

PRELIMINARY ECOLOGICAL APPRAISAL OF:

12 HIGHER STRAND HUGH TOWN ST MARY'S ISLES OF SCILLY TR21 OPT

Client: Sibleys on Scilly

Our reference: BS37-2020

Report date: 11th November 2020

Author: Darren Mason BSc (Hons)

Report peer reviewed: Sarah Mason

Report signed off: Sarah Mason

RECEIVED

By Tom Anderton at 8:49 am, Nov 13, 2020

REPORT ISSUED IN ELECTRONIC FORMAT ONLY

This page is intentionally blank

Contents

Non-technical Summary	5
1.0 Introduction	6
1.1 Survey and reporting	6
1.2 Aims and Scope of the report.....	6
1.3 Site Setting and Description.....	6
1.4 Site proposals	8
2.0 Methodology	8
2.1 Zone of Influence (ZoI)	8
2.2 Desk Study	8
2.2.1 Vegetation.....	8
2.2.2 Bats	9
2.2.3 Birds.....	9
2.2.4 Reptiles/Amphibians	9
2.2.5 Invertebrates	9
2.3 Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Limitations	9
2.4 Initial Protected Species Assessment.....	10
2.5 Criteria used to Assess Ecological Value.....	10
3. Results	13
3.1 Surveyor Details	13
3.2 Desktop Study	13
3.2.1 Statutory Designated Sites	13
3.3 Vegetation.....	14
3.3.1 Wall.....	14
3.3.7 Buildings and hardstanding	14
3.3.8 Summary.....	15
3.4 Bats	15
3.5 Birds.....	16
3.6 Reptiles/amphibians.....	16
3.7 Invertebrates	16
4. Planning Policy Context	17
4.1 Planning Policy	17
4.1.1 National Policy.....	17
4.1.2 Local Policy	17
5. Evaluation, Potential Impacts and Recommendations	18
5.1 Site Evaluation	18

5.2	Summary of Potential Impacts	18
5.3	Summary of Key Recommendations.....	18
5.4	Evaluation Against Relevant Planning Policy	19
5.5	Updating Survey	22
6.0	Conclusion	22
7.	Bibliography	23
APPENDIX 1	24
	Avoidance Measures – Bats	24

Non-technical Summary

- On the 11th November 2020, the Isles of Scilly Wildlife Trust (IoSWT) conducted a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) of 12 Higher Strand, Hugh Town, St Mary's, Isles of Scilly, TR21 0PT (BS37-2020), for which there is a proposal to extend the existing 2nd floor dormer window to sit flush with the north-west elevation and change the windows to French doors.
- The PEA was undertaken to ascertain the potential for protected habitats and species to be present within the site
- The habitats on site are assessed as being of low ecological value
- The property was deemed as having negative bat roost potential
- The property was deemed to have low ecological value for breeding birds
- The property was deemed to have negligible ecological value for reptiles, amphibians and invertebrates
- No additional surveys are recommended
- Due to the nature of the proposal, mitigation will be required to minimise the low risk that bats and breeding birds may be present during phases of the work and/or time of the year.
- A net gain in biodiversity is possible on this site if bat boxes are erected on the south-west and north-east aspects of the extended dormer window
- If works have not been completed by December 2021, it is recommended that this ecological appraisal is updated
- **This report is sufficient to support a planning application.**

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Survey and reporting

This report details the results of a preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA) of 12 Higher Strand, Hugh Town, St Mary's, Isles of Scilly TR21 0PT, National Grid Reference SV9058310637 (see Map 1). The survey, carried out on 11th November 2020, was undertaken to inform proposals to extend the existing 2nd floor dormer window to site flush with the north-west elevation of the development.

