

Ecological Survey and Assessment for Land at Chequers Little Bardfield

On behalf of:

**Edward Parsley Associates
West End Barn
The Street
Rayne
Braintree
Essex
CM77 6RY**

Prepared by:

**John Dobson B.Sc
Essex Mammal Surveys**

October 2023

Contents

1 Summary	3
2 Introduction	5
3 Legislation and planning policy relating to bats, badgers, barn owls, reptiles and NERC 2006 and s41 Priority species and habitats	5
4 Methods	7
5 Results	8
6 Discussion	14
7 Review of existing records of bats in the area	14
8 Review of existing records of badgers in the area	14
9 Assessment of impacts	15
10 Recommendations for reasonable biodiversity enhancements	15

John Dobson
Essex Mammal Surveys
148 Main Road
Danbury
Essex
CM3 4DT

1) Summary

As part of a planning proposal involving land at Chequers, Little Bardfield, Braintree, Essex CM7 4TW, a site visit was conducted on 10th October 2023 to determine whether the site had the potential to be occupied by protected species, which would be affected if any proposed development were to go ahead.



Photo 1: Looking W-E at the site. The proposal is to erect a new dwelling on the existing manège

There are no buildings or trees at the site that might offer potential roosting places for bats.

The vegetation at the site comprises a Laurel hedge bordering the road to the south. It is unaffected by the proposal. A new access from the road is to be created for Chequers, which will not affect any vegetation at the site. To enhance the site, planting with native species is proposed for the southern boundary of the development site. None of the vegetation had woodpecker holes, loose bark or crevices that might offer potential roosting places for bats. If the hedge is to be trimmed, then it is recommended that this takes place during November to the end of February to avoid the nesting season for birds.

The lack of potential roosting places and absence of any evidence of the presence of bats means that **no** further surveys are required for this site.

Since there was no evidence of bats at the site, a European Protected Species Licence will **not** be required for this project.

There are no buildings or trees at the site that might offer potential roosting or nesting places for barn owls.

The site is bordered to the north and west by residential properties with maintained gardens; to the east by the maintained garden of Chequers and to the south by a grazed paddock. Minor roads border the site to the north and south. The site comprises a former manège and there are no features that might be attractive to basking by reptiles, and, with the site surrounded by maintained gardens and a paddock there is no suitable habitat nearby from which the site could be colonised by reptiles. An ornamental pond in the garden of Chequers is stocked with goldfish and a lake on private land is also stocked with fish and visited by wildfowl. A flock of around 100 Mallard was on the road outside this property. There is no suitable terrestrial dispersal habitat at the site for great crested newts. The Essex Field Club has no records of great crested newts in this 10km square during the last fifteen years.

There were no latrines or digging by badgers found at the site, or within 30m of its boundaries.

Although no evidence of bats was found, it is probable that bats from nearby roosts will forage over the site and along the tree-lined lanes to the north and south. This foraging behaviour would be expected to continue after the completion of any building work and therefore it is considered that the proposal for this site will not have a detrimental effect on the local bat population, or on protected species.

Since there was no evidence of Protected Species at the site, a European Protected Species Licence will **not** be required for this project.

According to the latest guidance (December 2017) from CIEEM, the following is advised:

Very occasionally it might be possible to carry out a robust Preliminary Ecological Appraisal without obtaining LERC/NBDC/CEDaR data; this will usually only apply to low impact or small-scale projects (e.g. by virtue of size, extent, duration of works, magnitude and locality), and should be determined on a case-by-case basis. In all cases, the decision not to obtain these data should be justified in the report. The following is not intended to be an exhaustive list, but gives examples of the type of sites where such data might not be needed:

- a field in active arable cultivation where there is no impact on any hedges, trees or water bodies;
- small areas of cultivated garden/amenity grassland, as above; or
- small urban sites comprising mostly asphalt or compacted hardstanding.

CIEEM (December 2017) Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, 2nd edition. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.

The site is a manège. This is a low impact project that will have no impact on any trees, hedges, standing water or designated sites.

2) Introduction

Essex Mammal Surveys was requested to carry out a survey of land at Chequers, Little Bardfield to investigate for signs indicating the presence of protected species. The identification of protected and priority species is vital in the proposed development of a site to comply with existing legislation and also allows any work that may otherwise be detrimental to these species to be appropriately scheduled.

