
**BAT, BARN OWL & BREEDING BIRD
SCOPING SURVEY**

The Granary, Bannial Flat Farm

NYM/NPA

- 8 JUN 2012

Author	Steven Ward AIEEM	
Status	Date	Approved by:
Draft		
Revisions		
Final	8-6-2012	Giles Manners MIEEM CEnv



MAB Environment & Ecology Ltd

The Old Chapel, Knayton, Thirsk, North Yorkshire YO7 4AZ

www.mab.uk.com

Registered in the U.K. no.6504129

Protected Species Scoping Survey: The Granary

Site:

The Granary
Bannial Flat Farm
Guisborough Road
Whitby
YO21 1SQ

Dates:

Scoping survey: 29th May 2012
Scoping report: 8th June 2012

Client:

Jenny Lonsdale
The Granary
Bannial Flat Farm
Guisborough Road
Whitby
YO21 1SQ

Agent:

None

Local Authority:

Scarborough Borough Council

MAB Ref:

12-065



Protected Species Scoping Survey: The Granary

Contents

1. Summary 4

2. Introduction 5

3. Methodology..... 6

4. Constraints 7

5. Site Description 8

6. Pre-existing information 10

7. Results 11

8. Discussion and analysis 13

9. Impact assessment..... 14

10. Further work 14

11. Mitigation and compensation..... 15

12. Legislation 16

13. References 20

NYM/NPA
- 8 JUN 2012



1. Summary

A protected species scoping survey was undertaken at an old granary at Bannial Flat Farm to support a planning application for conversion into residential accommodation / holiday cottages.

No evidence of bats was found anywhere internally or externally. However, the building has several inaccessible features that provide potential roosting habitat for bats, such as lined roofs and masonry crevices.

It is considered unlikely that significant numbers of bats will be using the building as it is in an isolated location away from extensive good quality foraging habitat, but the presence of lower numbers of bats cannot be ruled out.

Further survey work will be necessary to confirm whether inaccessible features of the building are used by roosting bats. An evening emergence survey will need to be carried out between June and August, the main active season for bats. Two surveyors will be required to cover all elevations of the building.

The emergence survey will confirm the status of roosting at the site so that full consideration can be given to the impacts of the development and any necessary mitigation measures.

The building is unsuitable for barn owls. There is a very small amount of nesting bird activity in external wall crevices.

Protected Species Scoping Survey: The Granary

NYMNP
- 8 JUN 2012

2. Introduction

MAB Environment and Ecology Ltd was commissioned to conduct a protected species scoping survey at The Granary, Bannial Flat Farm to support a planning application. The southern end of the building has already been converted for residential use and proposals are now being submitted to convert the remainder of the building into dwellings / holiday accommodation.

The objectives of this report are to assess the potential impact of the conversion on bats, barn owl and breeding birds, identify the need for any further survey work, and assess the requirement for any mitigation measures and protected species licensing.

Ecologists from MAB Environment and Ecology Ltd are members of the Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (IEEM) and follow the Institute's Code of Professional Conduct when carrying out ecological work.



3. Methodology

3.1 Desktop study

Bat records within 2km of the site were requested from North Yorkshire Bat Group to see whether any roosts have been recorded at or near the site in the past.

3.2 Field survey

The building was surveyed by Steven Ward AIEEM of MAB Environment & Ecology Ltd. Steven has been trained by the Bat Conservation Trust in surveying buildings for bats and has over five years experience conducting such surveys, including recording the presence of barn owls and breeding birds.

An inspection of the building was undertaken during the day with the aid of ladders, close-focussing binoculars, a halogen torch (500,000 candlepower) and a flexible endoscope (Sea Snake LCD inspection scope). All normal signs of bats were looked for, including live and dead bats, droppings, feeding remains, grease marks around potential entrance / exit points and the smells / sounds of roosting bats. Signs of use by barn owls and breeding birds were also looked for, including old nests, droppings on and below perch points, feathers and owl pellets.

The condition, design and material of the building were assessed in terms of their potential value to roosting bats. The location of the site in the wider landscape, in relation to proximity and connectivity to good bat foraging habitat such as woodlands and water bodies, was also assessed.

Protected Species Scoping Survey: The Granary



4. Constraints

Internal evidence of bats, such as droppings, may have been inadvertently swept away as the internal floors are kept relatively clean. The building is used to store scaffolding gear.

The tall height of the building also meant that some potential crevice habitat for bats high up could not be reached for close inspection.

10000 / 2012 / 0285 / FL

Protected Species Scoping Survey: The Granary

NYMNP
- 8 JUN 2012

5. Site Description

The Granary is part of a range of old agricultural buildings at Bannial Flat Farm, which is located to the west of Whitby (OS Grid Ref: NZ 868 101). The farm is isolated and surrounded by arable farmland with hedgerow field boundaries. There are no waterbodies in the vicinity and the nearest woodlands exist 500m to the northwest.



