Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment

Document reference	AR183-Green Man Pub.PRA
Site	The Green Man Pub, Jolesfield Road, Partridge Green
Client	Mr N. Illes
Author	Alex Rosenfeld Ecologist (QCIEEM)
Revision Number	1
Report issue date	16th June 2025

The assessment and appraisal are considered relevant for a maximum of 18 months due to the possibility of changes in the habitats on-site and scope of proposals. Should alterations to the proposals or site occur, the ecologist should be consulted to confirm that the appraisal is still valid.

Contents

Summary

Mr N. Illes has commissioned a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment and Ecological Impact Assessment for proposals at The Green Man Pub, Jolesfield Road, Partridge Green *(grid refence: TQ18751980, hereafter referred to as 'the site'*).

The proposals include converting the existing pub into housing with associated landscaping and parking. Only internal alterations to the building are proposed.

A Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment (PBRA) was carried out on the 15th May 2025 by Aidan Bird (*BSC Ecology, Conservation and Environment*, accredited agent under a CL18 license with 6 years professional experience).

The northern half of the site is the carpark. The western section consists of a grass beer garden. A more densely vegetated grassy area is in the southeastern corner. In the centre of the site lies a building surrounded by patio and brick paths. Introduced shrubs line the boundaries to an extent. Scattered trees were noted across the site.

The building offered **'moderate' suitability** for roosting bats. However, due to the nature of proposals, no further surveys shall be required.

Disused bird nests were noted within the roof. The site may support commuting hedgehogs.

When mitigation and enhancements have been taken into account, the proposals are not considered to have a negative impact upon designated sites, habitats or protected species in accordance with planning policy and once enhancements are considered, would result in a minor gain of onsite ecology. The proposals would therefore accord with the relevant Local Plan Policies.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Mr N. Illes has commissioned a Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment and Ecological Impact Assessment at the Green Man Pub, Jolesfield Road, Partridge Green (*grid refence: TQ18751980, hereafter referred to as 'the site'*).

1.2 A Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment was carried out on the 15th May 2025 by Aidan Bird (*BSC in Ecology, Conservation and Environment* and accredited agent under a CL18 license with 6 years professional experience).

1.3 The following ecological impact assessment report has been completed by Alex Rosenfeld (*QCIEEM)*. The purpose of the assessment has been to identify whether any potential impacts upon protected species, habitats or designated sites might occur, and to propose mitigation or avoidance measures where necessary.

1.4 Based on the results of the appraisal, recommendations for potential ecological enhancements have been provided.

Site Description and Surrounding Area

1.5 The northern half of the site is the carpark. The western section consists of a grass beer garden. A more densely vegetated grassy area is in the southeastern corner. In the centre of the site lies a building surrounded by patio and brick paths. Introduced shrubs line the boundaries to an extent. Scattered trees were noted across the site.

Figure No. 01 – Site location

1.6 The site is located on the northern edge of Partridge Green, West Sussex. The site is bound by Jolesfield Road to the east and domestic dwellings to the north and south. A horse paddock lies to the west.

1.7 Surrounding land use is primarily rural in the form of arable and pasture fields with hedgerows and pockets of woodland.

1.8 No ponds are onsite. 2no. are noted within a 500 meter radius of the site.

Proposals

1.9 The proposals are for the conversion of the existing pub into housing with associated landscaping and parking.

2.0 Scope of Assessment

1. *Categorise habitats present on the site;*
2. *Identify habitat which may have potential for protected species;*
3. *Identify whether any signs of protected species are present on-site;*
4. *Recommend whether further surveys are required, or whether there are any relevant constraints with regards to protected species;*
5. *Identify impacts of the proposed development and set out appropriate avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures;*
6. *Provide recommendations as to how the site and proposals could be enhanced with regards to protected species and habitats.*

2.1 The assessment and appraisal are considered relevant for a maximum of 18 months due to the possibility of changes in the habitats on-site and scope of proposals. Should alterations to the proposals or site occur, the ecologist should be consulted to confirm that the appraisal is still valid.

3.0 Planning Policy and Legislation

National Planning Policy

3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was updated in December 2024 and sets out the government planning policies for England and how they should be applied. 'Chapter 15: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment' states that development should be 'minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.'

3.2 The Government Circular 06/2005, which is referred to by the NPPF, provides further guidance in respect of statutory obligations for biodiversity and geological conservation and their impact within the planning system.

Local Planning Policy

3.3 The site is within the Horsham District. As the existing local plan is at Regulation 19 stage, the proposals shall be assessed against existing Horsham District Planning Framework 2015.