1.2 Aims and Scope of the report

This report is a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA). According to the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) guidelines, a PEA "*can be used as a scoping report (for non-Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) projects), but should be submitted as part of a planning application unless it can be determined that the project would have no significant ecological effects, no mitigation is required and no further surveys are necessary.*"¹

This report is based on a desktop study and rapid on-site assessment aimed at assessing the suitability of the site to support notable habitats and protected species. This report will assess the compliance of the scheme with relevant local and national planning policy and will provide an initial assessment of the biodiversity value of the site to be made, identifying the likely ecological constraints associated with the project and identifying any mitigation measures likely to be required following the '*Mitigation Hierarchy*'². Any additional surveys that may be required to inform an Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) will be identified, as will any opportunities to deliver ecological enhancement.

1.3 Site Setting and Description

12 Higher Strand is situated in the Isles of Scilly National Character Area (NCA), described by Natural England as follows³; "*The Isles of Scilly comprise over 200 granite islands scattered across 200 km², set out in the Atlantic some 45 km south-west of Land's End. Of these islands only five are currently inhabited, namely the islands of St Mary's, St Agnes, St Martin's, Tresco and Bryher. The occupied islands cover a total area of just over 14 km². The islands contain 26 Sites of Special Scientific Interest and one Special Area of Conservation (SAC), designated for a range of geological and biological features, including maritime heathland and grassland, as well as one Special Protection Area and Ramsar site, highlighting the important seabird colonies. The marine environment between and around the islands is designated as an SAC and a Marine Conservation Zone for the wealth of marine species it supports, from diverse rocky reef to grey seals that breed around the islands. For such a small land area, the islands display a striking*

diversity of landscape, including lowland heath and small pastures enclosed by stone walls and banks, plus tiny hedged bulb fields and a varied coastline. Many of these features have been in place for 4,000 years, and still retain their original purpose. Harsh conditions created by the maritime climate mean that woodland cover is minimal. It is a landscape rich in history, with 900 historic monuments. The most notable features are the outstanding prehistoric monuments of chambered barrows and standing stones of the late Neolithic and early Bronze Age. The entire NCA has been designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and is recognised as a Heritage coast.

12 Higher Strand is situated within the Built-Up Areas Boundaries² (2011) for England and Wales (published by the Office for National Statistics, Geography, lying along the north-east boundary of Hugh Town. The proposed development is situated on the main road entering and leaving Hugh Town.

The site is approximately 108 sq metres in size and comprises a semi-detached residential property, bounded on 2 sides by other domestic buildings, with a small courtyard in front of its north-west elevation and a public alleyway situated adjacent to its south-west elevation. The north-west elevation faces Town Beach and the islands harbour.



Figure 1 Site Location

1.4 Site proposals

This report is provided in support of a planning application P/20/087 for the extension of the existing 2nd floor dormer window to sit flush with the north-west elevation and convert the windows into French doors.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Zone of Influence (ZoI)

The ZoI is the area encompassing all predicted negative ecological effects from the proposed scheme and is informed by the habitats present within the site and the nature of the proposals. Due to the scale and nature of the proposals it is considered that a ZoI of 1km from the centre of the site is appropriate for the gathering of information for the desk study.

2.2 Desk Study

A full biological record centre desktop study was undertaken for the presence of bats, but was not taken for the remaining assessment of the development, as it was not considered necessary given the limited scale of impacts and the nature of the on-site and surrounding habitats. The desk study also included accessing the Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC)⁴ database in order to establish the presence of statutory designated sites, including all internationally and nationally designated sites such as Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Ramsar sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) within 1km of the site.

Other resources used were aerial photography to identify the presence of habitats such as woodland blocks, watercourses and hedgerows in close proximity to the site. This assists in the assessment of the potential of the site and its surrounding habitat to support protected species.

2.2.1 Vegetation

An assessment was made of all areas of vegetation within the site based on the standardised Phase 1 survey methodology⁵. This involved a walkover survey to identify broad vegetation types, which were then classified against Phase 1 habitat types, where appropriate. A list of characteristic plant species for each vegetation type was compiled and any invasive species⁶ encountered as an incidental result of the survey are noted.