Figure 1: Aerial image of surrounding habitats and land use

The building to be converted is a large, two storey old stone granary with a hipped pan tile roof (Photos 1 and 2). The southern end of the building has already been converted for residential use (Figure 2). A single storey adjoining building at the northern end also

Protected Species Scoping Survey: The Granary

NYM NPA
- 8 JUN 2012

forms part of the plans. This has a new roof and connects to other old buildings on the farm to the east.



Photo 1: Granary eastern elevation



Photo 2: Granary north & west elevations




Figure 2: Site plan

2012 / 0285 / FL 1

Protected Species Scoping Survey: The Granary

NYMNP
- 8 JUN 2012




Figure 3: Site location

6. Pre-existing information

At the time of writing bat records have not been received from North Yorkshire Bat Group. Any relevant records will be appended upon receipt.

Protected Species Scoping Survey: The Granary

NYMNP
- 8 JUN 2012

7. Results

7.1 Bats

No evidence of bats was found anywhere on the exterior or interior of the building. However, several features were identified that provide potential roost sites for bats, some of which could not be inspected.

There are multiple masonry crevices both externally and internally which could be used by bats (Photo 3); no signs of bat presence were found around those that were accessible but some were too high up to be closely inspected.



Photo 3: External masonry crevices



Photo 4: Lath / felt lined roof

The roof of the building is lath lined in the main, with some sections of bitumastic felt (Photo 4). The gap between these linings and the pan tiles above provides potential roosting habitat for bats, with access available beneath raised / dislodged tiles. These areas cannot be checked during a scoping survey. Crevices below ridge tiles can also be used by bats and there are a few access points along the ridge where the mortar is missing (Photo 5).

Protected Species Scoping Survey: The Granary



The interior of the building is open from floor to roof, with no void. It is light due to skylights and windows, and also relatively draughty.



Photo 5: Gap along ridge

7.2 Barn owl

No signs of barn owl were found within the building. It is unsuitable for the species as it is light and disturbed internally and there are no suitable access points.

7.3 Breeding birds

An old bird nest was found in a large external wall crevice and other similar holes may be used by nesting birds. No internal use by birds such as swallows was noted as there is no open access.



8. Discussion and analysis

8.1 Bats

Despite not finding any evidence of bat presence during the inspection, the old building has several inaccessible features that provide potential roosting habitat. Therefore, the presence of bats cannot be ruled out at this stage.

Lined roofs are often used by crevice dwelling species such as pipistrelle bats, any evidence of which remains hidden in the roof. Significant numbers of bats can be found in such areas, though this is considered unlikely in this case due to the isolated nature of the site. The nearest extensive good quality foraging habitat is located 500m to the northwest within bands of woodland and large colonies are more likely to roost nearer such habitat. The habitats around the site – hedgerows, scattered trees and farm buildings – will only be able to support a relatively small number of bats.

Masonry crevices in the building may be used by bats as summer / cool roosts. These are sites used by solitary / low numbers of non-breeding bats in the active season.

The light and draughty interior of the building makes it unsuitable for large numbers of void dwelling species, such as brown long-eared bats. Lone males can be found in such buildings, though no evidence was found on surfaces which had not been cleaned.

8.2 Breeding birds

Barn owls have not used the building in the past and there is no risk of future use. A small number of birds exploit external masonry crevices to nest within.



9. Impact assessment

9.1 Bats

Works to convert the building have the potential to damage roost sites and disturb bats in those areas with roost potential, mainly around the roof.

Further survey work will be necessary to confirm whether bats use inaccessible features of the building in order to complete the impact assessment (see Section 10).

9.2 Breeding birds

There may be a negligible impact on breeding birds through the loss of a small number of crevice nesting sites.

10. Further work

To confirm the status of bat roosting at the site it is necessary to carry out an evening emergence survey between June and August, the core active period for bats. Two surveyors will be required to cover all elevations of the building.

Protected Species Scoping Survey: The Granary

NYMNP
- 8 JUN 2012

11. Mitigation and compensation

11.1 Bats

The level of mitigation required, if any, can only be determined once the emergence survey has been carried out and the status of roosting has been confirmed.

11.2 Breeding birds

If development work is undertaken during the bird breeding season (March to August inclusive) contractors should check masonry crevices for nesting birds prior to repointing. Any active nests found should be left alone until the young have fledged and the nest is no longer in use.

Consideration should be given to the provision of nest boxes on the converted building as compensation. Alternatively, crevices where nesting birds are found could be left open for future use.



12. Legislation

12.1 Bats

Relevant Legislation. All bat species are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (WCA) 1981 (as amended), the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and the Habitat Regulations 2010.

Under the WCA it is an offence for any person to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bat; to intentionally disturb any wild bat while it is occupying a structure or place that it uses for shelter or protection; to intentionally damage, destroy or obstruct access to any place that a wild bat uses for shelter or protection; to be in possession or control of any live or dead wild bat, or any part of, or anything derived from a wild bat; or to sell, offer or expose for sale, or possess or transport for the purpose of sale, any live or dead wild bat, or any part of, or anything derived from a wild bat.