3.4 Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity states:

1. Development will be supported where it can demonstrate that it maintains or enhances the existing network of green infrastructure. Proposals that would result in the loss of existing green infrastructure will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that new opportunities will be provided that mitigates or compensates for this loss, and ensures that the ecosystem services of the area are retained.

2. Development proposals will be required to contribute to the enhancement of existing biodiversity, and should create and manage new habitats where appropriate.The Council will support new development which retains and /or enhances significant features of nature conservation on development sites. The Council will also support development which makes a positive contribution to biodiversity through the creation of green spaces, and linkages between habitats to create local and regional ecological networks.

3. Where felling of protected trees is necessary, replacement planting with a suitable species will be required.

4. a) Particular consideration will be given to the hierarchy of sites and habitats in the district as follows:

i. Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Areas of Conservation (SAC)

ii. Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and National Nature Reserves (NNRs)

iii. Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCIs), Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) and any areas of Ancient woodland, local geodiversity or other irreplaceable habitats not already identified in i & ii above.

b) Where development is anticipated to have a direct or indirect adverse impact on sites or features for biodiversity, development will be refused unless it can be demonstrated that:

i. The reason for the development clearly outweighs the need to protect the value of the site; and,

ii. That appropriate mitigation and compensation measures are provided.

5. Any development with the potential to impact Arun Valley SPA or the Mens SAC will be subject to a HRA to determine the need for an Appropriate Assessment. In addition, development will be required to be in accordance with the necessary mitigation measures for development set out in the HRA of this plan

Legislation

- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017;
- The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended);
- The Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006;
- The Protection of Mammals Act 1996.

3.5 All species of bat and their roosts are protected under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. It is an offence to intentionally kill, injure or handle a bat, to possess a bat (live or dead), disturb a roosting bat, or sell or offer a bat for sale without a licence. It is also an offence to damage, destroy or obstruct access to any place used by bats for shelter, whether they are present or not.

3.6 All UK bird species are protected against disturbance whilst occupying a nest under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Developments that could predictably disturb, kill or injure nesting birds could result in an offence. Furthermore, a number of bird species are targets of UK and Local Biodiversity Action Plans and listed as Species of Principle Importance under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. This obligates local authorities to have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity with particular emphasis on targeted species.

3.7 All other mammals receive general protection against cruelty, inhumane killing or injuring under the Protection of Mammals Act 1996.

4.0 Methodology

Desktop Study

4.1 'Magic' Maps was consulted for information pertaining to priority habitats, statutory designated sites and permitted European Protected Species Mitigation Licences (EPSML's) within a potential zone of influence of the development site.

4.2 The following potential zones of influence have been used when identifying designated sites in the local area: Local Nature Reserves (LNRs), National Nature Reserves (NNRs), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Ramsar sites (Wetlands of International Importance) were searched for within a 2.0km radius of the site and non-statutory sites and protected habitats within a 1.0km radius of the site.

4.3 Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) and possible Special Areas of Conservation (pSACs) within a 12km radius of the site have also been assessed, to account for the potential presence of SAC's designated for their bat interest in accordance with recent guidance (SDNP, 2020).

4.4 Due to the scale and scope of proposals, a biodiversity record centre was not considered necessary.

4.5 A search was carried out to identify features of ecological interest in the area, such as water bodies and ancient woodland.

4.6 The report is written based on the following guidance:

- CIEEM Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing 2017 (CIEEM, 2017)

- CIEEM Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland (CIEEM, 2018)

- Surveys have been carried out following the guidance sources set out in CIEEM's Good Practice Guidance for Habitats and Species (CIEEM, 2021), which include:

  o CIEEM Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, Second Edition (CIEEM, 2017)

  o CIEEM Guidelines for Accessing, Using and Sharing Biodiversity Data in the UK. Second Edition (CIEEM, 2017)

  o Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (BCT, 2023)

Site Visit

4.8 A site visit was conducted on 15th May 2025 during suitable. Habitats were recorded broadly according to the UK-Hab Classification System as described within the UK Habitats Manual v2.01 (UKHab Ltd 2023).

4.9 During the survey any constraints with regard to protected species were considered; potential for impacts upon protected species even when evidence of such was not noted at the time of survey.