The objectives of the survey were to:

- assess the habitats on the site (noting any Priority habitats) including the potential of the site to support protected species (bats, reptiles, water voles, great crested newts and badgers) or any other species that may act as a constraint on development eg Priority species (s41 NERC Act 2006)
- determine any impact of development on any wildlife of conservation concern within the area
- produce a strategy for avoiding, mitigating and compensating for any potential impacts identified with reasonable enhancements for biodiversity.

John Dobson, a bat worker and trainer licensed by Natural England (Licence No. 2015-15258-CLS-CLS), and author of *Mammals of Essex* (Essex Field Club, 2014) carried out the survey on 10th October 2023. John Dobson has been elected a Fellow of the British Naturalists' Association and received the David Bellamy Award for natural history in 2015. The site is located at Grid Reference: TL664311.

This report has been compiled in accordance with the Bat Conservation Trust's *Bat Survey Guidelines for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines*.

Ref: Collins, J. (ed.) (2016) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines* (3rd edn). The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

However, the first page of all three editions includes the following: *The guidelines should be interpreted and adapted on a case-by-case basis according to site-specific factors and the professional judgement of an experienced ecologist. Where examples are used in the guidelines, they are descriptive rather than prescriptive.*

3) Legislation and planning policy relating to bats, badgers, barn owls, reptiles and NERC 2006 and s41 Priority species and habitats

All bat species in Britain are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 through inclusion on Schedule 5. They are also protected under the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 (which were issued under the European Communities Act 1972), through inclusion on Schedule 2. From January 31st 2020 these Regulations were consolidated into the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU exit) Regulations 2019.

European protected animal species and their breeding sites or resting places are protected under Regulation 39. It is an offence for anyone to deliberately capture, injure or kill any

such animal or to deliberately take or destroy their eggs. It is an offence to damage or destroy a breeding or resting place of such an animal. It is also an offence to have in one's possession or control, any live or dead European protected species.

The threshold above which a person will commit the offence of deliberately disturbing a wild animal of a European protected species has been raised. Now, a person will commit an offence only if he deliberately disturbs such animals in a way as to be likely significantly to affect (a) the ability of any significant groups of animals of that species to survive, breed, or rear or nurture their young, or (b) the local distribution or abundance of that species. However, please note that the existing offences under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) as amended which cover obstruction of places used for shelter or protection (for example, a bat roost), disturbance and sale still apply to European protected species.

This legislation provides defences so that necessary operations may be carried out in places used by bats, provided the appropriate Statutory Nature Conservation Organisation (in England this is Natural England) is notified and allowed a reasonable time to advise on whether the proposed operation should be carried out and, if so, the approach to be used. The UK is a signatory to the Agreement on the Conservation of Bats in Europe, set up under the Bonn Convention. The Fundamental Obligations of Article III of this Agreement require the protection of all bats and their habitats, including the identification and protection from damage or disturbance of important feeding areas for bats.

Paragraph 98 of Circular 06/2005 states that *'the presence of a protected species is a material consideration when a planning authority is considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat'*.

Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 (NPPF) states that *'the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ...minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity....'*

Since August 2007, building development that affects bats or their roosts needs a Protected Species Licence under The Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) (Amendment) Regulations 2007 administered in England by Natural England.

Schedule 12, paragraph 13 of the CROW Act (2000) makes an offence under Section 9 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act (1981) an arrestable offence. As a result, the police gain additional power to aid the investigation and enforcement of the legislation protecting bats.

In relation to the badger, the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) and its subsequent amendment (1985) made it an offence to take, kill, injure or ill-treat a badger. The badger gained further protection under the auspices of The Protection of Badgers Act (1992) which consolidates all former protective legislation in relation to badgers, except their inclusion on Schedule 6 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

Under the 1992 Act, the badger sett is protected against obstruction, destruction, and damage; furthermore the animal's access to and from the sett must not be impeded. It should be noted that the concept/definition of the sett extends beyond the main sett to include annexe, subsidiary and outlying setts. However, it must be noted that although the badger and its sett are protected (including access to the sett), the wider habitat and foraging ground is not.

With legal responsibilities and planning implications, it is essential that any ecological assessment of a potential development site, including the area of this report, must determine the possible presence or absence of any protected species as part of any planning development consideration.