2.2.2 Bats

An assessment was made of the suitability of the building up to the site boundary to support roosting bats based on the presence of features such as loose or missing tiles, lifted lead flashing for buildings and holes. An assessment was made of the suitability of the site and surrounding landscape to support foraging and/or commuting bat species. This survey confirmed to current Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) guidelines⁷.

2.2.3 Birds

The assessment of breeding and wintering birds on the site was based on the suitability of habitat present, evidence of nesting such as old or currently active nests and the presence of bird species that may potentially nest within the available habitat.

2.2.4 Reptiles/Amphibians

The reptile survey was based on an assessment of the suitability of habitat present within the site to support a population of reptiles. Reptiles particularly favour scrub and grassland interfaces and the presence of these is a good indication that reptiles may be present on site. In addition, reptiles are known to utilise features such as bare ground for basking, tussocky grassland for shelter and compost heaps and rubble piles for breeding and/or hibernating.

2.2.5 Invertebrates

An assessment was made of the site for its potential value to support diverse communities of invertebrates. The assessment was made based on the presence of habitat features which may support invertebrate communities. These features include; an abundance of dead wood, the presence of diverse plant communities, the presence of varied woodland structure, sunny woodland edges, presence of ponds and water courses and free-draining soil. At the time of the survey no attempt was made to identify species present and where a site supports features that may be of importance to invertebrates then further surveys (Phase 2) may be required to assess the importance of the site.

2.3 Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Limitations

Ecological surveys are limited by factors which affect the presence of plants and animals such as the time of year, migration patterns and behaviour. Therefore, the field survey has not produced a complete list of plants and animals and in the absence of evidence of any particular species should not be taken as conclusive proof that the species is not present or that it will not be present in the future. The survey was undertaken at a time of year when many species of plant and animal are either dormant, not visible above

ground or simply not present in the UK (such as migratory birds). Therefore, the survey was based upon an assessment of the habitat present on site and the suitability of this habitat to support protected species.

2.4 Initial Protected Species Assessment

As part of a PEA, the assessment criteria is based on the potential for the site to support the species considered, this is usually based on habitat features, their suitability for the species and the results of any desk study data obtained as part of the appraisal. In many cases Phase 2 surveys will be required to assess the status of species and hence the importance of a population at a site. Therefore, the assessment should be considered a provisional assessment. Tables 1 and 2 below define the criteria used to assess the potential of the site to support protected species.

2.5 Criteria used to Assess Ecological Value

The ecological values provided within this report are based around both the professional judgement of the author of this report and current published relevant guidance, including information sources such as "*A Nature Conservation Review*⁸" and "*Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the United Kingdom*⁹."

Table 1 – Description of the categories used to classify a building’s bat roost potential and the survey effort required to determine the likely presence or absence of bats

	Roost status	Description	Survey effort required to determine the likely presence or absence of bats
Bat Roost Potential	High	Numerous features potentially suitable for use by roosting bats, optimal or good quality bat foraging habitat nearby and good habitat connectivity. Alternatively, a building with fewer features potentially suitable for use by roosting bats and optimal foraging habitat nearby.	Three dusk emergence and/or pre-dawn re-entry surveys between May and September. Optimum period May – August. Two surveys should be undertaken during the optimal period and at least one survey should be a pre-dawn survey.
	Moderate	More than a few features potentially suitable for use by roosting bats, good foraging habitat nearby and limited habitat connectivity. Alternatively, a building with a few features potentially suitable for use by roosting bats but optimal foraging habitat nearby.	Two or three dusk emergence and/or pre-dawn re-entry surveys between May and September (but only if features will be affected by the proposals).
	Low	Only a few features potentially suitable for use by roosting bats but good bat foraging habitat nearby. Alternatively, a building with more than a few features potentially suitable for use by roosting bats but sub-optimal foraging habitat nearby and limited habitat connectivity.	One or two dusk emergence and/or pre-dawn re-entry surveys between May and September (but only if features will be affected by the proposals).
	Negligible	Very few features potentially suitable for use by roosting bats and / or in an area (such as a densely populated urban area) which has limited habitat connectivity and poor foraging habitat.	No further surveys required.

