



Brighter strategies
for greener projects



Client: Caritas Diocese of Salford
Project: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal
Report: Red Door Day Centre, Bury

QUALITY ASSURANCE

Issue/Revision:	Draft	Final
Date:	December 2025	December 2025
Comments:		
Prepared by:	Abbie Case	Abbie Case
Authorised by:	Annabel Walker-Evans	Helen Bradshaw
File Reference:	552817eh05Dec25_FV02_PEA.docx	552817eh05Dec25_FV02_PEA.docx

CONTENTS

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2.0 INTRODUCTION	3
2.1 SITE DESCRIPTION	3
3.0 METHODOLOGY	4
3.1 DESKTOP REVIEW	4
3.2 ON SITE SURVEYS	4
3.3 SURVEYORS	7
3.4 CONSTRAINTS	7
4.0 RESULTS	8
4.1 DESKTOP REVIEW	8
4.2 DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF SITE: HABITATS	10
4.3 DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF SITE: SPECIES	10
5.0 EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION	13
5.1 BASELINE SUMMARY	13
5.2 DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	14
6.0 SUMMARY & CONCLUSION	17
APPENDIX A SITE PLAN AND HABITAT MAP	
APPENDIX B SITE PHOTOGRAPHS	
APPENDIX C RELEVANT LEGISLATION AND POLICY	
REFERENCES	

Tables

Table 4.1 Statutory and Non-Statutory Designated Sites within Search Radius	8
Table 5.1 Baseline Summary	13

Figures

Figure A.1 Site plan and habitat map	
--------------------------------------	--

Plates

Plate B.1 The site, viewed from the northern aspect	
Plate B.2 The site, as viewed from the southern aspect	
Plate B.3 Mortared wall present around the boundaries of the site	

- Plate B.4 Building B3 present adjacent to the site boundary, to the east
- Plate B.5 Gaps underneath slate roof tiles on B3, facing the site boundary
- Plate B.6 Gaps underneath slate roof tiles on B3, facing the site boundary
- Plate B.7 The current Caritas building B1 (left) and the church B2 (right)
- Plate B.8 Missing mortar on B2, located on the northern aspect facing Badger Street
- Plate B.9 Lifted slate roof tile on B2 located on the southern aspect, facing the garden courtyard

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Greengage Environmental Ltd was commissioned to undertake a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) by Caritas Diocese of Salford of a site known as Red Door Day Centre in Bury, Greater Manchester.

This document is a report of this survey and has been produced to inform a full planning submission for the site for the construction of a new 'single storey day centre (Use Class F1) with kitchen and accessible wash areas, meeting and activity rooms, staff offices, cycle and car parking, landscaping and associated works' at Land adjacent to St Joseph's Presbytery, Bury, BL9 6AB.

This survey aimed to establish the ecological value of this site and the potential presence of legally protected species in order to inform appropriate mitigation, compensation and enhancement actions in light of proposed development works.

The site extends to 0.101ha and comprises of developed land; sealed surface, with a mortared wall running the perimeter of the site.

The site walkover, undertaken on 07th June 2024, alongside data received from a desk top study, identified the site has potential to support the following protected / notable species and to impact the following designated sites as described below:

- One statutory designated site, Chesham Woods Local Nature Reserve, was located 800m northeast of the site;
- Three non-statutory designations within 2km of the site, the closest being Chesham Woods Site of Biological Importance (SBI) located 800m northeast of the site;
- Low suitability for foraging and commuting bats;
- Low suitability for roosting bats.

The potential for the site to support other protected and / or notable species including badger, amphibians, reptiles, otter, water vole and invertebrates is considered negligible, due to unsuitable habitat on-site and within the wider landscape, and the high levels of human disturbance which would discourage / limit wildlife from ranging into the site.

Buildings B2 and B3, adjacent to the site, were found to have potential bat roost features however further surveys are not recommended. The one story proposed building will not inhibit any existing flight lines/ access or egress points (should bats be present). The habitats onsite and within the wider survey area are of low suitability to support commuting and foraging bats, being predominantly urban with limited greenspace / corridors and high levels of human disturbance. Landscaping within the designs of the proposed development will increase the opportunities for foraging and commuting bats within the site by providing grassland habitats and planting new trees. Mitigation measures to ensure no indirect disturbance on features will be provided within a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP).

