack of signs of any particular species does not confirm its absence, merely that there was no indication of its presence at the time of survey.

If no action or development of this land takes place within twelve months of the date of this survey, then the findings of this survey will no longer be considered reliable and should be repeated.

RESULTS

DESK STUDY

No statutory sites were situated within 1km of SX 197 840; the site falls within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone but does not match any corresponding development descriptions.

BATS

BUILDING INSPECTION

A light scattering of droppings [<10] characteristic of *Pipistrellus* sp. were observed within the two-storey barn. No inaccessible crevice dwelling opportunities were identified.

BIRDS

Swallows had previously nested within Barns.



Figures 2 & 3. Location of proposed access track looking back towards barns [left] & existing roadside access to be utilised [right]

HABITATS

The proposed new access will run through a field of improved grassland; herbaceous species included abundant white clover *Trifolium repens* and occasional creeping buttercup *Ranunculus repens*, common sorrel *Rumex acetosa* and dandelion *Taxaxacum officinale* agg.

ROADSIDE BOUNDARY

Defunct species-poor bank with locally dominant common nettle *Urtica dioica* and montbretia *Crocusmia x crocosmiiflora* and occasional male fern *Dryopteris filix-mas* and hogweed *Heracleum sphondylium*.

LEGISLATION AND SPECIES INFORMATION

BIRDS

All British birds, their nests and eggs [with certain exceptions] are protected under Section 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 as amended. This makes it an offence to: intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird; intentionally damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or being built; or intentionally take or destroy the egg of any wild bird.

RECOMMENDATION AND MITIGATION

DESK STUDY

No statutory sites would be affected by the proposed development of the site.

BATS

The proposed development will not affect the favourable conservation status of any local bat population. A light scattering of droppings [<10] characteristic of *Pipistrellus* sp. were observed within the two-storey barn. No inaccessible crevice dwelling opportunities were identified and with high internal light levels, the building is deemed unsuitable as a day roost; indicating the occasional use of the building by light sampling bats. The suggested swallow mitigation below would provide continued opportunities for light sampling bats; no further surveys are deemed necessary.

BIRDS

Swallows had previously nested within the barns. Commencement of works would best be undertaken outside the nesting bird season [March – August]. Alternatively, the buildings should be made inaccessible or unsuitable for this purpose during the same period. A simple opening to a garage / lean-to / wood store or access to an open dark sheltered void would benefit swallows. Dark nesting ledges away from predators [cats typically] should be c.260mm x 100mm; access to the building should be a minimum of 50mm x 150mm.

HABITATS

No other protected species or habitats would be affected by the proposed plans.

External south or west-facing building elevations have the potential to incorporate bat boxes; external east or north-facing elevations have the potential to incorporate bird boxes. Such features would enhance the potential ecological value of the site.



Figures 4 & 5. Indicative bat and bird box types

APPENDIX – NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. It provides a framework within which locally-prepared plans for housing and other development can be produced.

Below are excerpts within the NPPF of how the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

Paragraph 170

d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;

Paragraph 174

To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should:

- a) Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity⁵⁶; wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them; and areas identified by national and local partnerships for habitat management, enhancement, restoration or creation⁵⁷; and
- b) promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement 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.

Paragraph 175

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

- a) 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;
- b) 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;
- c) 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 reasons⁵⁸ and a suitable compensation strategy exists; and
- d) 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.

Paragraph 176


The following should be given the same protection as habitats sites:

- a) potential Special Protection Areas and possible Special Areas of Conservation;
- b) listed or proposed Ramsar sites⁵⁹; and
- c) sites identified, or required, as compensatory measures for adverse effects on habitats sites, potential Special Protection Areas, possible Special Areas of Conservation, and listed or proposed Ramsar sites.

Paragraph 177

The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment because of its potential impact on a habitats site is being planned or determined.

J.L Ecology Ltd


info@jlecolology.co.uk
www.jlecolology.co.uk