Table 1. Categorising and classifying a building’s bat roost potential

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

Table 2 – Description of the categories used to classify a sites potential and the survey effort required to determine the likely presence or absence of a protected species or protected group of species

Potential	Description	Survey effort required to determine the likely presence or absence of the species
High	On site habitat is of high quality for a species or species group. The site is within or near a geographic stronghold. Good quality surrounding habitat and good connectivity.	If species are likely to be affected by the proposals, further Phase 2 surveys will be required to establish the presence/likely absence of the species.
Moderate	On site habitat is of moderate quality, providing most of the species/species group requirements. Limiting factors may include small habitat area or disturbance	If species are likely to be affected by the proposals, further Phase 2 surveys will be required to establish the presence/likely absence of the species.
Low	On site habitat is of poor to moderate quality for the species or group. Presence cannot be discounted on the basis of distribution, isolation or surrounding habitats etc.	If species are likely to be affected by the proposals, further Phase 2 surveys will be required to establish the presence/likely absence of the species.
Negligible	Site includes very limited or poor quality habitat for the species or group. Surrounding habitat is unlikely to support wider populations.	Further Phase 2 surveys are unlikely to be required as species is unlikely to be present

Table 2. Categorising and classifying a sites protected species potential

3. Results

3.1 Surveyor Details

The survey was undertaken by Darren Mason BSc (Hons) of the Isles of Scilly Wildlife Trust. Darren has undertaken professional Bat Licence Training and holds a Natural England WML-A34-Level 2 (Class 2 License); registration number: 2020-46277-CLS-CLS which permits him to survey bats using artificial light and endoscopes and capture bats using hand and hand-held static nets.

3.2 Desktop Study

3.2.1 Statutory Designated Sites

There are three statutory designated sites of conservation importance situated within a 1km radius of the site. Details of these designations are provided below. For further information on statutory designated sites please see Appendix 2.

- i.) Porthloo SSSI** – Situated 820m north-east of the proposed development lies Porthloo SSSI designated for its geology, particularly for its Quaternary sediments in the cliffs that show changes in the climates and environments of the Quaternary period in Scilly.

- ii.) Peninnis Head SSSI** – Lying 660m due south-east of the proposed development is Peninnis Head SSSI. The site designated primarily for its maritime heathland, maritime grassland and scrub habitats together with good populations of a number of rare plant and lichen species, in addition to its significant quaternary geomorphology.

- iii.) Lower Moors SSSI** – Situated 463m east of 12 Higher Strand is Lower Moors SSSI. A topogenous mire that has a range of wetland habitats supporting a diverse range of wetland wildflower species, including the Nationally Scarce Tubular Water-dropwort (*Oenanthe fistulosa*). The site also holds locally important populations of Royal Fern (*Osmunda regalis*) and Southern Marsh Orchid (*Dactylorhiza praetermissa*) and is particularly important feeding for passage and wintering birds including Corncrake (*Crex crex*) and Spotted Crake (*Porzana porzana*).

3.3 Vegetation

The vegetation within the site is described here in general terms using Phase 1 habitat survey terminology and refers to dominant, characteristic and other noteworthy species in each vegetation type within the survey area. The habitat types on site consist of:

- Wall
- Building and hardstanding

3.3.1 Wall

Two short sections of granite stone wall extend along the north-west and part of the south-east boundary. These are typical in design for the islands being soil-filled. Native species recorded include the lichens; *Flavoparmelia caperata*, *Parmotrema perlatum*, *Ramalina siliquosa* and *Ochrolechia parella*, all species typical of a granite substrate. Non-native ornamental species included; African Lily (*Agapanthus africanus*), House Leek (*Sempervivum* sp.), Tree Houseleek (*Aeonium arboretum*), African Daisy (*Osteospermum ecklonis*) and ice plant (*Mesembryanthemum* sp.).