It is recommended that any new lighting design is modelled (to create a lighting contour plan) to estimate spill levels, particularly concerning the western edge of the building where Potential Roosting Features (PRFs) have been identified. This should then be reviewed and approved by a Suitably Qualified Ecologist (SQE).

It is also recommended that if construction has not commenced within 12 months, a further Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) is undertaken in order to ensure there has been no change in condition of the buildings.

The following ecological enhancements are detailed within this report, targeting UK and Greater Manchester policy:

- Provision of enhanced wildlife-friendly landscaping;
- Incorporation of bird and bat boxes; and
- Installation of invertebrate features.

The site qualifies for statutory BNG exemption as it comprises entirely hardstanding, so a quantified Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment is not required. A review of the site's baseline conditions and proposed works confirms that, provided the recommendations in this report are followed, the development would accord with relevant biodiversity protection legislation and planning policy.

An Ecological Management Plan (EMP) and CEMP should be produced and implemented for the site, which should be secured through planning condition in accordance with BS 42020: 2013 Biodiversity.

It is generally recognised that ecological survey data is valid for up to 12 months, depending on the site and species present. Therefore, surveys may need to be updated if this time elapses before planning permission submission or conditions on the site are subject to change.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

Greengage was commissioned to undertake a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) by Caritas Diocese of Salford of a site known as Red Door Day Centre in Bury, Greater Manchester.

This document is a report of this survey and has been produced to inform a full planning submission for the site which seeks to create a 'single storey day centre (Use Class F1) with kitchen and accessible wash areas, meeting and activity rooms, staff offices, cycle and car parking, landscaping and associated works.'

This survey aimed to establish the ecological value of this site and the potential presence of legally protected species in order to inform appropriate mitigation, compensation and enhancement actions in light of proposed development works.

2.1 SITE DESCRIPTION

The site extends to approximately 0.101ha and is centred on National Grid Reference SD 81021 11275, OS Co-ordinates 381021, 411275.

The land proposed for development is the surface car park which adjoins the St Joseph's R C Church and the St Joseph's Presbytery, a former priest house which was converted to non-residential institution (Use Class F1 formerly Use Class D1) in 2011. The presbytery is currently used by Red Door but is not fit for purpose due to its layout and condition, which is a safety concern for the Charity.

The site is accessible via the current Bold Street access which leads to the car park.

The site is bound by Peter Street to the north, beyond which are several 2-storey terraced properties. To the east of the site is an industrial estate comprising a few commercial and industrial units. Back Moorgate West lines the property to the south, beyond which lies a small car park and the Moorgate Retail Park across the B6222, a local commuter route between Bury & Rochdale. Back Peter Street adjoins the western boundary of the site, beyond which several small local shops & cafes exist.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

The PEA was undertaken in accordance with guidance in the UK Habitat Classification System (UKHab)¹ and the Chartered Institute of Ecological and Environmental Management (CIEEM) (2017) Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal², in accordance with BS42020:2013: Biodiversity³. The overall assessment consisted of:

- Site specific biological information gained from statutory and non-statutory consultation; and
- A site walkover, protected species scoping assessment and UKHAB habitat survey.

The site-specific consultation provided the ecological context for the site survey carried out on the 07th June 2024.

The survey boundary and existing site is shown at Figure A.1.

Greengage undertook the site walkover during sunny weather conditions. Features within the site boundary and accessible features immediately bordering it were evaluated and the extent and distribution of habitats and plant communities were recorded and supplemented with target notes on areas or species requiring further commentary. Fauna using the area were recorded and areas of habitat suitable for statutorily protected species were identified where present, with an active search carried out for evidence of such use.

3.1 DESKTOP REVIEW

A review of readily available ecological information and other relevant environmental databases (included Defra's Multi-Agency Geographic Information for the Countryside (MAGIC) website⁴) was undertaken for the site and its vicinity. In addition, local Greater Manchester Record Centre websites and a biological records search from Greater Manchester Ecology unit (GMEU) were reviewed to identify the location and citations of local non-statutory designated sites and presence of records for notable and protected species. This provided the overall ecological context for the site, to better inform the UKHAB Survey.