4.10 Points of interest for protected species have been plotted into the Site Habitat Plan and within target notes. Protected and Notable Species considered as part of this assessment include but are not limited to:

- *Bats – foraging, commuting, roosting, swarming and hibernating;*
- *Badgers Meles meles – setts, latrines, push-unders and trapped hairs to fences, snuffle holes, and tracks;*
- *Dormice Muscardinus avellanarius – nesting and commuting;*
- *Great Crested Newts Triturus cristatus and other Amphibians such as Common Toads Bufo bufo – terrestrial active and hibernation habitat and aquatic habitat, including commuting;*
- *Birds – nesting, foraging and wintering;*
- *Reptiles – terrestrial active and hibernation habitat;*
- *Rare or Notable Invertebrates;*
- *Rare or Notable Plants;*
- *Water Voles Arvicola amphibius – foraging and shelter habitats;*
- *Otters Lutra lutra – foraging and shelter habitats;*
- *White-clawed Crayfish Austropotamobius pallipes;*

4.11 The structure was inspected for features conducive to bat and bird roosting. The bat roost assessment was conducted following the Bat Conservation Trust - Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (2023). Any evidence of bats such as grease marks, bat droppings, feeding remains and suitable cavities were noted.

4.12 Structures were assigned levels of bat roost suitability, ranging between negligible and high for buildings. Trees are assessed either as having no suitability, PRF-I (only able to support individual bats) and PRF-M (being able to support larger numbers of bats and therefore maternity colonies).

4.13 Due to the site visit being carried out over one day, it is possible that some signs of protected species may not be apparent within this short timeframe. This is a constraint recognised within the Survey Guidelines and all reasonable effort has been made to identify evidence of protected species. The further revisits added certainty to the original findings.

Ecological Impact Assessment

4.14 The methodology for Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) follows best practice guidelines set by the Chartered Institute of Ecology & Environmental Management (CIEEM): 'Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment' (CIEEM, 2018). This includes identifying the baseline conditions on the site and subsequently rating the potential effects of the development based on the sensitivity and value of the resource affected,

combined with the magnitude, duration and scale of the impact (or change). This is initially assessed without mitigation measures, and then assessed again after allowing for the proposed mitigation measures; this provides the residual effects. The assessment is divided into construction effects and longer-term operational effects.

4.15 Each ecological feature within the site has been considered within a defined Geographic context such as:

- International and European;
- National;
- Regional;
- County;
- District;
- Local;
- Site Level;
- Negligible.

4.16 Based upon CIEEM guidance, value was determined with reference to the following factors:

- Its inclusion as a Designated Site or other protected area;
- The presence of habitat types of conservation significance, e.g. Habitats of Principal Importance (NERC 2006);
- The presence (or potential presence) of species of conservation significance e.g. Species of Principal Importance (NERC 2006);
- The presence of other protected species e.g. those protected under The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981;
- The sites social and economic value.

4.17 Specifically in the case of bats, the impact assessment has been conducted in accordance with the recently published Bat Mitigation Guidelines (Reason and Wray 2023). Other relevant guidelines such as the Dormouse Conservation Handbook, Great Crested Newt Mitigation Guidelines and Froglife Advice Sheet for Reptiles were consulted as appropriate.

5.0 Constraints

5.1 The main roof space of the building was not accessible. Access onto the roof was not possible. As such, some areas of roof were not visible from the ground due to the complex nature of the roof. However, it is considered sufficient information was gathered to make an informed decision as to the requirement for further surveys where necessary.

6.0 Baseline Ecological Conditions

Desktop Study

6.1 No statutory designated sites are noted within a 2.0km radius of the site.

6.2 No non-statutory designated sites were noted within a 1.0km radius of the site.

6.3 Due to the nature of the proposals, the LPA will not have to consult with Natural England.

Habitats

Desk Study

6.4 Within 1.0km of the site there are Priority Habitats of Deciduous Woodland and Traditional Orchards.

Site Assessment

6.5 The site is given over to the following habitats.

U1b5 – Building

6.6 The site comprises a two storey redbrick building formally used as a pub. Two sheds are also noted. The habitats offers '**negligible'** ecological value in a broader sense. The buildings' potential for protected species is discussed in more detail in Section 6.0.

U1b – Developed Land Sealed; Surface

6.7 A hardstanding parking area is noted to the north and south of the building. A small paved patio is to the west. Overall, this habitat is of '**negligible'** ecological value.