Under the Habitat Regulations 2010, it is an offence to (a) deliberately capture, injure or kills any wild animal of a European protected species (EPS), (b) deliberately disturb wild animals of any such species, (c) deliberately take or destroy the eggs of such an animal, or (d) damages or destroys a breeding site or resting place of such an animal. Deliberate disturbance of animals of a European protected species (EPS) includes in particular any disturbance which is likely to impair their ability (i) to survive, to breed or reproduce, or to rear or nurture their young; or (ii) in the case of animals of a hibernating or migratory species, to hibernate or migrate; or to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong.

Prosecution could result in imprisonment, fines of £5,000 per animal affected and confiscation of vehicles and equipment used. In order to minimise the risk of breaking the law it is essential to work with care to avoid harming bats, to be aware of the procedures to be followed if bats are found during works, and to commission surveys and expert advice as required to minimise the risk of reckless harm to bats.

Licences. Where it is proposed to carry out works which will damage / destroy a bat roost or disturb bats to a significant degree, an EPS licence must first be obtained from the Natural England (even if no bats are expected to be present when the work is carried out). The application for a license normally requires a full knowledge of the use of a site by bats, including species, numbers, and timings. Gathering this information

Protected Species Scoping Survey: The Granary



usually involves surveying throughout the bat active season. The licence may require ongoing monitoring of the site following completion of the works.

Licences can only be issued if Natural England are satisfied that there is no satisfactory alternative to the development and that the action authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species at a favourable conservation status in their natural range.

Planning and Wildlife. The March 2012 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has replaced PPS9 (Planning Policy Statement on Biodiversity and Geological Conservation) as the relevant national planning guidance in relation to ecological issues.

Para 109 of NPPF states that the planning system should “contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government’s commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures”.

Para 117 of NPPF states that the planning system should “promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species, populations, linked to national and local targets”.

Para 118 of NPPF states that “When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles:

- if significant harm 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;
- proposed development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest likely to have an adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (either individually or in combination with other developments) should not normally be permitted. Where an adverse effect on the site’s notified special interest features is likely, an exception should only be made where the benefits of the development, at this site, clearly outweigh both the impacts that it is likely to have 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 proposals where the primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be permitted;
- opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged;
- planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss.

Para 119 of the NPPF makes it clear that “The presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 14) does not apply where development requiring appropriate assessment under the Birds or Habitats Directives is being considered, planned or determined”. Therefore EPS will still be a material consideration when considering sustainable developments.

The accompanying ODPM Circular 06/2005 remains pertinent; circular 06/2005 is prescriptive in how planning officers should deal with protected species, see paragraphs 98 and 99:

- The presence of a protected species is a material consideration when considering a proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat (see ODPM/Defra Circular, para 98)
- LPAs should consider attaching planning conditions/entering into planning obligations to enable protection of species. They should also advise developers that they must comply with any statutory species protection issues affecting the site (ODPM/Defra Circular, para 98)
- The presence and extent to which protected species will be affected must be established before planning permission is granted. If not, a decision will have been made without all the facts (ODPM/Defra Circular, para 99)
- Any measures necessary to protect the species should be conditioned/planning obligations used, before the permission is granted. Conditions can also be placed on a permission in order to prevent development proceeding without a Habitats Regulations Licence (ODPM/Defra Circular, para 99).
- *The need to ensure ecological surveys are carried out should therefore only be left to coverage under planning conditions in exceptional circumstances.*

Protected Species Scoping Survey: The Granary



Further to NPPF and OPDM Circular 06/2005, Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) states that 'Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity'. Section 40(3) also states that 'conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat'.

12.2 Breeding birds

Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981), a wild bird is defined as any bird of a species that is resident in or is a visitor to the European Territory of any member state in a wild state.

Game birds however are not included in this definition (except for limited parts of the Act). They are covered by the Game Acts, which fully protect them during the close season.

All birds, their nests and eggs are protected by law and it is thus an offence, with certain exceptions to:

- intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bird
- intentionally take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird whilst it is in use or being built
- intentionally take or destroy the egg of any wild bird
- have in one's possession or control any wild bird, dead or alive, or any part of a wild bird, which has been taken in contravention of the Act or the Protection of Birds Act 1954
- have in one's possession or control any egg or part of an egg which has been taken in contravention of the Act or the Protection of Birds Act 1954
- use traps or similar items to kill, injure or take wild birds
- have in one's possession or control any bird of a species occurring on Schedule 4 of the Act unless registered, and in most cases ringed, in accordance with the Secretary of State's regulations (see *Schedules*)
- intentionally or recklessly disturb any wild bird listed on Schedule 1 while it is nest building, or at a nest containing eggs or young, or disturb the dependent young of such a bird.



13. References

Mitchell-Jones, A.J. (2004). *Bat Mitigation Guidelines*. English Nature.

Mitchell-Jones, A.J. & McLeish, A.P. Ed.(2004) *3rd Edition Bat Workers' Manual*. JNCC.

Parsons K., Crompton R., Graves R., Markham S., Mathews J., Oxford M., Shepherd P.,
Sowler S. (2007) *Bat Surveys Good Practice Guidelines*. Bat Conservation Trust.

The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2010/490/contents/made>