3.2 ON SITE SURVEYS

Flora

The extent and distribution of different habitats on site were identified and mapped according to the standard UKHAB Survey methodologies, supplemented with target notes describing the dominant botanical species and any features of interest. Any present protected plant species and invasive/non-natives were also noted. A habitat map has been produced to illustrate the results, as shown at
Figure A.1

Fauna

The PEA Survey specifically included assessments to identify the potential value for notable, rare and protected species at the site. This involved identifying potential habitats in terms of refugia, breeding sites and foraging areas in the context of species known to be present locally and regionally.

The likelihood of occurrence is ranked as follows:

- Negligible - While presence cannot be absolutely discounted, the site includes very limited or poor-quality habitat for a particular species. The site may also be outside the known national range for a species;
- Low - On-site habitat is poor to moderate quality for a given species, with few or no information about their presence from desk top study. However, presence cannot be discounted due to the national distribution of the species or the nature of on-site and surrounding habitats;
- Moderate - The on-site habitats are of moderate quality, providing most or all of the key requirements for a species. Several factors may limit the likelihood of occurrence, habitat severance, habitat disturbance and small habitat area;
- High - On-site habitat of high quality for given species. Site is within a regional or national stronghold for that particular species with good quality surroundings and good connectivity; and
- Present - Presence confirmed for the survey itself or recent, confirmed records from information gathered through desk top study.

The species surveyed for included:

Badger (*Meles meles*)

The potential for badger to inhabit or forage within the study area was assessed. Evidence of badger activity includes the identification of setts (a system of underground tunnels and nesting chambers), grubbed up grassland (caused by the animals digging for earthworms, slugs, beetles etc.), badger hairs, paths, latrines and paw prints.

Bat Species (*Chiroptera*)

The site visit was undertaken in daylight and the evaluation of bat potential comprised an assessment of natural features on site that aimed to identify characteristics suitable for bat roosts, foraging and commuting. In accordance with the 2023 Bat Conservation Trust's Good Practice Guidelines⁵ and methods given in CIEEM's Bat Mitigation Guidelines⁶ consideration was given to:

- The availability of access to roosts for bats;
- The presence and suitability of crevices and other places as roosts; and
- Signs of bat activity or presence.

Definite signs of bat activity were taken to be:

- The bats themselves;
- Droppings;
- Grease marks;
- Scratch marks; and
- Urine spatter.

Signs of possible bat presence were taken to be:

- Stains; and
- Moth and butterfly wings.

Features with potential as roost sites include mature trees with holes, crevices or splits (the most utilised trees being oak, ash, beech, willow and Scots pine), caves, bridges, tunnels and buildings with cracks or gaps serving as possible access points to voids or crevices.

Additionally, linear natural features such as tree lines, hedgerows and river corridors are often considered valuable for commuting and semi-natural habitats such as woodland, meadows and waterbodies can provide important foraging resources. Consideration was given to the presence of these features both immediately within and adjacent to the assessment area.

Great Crested Newt (*Triturus cristatus*)

An assessment was carried out to identify any potential habitats that may support great crested newt (GCN) and other native amphibians. The aquatic and terrestrial habitats required generally include small, still ponds or water bodies suitable for breeding; and woodland or grassland areas where there is optimal invertebrate prey potential.

Reptiles

The potential for reptile species on site was assessed during the walkover survey. Possible species include grass snake (*Natrix helvetica*), smooth snake (*Coronella austriaca*), adder (*Vipera berus*), common and sand lizard (*Lacerta vivipara* and *L. agilis*) and slow worm (*Anguis fragilis*). These native reptile species generally require open areas with low, mixed-height vegetation, such as heathland, rough grassland, and open scrub or, in the case of grass snake, waterbody margins. Suitable well drained and frost-free areas are needed so they can survive the winter.

Dormouse (*Muscardinus avellanarius*)

During the walkover survey the potential for dormouse to be present on site was assessed. This included observations for suitable habitat such as well-layered woodland, scrub and linking hedgerows, particularly those comprised of species offering suitable food sources such as honeysuckle and hazel, in addition to direct evidence such as characteristically gnawed hazelnuts, chewed ash keys and honeysuckle flowers, or nests.

Water Vole (*Arvicola amphibius*)

Water vole potential was assessed during the walkover survey. The potential is identified by the presence of ditches, rivers, dykes and lakes with holes and runs along the banks. Latrines, footprints or piles of food can also be noted.