G4 847, 32 – Modified Grassland with Introduced Shrubs and Scattered Trees

6.8 The small area of grass in the west of the site which, when the pub was active, was used as a beer garden, is vegetated with patchy grass and various forbes. Species include annual meadow grass *Poa annua,* Perennial ryegrass *Lolium perenne*, daisy *Bellis perennis* and plantain *Plantago major.*

6.9 Introduced shrubs are noted along the borders of the site and dividing the carpark in the north and beer garden. Several trees of varying age and species were noted across the site. Species noted including silver birch *Betula pendula,* ash *Fraxinus excelsior* and fir sp. *Aibes sp. Overall*, this habitat was of '**site' value** only.

7.0 Protected Species Assessment

Bats

Desk Study

7.1 1no. active granted European Protected Species Licence (EPSML) is noted within a 2.0km radius of the site (located 1.5km north east, case reference: 2015-11579-EPS-MIT). The licence regards the destruction of a breeding site and a resting place for brown long eared bat *Plecotus auritus* and common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus.*

Site Assessment - Buildings

7.2 The building is of redbrick construction with clay tiled roof and brick chimneys with lead flashings. The roof has several aspects of varying areas. A cellar is also present.

7.3 Externally, the roof displays several areas of lifted, cracked and slipped tiles creating bat roost potential on each aspect. The lead flashing around the base of the chimney stacks also appear lifted in places, thus creating roosting opportunities.

7.4 The soffits and facias are of wood and in generally good condition with no obvious gaps present to create entry opportunities for bats.

7.5 Internally, the main roof space is inaccessible. The roof space above the kitchen is of wooden rafter construction with roofing felt.

7.6 The roof space displays several ingress points at the gable end creating bat roost potential with light visibly entering the loft from outside. No signs of bats were noted anywhere during the survey. Multiple area of squirrel droppings were present.

7.7 No potential ingress / exit points were noted within the cellar.

7.8 Overall, due to the lifted roof tiles, gaps in the gable end of the loft and lifted lead flashings, the building is considered to be of '**moderate'** roost suitability for bats.

7.9 Two sheds are also noted. Both have windows which allow constant light to enter and absolutely unsuitable for bats. Both are of '**negligible'** value to bats.

The tees within the garden displayed no features of value to bats. No cracked / lifted bark was noted and no knot holes or cracks in trees were noted which could allow a bat to enter. Overall, the trees were of '**negligible'** value to roosting bats.

Foraging and Commuting Value

7.10 The garden provides limited foraging and commuting opportunities primarily from the trees. The grass is well maintain and no inflorescence were noted. The wider area comprises a network of hedgerows and woodland providing good foraging and commuting potential. There is limited nighttime street lighting. Overall, the garden is of '**site'** value for foraging and commuting bats.

Birds

Desk Study

7.11 Numerous bird species are present in the local area, including those which utilise garden and hedgerow habitats such as blackbird *Turdus merula* and dunnock *Prunella modularis*.

Site Assessment

7.12 Several old bird nests were noted within the kitchen roof space. No active nests were found during the survey.

7.13 The trees and shrubs provide numerous nesting opportunities for a variety of cavity and open-nesting species. The wider landholding is of '**site' value** to nesting and foraging birds.

Badger

Desk Study

7.14 Badger (*Meles meles)* records are confidential, but they are likely present nearby.

Site Assessment

7.15 No evidence of badger such as setts, snuffle holes or latrines were noted. Overall, the site is of '**low' value** to foraging badger.

Other

7.16 No potential for or evidence of any other protected species such as rare plants were recorded. There is good potential for hedgehogs *Erinaceus europaeus* to forage in the grass and shrubs given the site location surroundings. No impacts upon other protected species are considered likely and have not been assessed further.

8.0 Evaluation of Impacts and Mitigation

Designated Sites

Potential Impacts

8.1 None foreseen. It is considered that the small scale and scope of works in addition to the intervening distance of the site from any protected sites will nullify any impacts upon any designated site.

Avoidance, Mitigation and Compensation

8.2 None required.

Habitats

Potential Impacts

8.3 Introduced shrubs and small areas of grass are to be lost to facilitate works.

8.4 In the absence of mitigation small areas of vegetated ground could be degraded through construction activities.

Avoidance, Mitigation and Compensation

8.5 Mandatory BNG shall ensure any small losses of introduced shrubs shall be offset post works with Biodiversity Credits purchased from a local landbank.

8.6 Ensure all materials and plant machinery are stored and operate within exiting hard surfaces. All soft ground should be avoided.

8.7 All hazardous chemicals should be stored on existing hard surfaces away from soft or open ground. Refuelling should be undertaken in a designated area on existing hard surfaces. Spill kits should be provided in case of emergency.

