**CONSULTATION UNDER TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application Number** | 2022/00458 |
| **Address** | Arbour Tree Farm, Warwick Road |
| **Proposal** | Conversion of existing farmhouse into four dwellings and the conversion and alteration of two existing agricultural barns into four dwellings. |
| **Case Officer** | Ian Hiscock |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date comments sent** | 06.04.22 |
| **Name of consultee department** | Ecology |
| **Consultation response author** | Jenni Blakeman |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Pre-app comments | |  |
| No Comments | |  |
| No Objection | |  |
| No Objection Subject to Conditions | |  |
| Objection | |  |
| Further information Requested | | **X** |
|  | | | |
| **Comments:**  (Please explain the reason for your response) | | | |
| SMBC Ecology has previously commented on application 2021/00301 which was also for conversion of the farmhouse and outbuildings to form new dwellings. One of the reasons for refusal of application 2021/00301 was that it failed to demonstrate that the application would provide a net gain to biodiversity in accordance with P10 and NPPF.  The same ecological information has been submitted to support this application, with the addition of a Biodiversity Impact Assessment calculator (BIA).  **Protected Species**  Nocturnal surveys were undertaken in 2021, which concluded that there are currently 3 bat roosts within the property:   1. Brown long-eared (BLE) non-breeding day roost in the gatehouse – activity surveys in 2020 recorded 10 BLE’s leaving the roost in this location, which is a level of activity that suggests a possible maternity roost. 3 and 4 BLE’s were recorded during the 2021 surveys which suggest a smaller non-breeding day roost. 2. Common pipistrelle – two day roosts for single bats within the gatehouse (one at the western end and one within the covered link)   Droppings attributed to pipistrelle bats were recorded in the roof void of the farmhouse during the diurnal survey in 2019; however no bats were recorded emerging or re-entering during any of the nocturnal surveys. The presence of bat droppings means that bats have used this space as a roost, and therefore appropriate care must be taken when works to the farmhouse are undertaken. It appears from the submitted documents that no works are proposed to the roof void of the farmhouse, however it is important that any contractors are aware of the presence of the roosts, and the possibility that works might disturb any bats. It may be that any works carried out to the farmhouse roof need to be under licence with Natural England, and the applicant is advised to seek advice from them.  Mitigation for the loss of bat roosts is proposed in the form of a new bat loft at the north end of the site. The location, orientation and dimensions of the proposed bat loft are appropriate. Delivery of the bat loft can be secured via condition.  No up to date information has been submitted to clarify whether swallows are using the site to nest, and whether these nests would be impacted by the proposed development.  A reptile survey was also carried out which did not record any reptiles or any evidence of reptiles. No further survey for reptiles are required.  **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**  A BIA has been submitted which shows that the development as proposed will result in a net gain to biodiversity. However, it does not appear that the loss of trees (3) or hedgerow (126m for access visibility splay) has been taken into consideration within the calculation. The BIA needs to be revisited to take into consideration the hedgerow loss – perhaps some new hedgerow planting could be accommodated within the new gardens. The loss of trees is difficult to quantify within the BIA, and therefore compensation for their loss should be provided within a Landscape Strategy or Scheme, as also requested by the Landscape Architect. | | | |
| **Further information required (if applicable):**  (Please explain the reason for your response) | | | |
| Revisit BIA to take into consideration hedgerow loss  Landscape Strategy/Scheme | | | |
| **Amendments recommended (if applicable):**  (Please explain the reason for your response) | | | |
|  | | | |
| **Recommended conditions (if applicable):**  (Please provide justification for any pre-commencement conditions) | | | |
|  | | | |
| **If the application is to DISCHARGE CONDITIONS, please confirm the list of documents you are approving below:** | | | |
|  | | | |
| **If the application requires a S106 contribution/ requirement, please include the following information:**  Please note: The legal tests for when a S106 contribution can be requested are set out in regulation 122 and 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended). The regulations and guidance can be viewed here: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukdsi/2010/9780111492390/regulation/122> and <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2010/948/contents/made> and  <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/planning-obligations> and  The tests are:   1. Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; 2. Directly related to the development; and 3. Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. | | | |
| * Contribution description |  | | |
| * Contribution amount £ (if applicable). Please provide justification. |  | | |
| * Trigger point for payment (i.e. upon commencement of development, upon first occupation, upon 50% occupation…) |  | | |
| * Trigger point for works to be undertaken (if applicable) |  | | |