Otter (*Lutra lutra*)

Where desktop review or consultation indicates the presence of otter in a river catchment, the presence of water bodies with good cover and potential holt (den) sites would be noted. Spraint, footprints or food remains can also be noted.

Birds

During the walkover survey, the potential for breeding, wintering and migratory birds was assessed. In particular, this includes areas of trees, scrub, heathland and wetlands that could support nests for common or notable species.

Invertebrates

As part of the walkover survey the quality of invertebrate habitat and the potential for notable terrestrial and aquatic invertebrate species was considered. There is a wide variety of habitats suitable for invertebrates including wetland areas, heathland, areas of bare sandy soil, ephemeral brownfield vegetation and meadows.

Biodiversity Action Plan priority species/ Species of Principal Importance

Where consultation and desk-study indicates the presence of BAP priority species (Species of Principal Importance) not protected by statute, effort was made to establish the potential for the site to support these species.

3.3 SURVEYORS

Abbie Case, Senior Consultant, has an undergraduate degree in Ecology and Conservation (BSc Hons) and a master's degree in Conservation Biology, and is an Associate member of CIEEM, with over seven years' experience in ecological survey and assessment. The survey was undertaken by Abbie Case.

Annabel Walker-Evans, Senior Consultant, has a Bachelor's degree in Animal Conservation Science BSc (Hons) and has worked within ecological consultancy for 8 years. Annabel holds a Level 2 Natural England Bat Survey Class Licence and is a Qualifying member of CIEEM.

Helen Bradshaw, Principal Consultant, has a degree in Geography (BSc Hons) and 17 year's experience as an ecologist. She spent over a decade as a Local Authority Ecologist and holds class survey licences for both bats and GCN. She has held bat mitigation licences and worked on monitoring schemes for both bats and GCN. Helen is Chair of her local badger group and has worked extensively on badger surveying and monitoring as well as delivering badger vaccination schemes for 8 years. She holds a position as a charity trustee for the Cheshire Local Records Centre.

This report was written by Abbie Case and reviewed and verified by Annabel Walker-Evans and QA2 Helen Bradshaw who confirms in writing (see the QA sheet at the front of this report) that the report is in line with the following:

- Represents sound industry practice;
- Reports and recommends correctly, truthfully and objectively;
- Is appropriate given the local site conditions and scope of works proposed; and
- Avoids invalid, biased and exaggerated statements.

3.4 CONSTRAINTS

The PEA was undertaken during an optimal time of year during ideal conditions by a suitably qualified ecologist. It was possible to access all areas of the site.

No significant constraints that stand to impact conclusions drawn in this report therefore presented themselves.

4.0 RESULTS

4.1 DESKTOP REVIEW

Designations

Consultations with the local biological record centres (GMEU) and the MAGIC dataset have confirmed that there are no statutory designations of national or international importance within the boundary of the site however, there is one statutorily designated Local Nature Reserve (LNR) within a 2km radius.

Records from GMEU also identified three non-statutory sites Site of Biological Importance (SBI) within 2km of the site boundary. SBI are recognised by LPAs as important wildlife sites.

Table 4.1 below gives the locations and descriptions of a selection of the nearest/most relevant local designations.

Table 4.1 Statutory and Non-Statutory Designated Sites within Search Radius

Site Name	Approximate Location	Description
Statutory Designations		
Chesham Woods Local Nature Reserve (LNR)	800m northeast	The site is made up of six small woodlands, three of which are semi-natural, with the remaining three plantation. Other habitats present within the site include; scrub, improved grassland, amenity grassland, neutral grassland and an orchard.
Non-Statutory		
Chesham Woods SBI	800m northeast	Same description as previous.
Townside SBI	1.3km southwest	Site is selected for the ponds and lodges (manmade waterbodies, most originating from during the industrial revolution). The ponds support amphibian populations.
Gorses Quarry SBI	1.5km northeast	Site is a disused quarry with heathland, ponds and lodges present. The waterbodies support aquatic invertebrate assemblages.

Biodiversity Action Plans

UK Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) have been developed which set priorities for nationally important habitats and species. To support the BAPs, Species/Habitat Statements (otherwise known as Species/Habitat Action Plans) were produced that provide an overview of the status of the species and set out the broad policies that can be developed to conserve them. A list of priority species of conservation importance was also developed.