Without this assessment the potential developer would be unable to demonstrate due diligence in his responsibilities. Furthermore the local planning authority would not have been provided with sufficient information for a planning decision to be made. This could result in the application being designated incomplete and not determined, or simply refused.

The barn owl is protected under Schedule 1 and Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. It is therefore an offence to injure, kill or capture the bird, to disturb nesting birds, to take eggs, and to release captive owls into the wild without a licence. The barn owl is also recognised by the UK Biodiversity Group as a “Species of Conservation Concern”.

Reptiles such as common lizard, slowworm, grass snake or adder (the species recorded in Essex), are protected under Section 9 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act (1981) as amended. The legislation makes it illegal to deliberately or recklessly kill or injure any native reptile. This protection therefore requires that reasonable effort be made to avoid harm to reptiles during developments on land occupied by reptiles.

Priority species likely to be present and affected by this development and therefore require consideration are Common Toad and Hedgehog. The Essex Field Club has no records of Common Toad, Great Crested Newt or Hedgehog in this tetrad.

The site has no suitable habitat to support Harvest Mouse, Otter, Water Vole, Hazel Dormouse or White-clawed Crayfish.

4) Methods

4.1 Bats

There are no trees or buildings at the site that might offer potential roosting places for bats

4.2 Badgers

The survey area (extending 30m beyond the site boundary) was investigated for evidence of badgers such as setts, well-worn paths, footprints, guard hairs caught on wire or vegetation and latrines.

4.3 Reptiles

The site was inspected for any feature that might support reptiles such as sheltered refuge features (e.g. logs, compost heaps) open sunny areas for basking and varied habitats such as rockeries and grassy areas for feeding.

4.4 Barn owls

There are no buildings or trees at the site that might offer potential roosting or nesting places for barn owls.

4.5 Priority species

Common Toad and Hedgehog are likely to be present as the adjacent habitat is compatible. Field-based surveys would be unreasonable, and a desk top data search revealed no records within 2km of the site.

5) Results

5.1 Bats

There are no buildings or trees at the site that might offer potential roosting places for bats.

The vegetation at the site comprises a Laurel hedge bordering the road to the south. It is unaffected by the proposal. A new access from the road is to be created for Chequers, which will not affect any vegetation at the site. To enhance the site, planting with native species is proposed for the southern boundary of the development site. None of the vegetation had woodpecker holes, loose bark or crevices that might offer potential roosting places for bats. If the hedge is to be trimmed, then it is recommended that this takes place during November to the end of February to avoid the nesting season for birds.

5.2 Badgers

There were no latrines or digging by badgers found at the site, or within 30m of its boundaries.

5.3 Reptiles

The site is bordered to the north and west by residential properties with maintained gardens; to the east by the maintained garden of Chequers and to the south by a grazed paddock. Minor roads border the site to the north and south. The site comprises a former manège and there are no features that might be attractive to basking by reptiles, and, with the site surrounded by maintained gardens and a paddock there is no suitable habitat nearby from which the site could be colonised by reptiles. An ornamental pond in the garden of Chequers is stocked with goldfish and a lake on private land is also stocked with fish and visited by wildfowl. A flock of around 100 Mallard was on the road outside this property. There is no suitable terrestrial dispersal habitat at the site for great crested newts. The Essex Field Club has no records of great crested newts in this 10km square during the last fifteen years.



Photo 2: Looking eastwards along the southern boundary



Photo 3: Looking S-N across the site



Photo 4: Looking westwards along southern boundary



Photo 5: Looking northwards along eastern boundary



Photo 6: Looking E-W along the site. Note lack of habitat for reptiles



Photo 7: Looking southwards along eastern boundary



Photo 8: Looking westwards along northern boundary



Photo 9: Looking N-S across the site



Photo 10: Looking eastwards along northern boundary. Note extent of paved area



Photo 11: Paved area to west of site



Photo 12: Access from road



Photo 13: Maintained garden of Chequers



Photo 14: Paved area with site beyond fence



Photo 15: Ornamental pond with goldfish



Photo 16: Flock of Mallard on road bordering the site



Photo 17: A new access for Chequers is to be created here

5.4 Barn owls

There are no buildings or trees affected by the proposal that might offer potential roosting or nesting places for barn owls.