3.3.7 Buildings and hardstanding

The property is semi-detached, cement rendered with a north-west/south-east aspect (see Photo 1.). The roof comprises fibre cement tiles, capped with glazed concrete ridge tiles. A rendered chimney is present at the south-east end of the roof. The existing dormer window is constructed of modern UPVc moulded shiplap panels and fascia, with a modern fibre-glass roof. The window and the panels are tied into the roof with lead flashing. The remaining fenestration is also constructed of modern UPVc on all aspects.

A small concrete hardstanding sits between the porch and the drystone wall described above.



Photo 1.

3.3.8 Summary

The site comprises a residential property with a drystone wall boundary and small concrete courtyard. The most significant habitat features in the context of the site itself are the maritime lichen species. However, these are not rare or notable and overall, the site is assessed as being of **low ecological value**.

3.4 Bats

Throughout, the building presents with little or no gaps, crevices or holes particularly around the proposed extension of the dormer window. No tiles are missing and are tightly bound to each other; the lead flashing is well-fitting and not raised; the fenestration presents with no gaps between the window frames and the moulded plastic shiplap and render is in good condition on the chimney with no obvious cracks (see Photo 2.). The immediate surrounding habitat is impacted by 3 streetlights. The first being situated approximately 5m due north-west of the property, which spills light onto the proposed dormer extension. The remaining 2 lights illuminate the alleyway immediately south-west of the property. Beyond the immediate boundary of the building the habitat quickly becomes optimal for bats due to the strandline of Town Beach and the old school site at Carn Thomas with its associated scrub, open grassland and trees. Both provide access to the wider countryside for commuting and foraging bats. However, it must be noted that on a small island links to the wider countryside are easily reached.



Photo 2.

In summary, the building and the proposed development has negligible features suitable for use by roosting bats, in particular crevice-dwelling species of the pipistrellus genus. The immediate habitat surrounding the development has very little vegetation and is illuminated by 3 streetlights. However, beyond the buildings immediate surroundings the habitat becomes more favourable for foraging and commuting bats, providing links to the wider countryside. Overall, the site is assessed as being of **negligible roost potential**.

3.5 Birds

During the survey no birds were seen and no active or used bird nests were recorded. The wider landscape comprises ample suitable feeding habitat in the form of the beach strandline, areas of scrub, grassland and Elm copses at Carn Thomas and mature gardens throughout the rest of Hugh Town. Overall, the site is considered to have **low potential** for supporting nesting birds.

3.6 Reptiles/amphibians

The majority of the site is sub-optimal for reptiles with only the drystone wall potentially being utilised as a hibernaculum. There are no ponds on site, but there are ponds within 500m of the development at Lower Moors SSSI. Though the surrounding habitat has good habitat connectivity in the form of mature garden and hedgerows the site is considered to have **negligible potential** to support reptiles and amphibians

3.7 Invertebrates

The site consists of predominantly suburban landscape, however mature gardens and the beach are present nearby which are likely to support invertebrate species, but are highly unlikely to support an important food plant or rare or notable species, or species assemblage of terrestrial invertebrate. Therefore, the site is considered to offer **negligible potential** for supporting any rare or scarce species or species assemblage of invertebrate.

4. Planning Policy Context

4.1 Planning Policy

4.1.1 National Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)¹⁰ sets out the government's requirements for the planning system in England. A number of sections of the NPPF are relevant when taking into account development proposals and the environment. As set out in within Paragraphs 7 to 10 of the NPPF "*the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.*" The general impetus of the NPPF in relation to ecology and biodiversity is for development proposals to not only minimise the impacts on biodiversity but also to provide enhancement. Paragraph 170 states that "*Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment and minimise impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity.*" A number of principles are set out in Paragraph 175 including the principle that where harm cannot be adequately avoided then it should be adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for.

In addition to the NPPF, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) circular 06/05¹¹ provides guidance on the application of law relating to planning and nature conservation as it applies in England. Paragraph 98 states "*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.*" Whilst Paragraph 99 states "*it is essential that the presence or otherwise of a protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before planning permission is granted.*"

4.1.2 Local Policy

Local planning policy with the Isles of Scilly Council is provided by the current Local Plan 'A 2020 Vision.' A single over-arching policy within this document makes specific reference to environmental protection.