The UK BAP was succeeded in 2012 by the UK-Post 2012 Biodiversity Framework which informed the creation of the Biodiversity 2020 strategy; England's contribution towards the UK's commitments under the United Nations Convention of Biological Diversity.

Despite this, the UK BAP priority species lists, and conservation objectives still remain valid through integration with local BAPs (which remain valid), and in the form of the Habitats and

Species of Principle Importance list (as required under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act).

No UK BAP habitats were present on-site or within the immediate vicinity.

Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs) ensure that national action plans (the UK BAP/Biodiversity 2020) are translated into effective action at the local level and establish targets and actions for locally characteristic species and habitats.

Greater Manchester BAP

The Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action plan (GMBAP) aims to provide an over-arching document across all ten districts in Greater Manchester; these are Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Stockport, Trafford, Tameside and Wigan. The Greater Manchester audit identified those species and habitats that are of local conservation importance and require action in order to conserve and protect them.

A total of nine habitats and nine species are listed within the GMBAP, including:

- Bats (all species);
- Black redstart *Phoenicurus ochruros*;
- Farmland birds;
- Great crested newts *Triturus cristatus*;
- Hares *Lepus europaeus*;
- Native black poplar *Populus nigra*;
- Twite *Linaria flavirostris*;
- Water vole *Arvicola amphibius*; and
- Willow tit *Poecile montanus*.

No GMBAP habitats were recorded within the site, as it was dominated by developed land; sealed surface and built linear features. One habitat 'urban managed greenspace' was located within the wider survey area, in the form of a small courtyard of the church. This habitat 'provides green breaks in development and contributes to the health and wellbeing of local people'.

Species Record

The information provided in the biological data search from GMEU identified records of a number of protected and BAP priority species within 2km search radius of the site. Among others, these include the following species of relevance to the site:

Bats: A total of 173 records were returned pertaining to ten species; brown long-eared *Plecotus auritus*, common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus*, Daubenton's bat *Myotis daubentonii*, *Myotis* sp, Natter's bat *Myotis nattereri*, Noctule *Nyctalus noctula*, Pipistrelle sp, soprano pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pygmaeus*, Whiskered bat *Myotis mystacinus* and whiskered/ Brandt's bat *Myotis mystacinus/ brandti*. Out of these records, 19 of these were bat roosts, the closest of which was a common pipistrelle roost, located 375m northeast of the site at Bury Business Centre.

Amphibians: three records of great crested newt (GCN) were returned, the closest located 1.93km northeast of the site. Three records of common toad *Bufo bufo* were returned, the closest record located 1.15km northeast.

Mammals (excluding bats): five records of badger, six records of otter and 21 records of hedgehog *Erinaceus europaeus*. The closest record 475m north and related to hedgehog.

Birds: 92 records of 15 unique bird species were returned and included: one record of barn owl *Tyto alba*, nine records of bullfinch *Pyrrhula pyrrhula*, 12 records of dunnoek *Prunella modularis*, eight records of herring gull *Larus argentatus*, one record of hobby *Falco subbuteo*, eight records of house sparrow *Passer domesticus*, four records of kingfisher *Alcedo atthis*, ten records of lapwing *Vanellus vanellus*, two records of lesser redpoll *Acanthis cabaret*, two records of linnet *Linaria cannabina*, one record of peregrine *Falco peregrinus*, four records of reed bunting *Emberiza schoeniclus*, seven records of song thrush *Turdus philomelos*, ten records of starling *Sturnus vulgaris* and 13 records of wood warbler *Phylloscopus sibilatrix*. The closest record was 85m northwest of the site and was for house sparrow.

Invertebrates: 24 records of six unique species were returned including; two records of blood vein *Timandra comae*, one record of cinnabar *Tyria jacobaeae*, one record of grey dagger *Acronicta psi*, one record of small heath *Coenonympha pamphilus*, one record of wall *Lasiommata megera* and 18 records of white letter hairstreak *Satyrrium w-album*. The closest record was located 900m west as pertained to white letter hairstreak.

Following a search on MAGIC maps, two granted European Protected Species (EPS) Licences were located within 2km. The closest of these was located 800m west of the site and was granted in 2012. The licence (reference: EPSM2012-4607) pertained to the destruction of a resting place for common pipistrelle.

4.2 DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF SITE: HABITATS

The habitats presented across the assessment site consist of the following UKHab categories, as mapped at Figure A.1:

- Developed land; sealed surface (u1b) car park (804).