5.5 Priority species

Although Hedgehog and Common Toad have not been recorded within 1km of the site, they are likely to be present in the area.

6) Discussion

Bats are inquisitive, highly mobile animals, which constantly investigate their surroundings, evaluating good feeding areas and potential roosting opportunities. Where suitable habitat such as woodland, woodland edge or sheltered pasture occurs, bats will travel up to several kilometres to take advantage of this resource. To reach favoured sites, small bats will follow linear landscape features such as hedgerows, streams and lanes etc. The absence of such features can make an otherwise suitable site inaccessible to bats. In addition, new roosts will become established in such areas - examples being the rapid colonisation of artificial roost boxes placed in conifer forests or the occupation of new houses by nursery colonies of pipistrelle bats within a year or two of their completion.

Although no evidence of bats was found, it is probable that bats from nearby roosts will forage over the site and along the tree-lined lanes to the north and south. This foraging behaviour would be expected to continue after the completion of any building work and therefore it is considered that the proposal for this site will not have a detrimental effect on the local bat population, or on protected species.

7) Review of existing records of bats in the area

Since the early 1980s, the Essex Bat Group has monitored the status and distribution of bats in this area. Records occurring within a 2km radius of the site are as follows:

TL658307	27 Oct 2016	Brown Long-eared Bat found by member of public
TL673306	21 Sep 1996	Common Pipistrelle recorded foraging
TL663327	26 Nov 2005	Natterer's Bat found by member of public
TL661313	21 Sep 2014	Common Pipistrelle recorded foraging
TL677303	04 May 2015	Brown Long-eared Bat roost in church
TL677303	04 May 2015	Soprano Pipistrelle recorded foraging
TL677303	04 May 2015	Common Pipistrelle recorded foraging

8) Review of existing records of badgers in the area

Since the early 1980s, the author has monitored the status and distribution of mammals in Essex and has a database of over 34,000 records. There is one record of a Badger found dead on a minor road within a 1km radius of the site in October 2011.

9) Assessment of impacts

The site is a manège and has no Priority habitats. Although no records of Hedgehog and Common Toad within 2km are held on the Essex Field Club database, it is possible that they are present in the area. It is therefore recommended that any trenches dug during the construction phase are covered at night, or, if open, that sloping planks are left in the trench such that any mammals and amphibians are able to escape. All open trenches should be checked for mammals and amphibians each morning.

The site has no suitable habitat to support Harvest Mouse, Otter, Water Vole, Hazel Dormouse or White-clawed Crayfish.

10) Recommendations for reasonable biodiversity enhancements

1: It is recommended that the existing gaps along the site boundaries are retained to allow hedgehogs and common toads to forage across the site as, potentially, at present. However if any boundary fences are to be introduced, see below:



Photo 18: Hedgehog pathway at base of fence

A gap 13cm by 13cm is sufficient for any hedgehog to pass through. This will be too small for nearly all pets.

Hedgehogs travel around **one mile** every night through our parks and gardens in their quest to find enough food and a mate. If you have an enclosed garden this can prevent hedgehogs from dispersing throughout their territory. It is now known that one of the main reasons why hedgehogs are declining in Britain is because our fences and walls are becoming more and more secure, reducing the amount of land available to them. Developers can make their life a little easier by removing the barriers within their control – for example, by making holes in or under our garden fences and walls for them to pass through.

Alternatively:

- Remove a brick from the bottom of the wall
- Cut a small hole in your fence if there are no gaps
- Dig a channel underneath your wall, fence or gate

2: Two bird nesting boxes to be erected on trees or buildings at the site.

3: A Hedgehog nesting box to be sited at base of a hedged boundary.

4: Two solitary bee hives to be erected at the site.

A solitary beehive may be manufactured from durable FSC timber and provides valuable habitat for bees in modern gardens. It is designed specifically to attract non-swarming bees like the Red Mason Bee, Leafcutter Bee and other solitary bees which are naturally attracted to holes in wood.



Attracting solitary bees to the garden is not only safe, but beneficial to pollination of flowers, fruit and vegetables.

Siting: Site in a visible warm place ideally oriented to face between southeast and south and to catch some sun. It is helpful to have soil nearby, and food sources such as flowers, orchards and fruit.