Policy 1 – Environmental protection

- *Protect a statutorily-protected plant or animal species and the wildlife, geological and geomorphological interest and features of designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest; and locally important biodiversity habitats, species and landscape features;*

5. Evaluation, Potential Impacts and Recommendations

5.1 Site Evaluation

The site is approximately 108 sq metres in size and comprises solely of a residential property. The protected species potential on site is very limited, restricted to common maritime lichen species.

Therefore, the site is assessed as being of **low ecological value**.

5.2 Summary of Potential Impacts

The proposed development entails the extension of the existing 2nd floor dormer window to sit flush with the north-west elevation, converting the windows into French doors. In the absence of mitigation, the potential ecological impact of these works is:

- A very low risk of disturbing bats during the demolition phase of extending the dormer window
- A low risk of disturbing of nesting birds

5.3 Summary of Key Recommendations

The following recommendations have been designed to minimise the potential impacts and enhance the site for wildlife:

- Avoidance measures during the demolition phase are undertaken (See Appendix 1 for avoidance measures).
- Work should take place between the 1st November and 1st May inclusive, but if possible, avoid the months November to February to minimise the risk of bats in torpor.
- If work were to commence between March and August inclusive, the site would need to be checked first for nesting birds and if, any evidence of breeding activity was found, or nests are identified works that would disturb the adults, the nest or young must be postponed until all young have fledged the nest and it is no longer in use.
- Undertake enhancement measures to meet NPPF net gain in biodiversity principles by installing 2 stand-alone bat boxes one on each of the north-east and south-west elevations of the dormer extension

5.4 Evaluation Against Relevant Planning Policy

Given the impacts identified and the subsequent recommendations made it is considered that the proposals will accord with all relevant national and local planning policy in relation to ecology (see Section 4). Providing there is scope within the proposals to support the necessary mitigation for roosting bats.

Ecological Feature	Summary	Potential Impacts of the Development	Recommendations
Designated Sites	3 Isles of Scilly SSSIs	The development proposal may result in an increase in residents, therefore there is a risk that there will be an increase in recreational pressure on designations within the wider countryside	Monitoring, evaluation and resolution of recreational disturbance events should be carried out in accordance with the local authorities recreational pressure assessment and strategy
Vegetation	The site comprises no managed garden landscape and is deemed as having low ecological value	The proposal is anticipated to not have any negative effects on the ecological value of the site	The proposal should maintain the drystone wall on the north-west/south-east boundary maintaining the lichen species and ornamental plants found amongst the walls.
Bats	The site has no features suitable to host roosting bats, with the immediate habitat is illuminated by 3 streetlights. Despite having links to the wider countryside and optimal foraging habitat the development is deemed to have negligible bat roost potential	Demolition of the dormer window may lead to the disturbance of bats or may cause harm to roosting bats.	Avoidance measures (see Appendix 1) should be undertaken during the demolition phase of the works. Install 2 stand-alone bat boxes on the north-east and south-west elevations of the dormer window extension
Birds	The site has been assessed as having low potential to support nesting birds.	Demolition of the dormer window may lead to the disturbance of nesting birds and/or their young	Ideally carry out the work between November and May inclusive. But work should stop if evidence of nesting birds is found during the months of May to August inclusive.

Table 4. Potential impacts and recommendations

Ecological Feature	Summary	Potential Impacts of the Development	Recommendations
Reptiles/Amphibians	The drystone wall has the potential to support hibernating amphibians, but, overall the site is assessed as having negligible potential to support reptiles/amphibians	There are no anticipated impacts associated with reptiles and amphibians as the existing drystone walls are to be retained and new drystone walls are proposed along the eastern boundary	There are no recommendations to be made in respect of reptiles and amphibians
Invertebrates	The site is assessed as having negligible potential to support any rare or notable invertebrate species or species assemblages	There are no anticipated impacts associated with rare or notable invertebrates and the proposals	There are no recommendations to be made in respect of reptiles and amphibians

Table 4. Potential impacts and recommendations cont....