The wider survey area consisted of three buildings, a courtyard garden which included modified grassland and ornamental planting, an area of dense scrub, and developed land; sealed surface in the form of roads.

Developed land; sealed surface

The entire site was recorded as developed land; sealed surface. Cracks and crevices within the surface included rare patches of dandelion *Taraxacum officinale agg.* (shown on plates B1 and B2).

Built linear features

A short, red brick mortared wall was present around the boundaries of the site (shown on plate B3). The wall was approximately 1m in height, and all mortar and bricks were in good condition, with no visible cracks or crevices, at the time of survey.

4.3 DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF SITE: SPECIES

Badger

Five records relating to badgers were located within 2km of the site, the exact location of these was confidential. The habitats on the site are not suitable for sett creation and are sub-optimal for

foraging and commuting badger as the site is dominated by hardstanding with large amounts of human disturbance. No badger setts were recorded on site or within 30m of the site where accessible, it is considered highly unlikely badger are present within the site or the immediate surrounding area and therefore are not considered further within this report.

Bats

Foraging and commuting

The site has limited foraging habitat as it comprises mainly of hardstanding, with street lighting around the perimeter of the site. The closest area of greenspace is located approximately 300m southeast of the site, in the ground of St Pauls church.

Therefore, the site is considered to be of **Low** suitability for commuting and foraging bats.

Roosting

The habitats within the site were not suitable to support roosting bats, as there are no structures or buildings present that provide potential roosting features. Outside of the site boundary, within close proximity, three buildings were recorded with aspects facing the site;

- B1 - the current Caritas building. A red brick multistorey building, with a slate tiled roof.
- B2 - the church. A red brick church building, with slate tiled roof.
- B3 - a multistorey red brick commercial building. The main roof consisted of slate roof tiles, with the smaller first story roof consisting of corrugated metal sheeting.

There were no potential roosting features for bats recorded on B1.

On B2, located west outside the site boundary, there was a small gap around the drainpipe where mortar was missing (as shown in plate B.8). In addition, a small gap underneath a slate roof tile was located on B2 and was south facing into the garden courtyard (shown in plate B.9).

B3 was present to the west outside of the site boundary within 30m which had several gaps underneath slate roof tiles, on the aspect facing the site (plates B.3 to B.6).

The site is considered to be **Low** suitability to support roosting bats.

Amphibians

Three records of GCN were returned within 2km of the site, the closest located 1.93km northeast. There was no aquatic habitat present on-site, or suitable waterbodies present within 250m of the site, and all terrestrial habitats were of negligible suitability to support GCN or other amphibians. It is considered highly unlikely GCN, or other amphibians, are present within the site, and therefore are not considered further within this report.

Birds

The desk study returned 92 records of 15 unique bird species. Habitats present on-site were all hardstanding and therefore negligible suitability to support nesting birds. Buildings adjacent to the site boundary have limited potential to support nesting bird populations, with no birds' nests recorded during the survey. Therefore, it is anticipated that the proposed works are unlikely to cause disturbance to nesting birds present on buildings adjacent to the site. Potential

enhancement measures are given in Section 5.2 with regards to attempt to increase bird numbers to the site.

Invertebrates

The desk study returned 24 records of six unique species of invertebrates. The site has negligible suitability to support invertebrate populations, due to the lack of vegetation as all habitats within the site are hardstanding therefore, invertebrates are not considered further within this report.

Other BAP Species

The potential for the presence of other protected species on site such as hedgehog, is considered to be **negligible** due to the lack of suitable habitat on site and lack of connectivity to other suitable habitats, such as waterbodies and greenspace due to busy roads and man-made structures such as roads and buildings.