Bats

Potential Impacts

8.8 The building is of '**moderate' suitability** for roosting bats. In the absence of mitigation, there is potential a bats could be harmed or killed during works. This would constitute an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (As Amended). However, as the application is for Change of Use and all alterations to the building shall be internal, no impacts upon the roof are foreseen.

Mitigation and Compensation.

8.9 None required.

Residual Impacts

8.10 The overall impact of the scheme will be **negligible**.

Nesting Birds

Potential Impacts

8.11 Vegetation removal could lead to the destruction of a birds nest. This would constitute an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (As Amended). A nest built within the roof of the garage could be disturbed during works.

Avoidance, Mitigation and Compensation

8.12 Any vegetation shall be removed outside the bird-nesting season (March – August inclusive). Where not possible, all vegetation to be removed shall be checked prior to works by a suitably qualified ecologist.

8.13 Should an active nest be discovered or suspected during works, all operations in the area must cease and a suitably qualified ecologist contacted for advice.

Badger

Potential Impacts

8.14 None foreseen.

Avoidance, Mitigation and Compensation

8.15 None required.

Other

Potential Impacts

8.16 In the absence of mitigation there is a low risk of hedgehogs being disturbed, especially if materials are not stored properly in the garden.

Mitigation and Compensation

8.17 All materials shall be stored on hard surfaces or pallets, avoiding soft ground and any piles of aggregates, timber etc. checked for presence of hedgehogs before removal.

Residual Impacts

8.18 The overall impact of the scheme will be negligible.

9.0 Ecological Enhancements

9.1 Because of the scale and nature of the proposals, ecological enhancement opportunities within the construction zone are limited.

9.2 The most beneficial enhancements would involve the following:

- Installation of new bat roost features to a mature tree in public areas;
- Installation of bird nesting features to mature trees in public areas;
- Installation of a hedgehog box to the building or garden in a public area;
- Installation of an insect feature to the building or garden in a public area.

10.0 Conclusions

10.1 The building offers '**moderate' suitability** for roosting bats. The roof is not to be affected by works as proposals only include internal alterations, therefore no impacts to bats are foreseen.

10.2 Basic mitigation detailed herein is considered sufficient to protect badgers, birds and hedgehogs.

10.3 No significant effects are anticipated upon designated sites, provided the avoidance and mitigation measures stated within this report are followed.

10.4 When mitigation has been taken into account, the proposals are not considered to have a negative impact upon designated sites, habitats or protected species. Enhancements are included to confirm how ecological gains will be achieved.

11.0 References

Bat Conservation Trust (2023). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines. Third Edition. Available online: http://www.bats.org.uk/pages/batsurveyguide.html

Bat Conservation Trust and Institution for Lighting Professionals (BCT/ILP, 2023). Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night. Available online: https://theilp.org.uk/publication/guidance-note-8-bats-and-artificial-lighting/

British Standards Institution. (2013). BS 42020:2013 Biodiversity – Code of practice for planning and development. London: BSI Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC 2010). Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey - a technique for environmental audit. Available online: http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-2468

Chichester District Council (2015) Chichester Local Plan: Key Policies 2014-2029.

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

CIEEM (2020) Guidelines for Accessing, Using and Sharing Biodiversity Data in the UK. 2nd Edition. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management. Winchester, UK.

CIEEM (2021) Bat Mitigation Guidelines, Beta Version 1.0. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.

CIEEM (2022) Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment, 1st edition, Revision 1.02. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.

East Hampshire District Council (2021). Biodiversity and Planning Guidance. Available online: https://www.easthants.gov.uk/media/6296/download?inline

Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC 2010). Handbook for Phase 1 habitat survey - a technique for environmental audit. Available online: http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-2468

MAGIC Interactive Map Tool (Accessed 20th November 2024): www.magic.gov.uk

Reason, P.F. and Wray, S. (2023). UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines: a guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Ampfield.

Streeter, D. (2010). The Most Complete Guide to the Flowers of Britain and Ireland; Harper Collins, London.

UK Hab Ltd. (2023). The Habitat Classification Version 2.0. Available online: https://www.ukhab.org

13.0 Appendix A - Site Photos

Photo 1 –Building viewed from the east.

Photo 2 – Roof tiles of the southern aspect. Numerous lifted, displaced or cracked tiles were noted across each roof section.

Photo 3 – View of soffits and facias on the western aspect.

Photo 4 – Roof space above the kitchen.

Photo 5 – Disused bird nest within roof

Photo 6 – The cellar, with no value to bats.

Photo 7 –Beer garden to the west of building.