5.5 Updating Survey

If the works have not commenced by December 2021, it is recommended that this PEA is updated. This recommendation is made as many of the species considered during the current survey are highly mobile and the ecology of the site is likely to change over a two-year period. Similarly, if the planning application boundary changes or the proposals of the site alter, a re-assessment of the impacts may be required.

6.0 Conclusion

12 Higher Strand comprises a semi-detached residential property, with associated drystone wall boundary (to the north-west) enclosing a small area of hardstanding, which has been assessed as having low ecological value. The property has been assessed for its bat roost potential and has been categorised as having negligible potential to host roosting bats in its current state. Avoidance measures should be undertaken during the demolition phase of works to minimise the risk of disturbing or causing harm to bats if they were to be found (see Appendix 1). However, the site does have the potential to provide a net gain in biodiversity, in keeping with national and local planning policy, via the erection of bat boxes on each of the north-east and south-west elevations of the extended dormer window. No impact on reptiles/amphibians and invertebrates is anticipated.

7. Bibliography

1. CIEEM (2017). *Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, 2nd edition*. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management. Winchester
2. BSI (2013). *Biodiversity. Code of practice for planning and development*. BS42020. British Standards Institute
3. Natural England (2015). *National Character Area profile: 158. Isles of Scilly*. Catalogue Code: NE507. ISBN: 978-1-78367-067-3
4. <http://defra.magic.gov.uk>
5. JNCC (2010). *Handbook for Phase 1 Habitat Survey: A technique for environmental audit – Field manual*
6. H.M.S.O. (1981). *The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)*. London.
7. Collins, J. (ed.) (2016). *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edition)*. The Bat Conservation Trust
8. Ratcliffe, D. (1977). *A Nature Conservation Review*. Cambridge University Press
9. CIEEM (2016). *Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland*. 2nd Edition. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management. Winchester.
10. Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government. (2019). *National Planning Policy Framework*. OGL
11. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. (2005). *Biodiversity and Geological Conservation – Statutory Obligations and their Impact within the Planning System*. ODPM Circular 06/2005

APPENDIX 1

Avoidance Measures – Bats

- i. When roofing works are planned these should avoid the main breeding and mating season of *Vespertilionidae* bats, **work should typically take place between the 1st November and 1st May inclusive.**
- ii. Ensure all workers on site (including sub-contractors) are made familiar with bat legislation and agree to work in accordance with and fully follow best practice measures.
- iii. Carry out prior to demolition careful checks of any cracks/crevices and cavities in or on the building. Signs of usage include; bat droppings, dis-colouration or polishing of access points where bats rub against them, urine stains and a lack of cobwebs, particularly if other crevices around them have plenty.
- iv. Individual bats may be found in/under; cladding, between timber boards, between corrugated sheeting, in soffit boxes, behind lead flashing and sometimes just clinging to timber beams around joins as well as other areas. When any of these are removed, please do so carefully, lifting outwardly, and checking for bats continually. If in doubt, consult a licensed bat worker.
- v. Try to minimise any dust generated from demolition works from entering off-site buildings and gardens
- vi. In the unlikely event that a bat is found please see below:

1. At no point should a worker handle a bat. Untrained handling may cause undue stress and injury to the bat, and if bitten may expose the worker to rabies-related European Bat Lyssavirus
2. Where possible replace any covering without damaging the bat, then halt works and contact **Natural England** (Tel: 0845 601 4523), or the **Bat Conservation Trust Helpline** (0845 1300 228), or **IoSWT** (01720 422153) for advice.
3. Any bats that go to ground should be covered with a box and left alone until a licensed bat worker arrives to assess the condition of the bat
4. If the bat attempts to fly at any point allow it to do so. Preventing natural behavior will cause unnecessary stress and may cause injury. Attempt to see where bat goes. If the bat returns to the building, halt works and report the escaped bat to the local bat worker