5.0 EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION

5.1 BASELINE SUMMARY

The assessment site and its surroundings have potential to support the following ecological receptors of note, which could therefore be impacted upon by any future prospective development proposals, as indicated in Table 5.1 below. Comment on further recommendations for each receptor is provided; further detail and discussion can be found at paragraph 5.2 onward:

Table 5.1 Baseline Summary

Receptor	Presence/Potential Presence	Comments
Designated Sites: Statutory	Present within 2km	One LNR is present within 2km. Given the distance of the application site to the LNR (800m northeast), and the barrier to wildlife movement present i.e. surrounding urban landscape, it is highly unlikely that any direct impacts will occur due to the proposed development. Indirect impacts such as construction related pollution may be caused by the development works. Recommendations to mitigate any potential impacts are given below.
Designated Sites: Non-Statutory	Present within 2km	Three SBIs were located within 2km. Due to the habitats present on site and the lack of connectivity to the SBIs, it is highly unlikely that development works will directly impact the SBIs. Indirect impacts such as construction related pollution may be caused by the development works. Recommendations to mitigate any potential impacts are given below.
Foraging and commuting bats	Low	Due to the highly urbanised location, lack of vegetation and surrounding light pollution, the site is assessed as having Low suitability to support foraging and commuting bats. Recommendations are discussed within the next section.
Roosting bats	Low	There are no suitable roosting habitats present within the site. However, two buildings outside the site boundary in close proximity to the site have Low suitability potential roosting features in the form of gaps under slate tiles, and missing mortar. No further surveys are recommended, this is discussed in more detail below.

5.2 DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion is provided below on the key ecological receptors that stand to be impacted/benefit from proposed works; high level commentary on appropriate mitigation, compensation and enhancement actions is also provided.

An Ecological Management Plan (EMP) and Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) should be produced and implemented for the site providing greater detail on the below, which should be secured through planning condition in accordance with BS 42020: 2013 Biodiversity.

Designated sites

Statutory

The closest statutory designated site is Chesham Woods LNR, which is located 800m northeast of the site. The LNR is separated by barriers such as main roads and residential areas, and there is no hydrological links to the site. Therefore, the designated site is not considered to be at risk from direct impacts.

Although indirect impacts are unlikely, caution should be taken to reduce the potential impact caused by any noise, vibration or traffic resulting from the development. Mitigation measures should be detailed within the CEMP which will detail pollution control, and which should be secured thorough condition.

Non-Statutory

The closest statutory designated site is Chesham Woods SBI, which is located 800m northeast of the site. The SBI is separated by barriers such as main roads and residential areas, and there is no hydrological links to the site. Therefore, the designated site is not considered to be at risk from direct impacts, and no further mitigation has been recommended beyond the provision and implementation of a CEMP as described above.

Bats

Foraging and Commuting

No further survey is required for commuting and foraging bats, due to the size of the site, the presence of street lighting around the perimeter, and the lack of foraging habitat on-site. However, it is recommended that task lighting should be used where required during the construction stage to limit disturbance for any commuting and foraging bats. Details on bat sensitive lighting are given below.

Roosting

There are no suitable features within the site boundary to support roosting bats. However, during the field survey, features on buildings adjacent to the site boundary were recorded which have Low suitability to support roosting bats.

Potential roosting features were noted on B2 on the northern aspect in the form of missing mortar/ gaps around a drainpipe, and on the southern aspect in the form of a gap under a roof tile. B2 is not proposed to be demolished or worked on as part of the proposed development. Several gaps and missing slate roof tiles were recorded on B3, which may be utilised by roosting

bats. B3 is not proposed to be demolished to facilitate the proposed works. There was no external evidence of roosting bats recorded during the field survey on either of the buildings.

Further survey of B2 and B3 is not recommended. The one story proposed building will not inhibit any existing flight lines/ access or egress points. The habitats onsite and within the wider survey area are of low suitability to support commuting and foraging bats, being predominantly urban with limited greenspace / corridors and high levels of human disturbance. Landscaping within the designs of the proposed development will increase the opportunities for foraging and commuting bats within the site by providing grassland habitats and planting new trees.

It is recommended that any new lighting design is modelled (to create a lighting contour plan) to estimate spill levels. This should then be reviewed and approved by a Suitably Qualified Ecologist (SQE). Details on sensitive lighting are given below. The CEMP will provide mitigation measures to ensure that there are no indirect effects during construction of the development on the features outlined on B3. It is also recommended that if construction has not commenced within 12 months, a further Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) is undertaken in order to ensure there has been no decline in condition of the buildings.

It is recommended that bat boxes be provided within the proposed development. Bat boxes should be positioned in sunny locations, most suitably on the southern and western façades of the building. Bat boxes should be placed away from doors, windows and street lighting, ideally at 3-5m from ground level, with the entrance free from obstruction. The behaviour of bats varies between species however, generally they will use a number of different roosts of varying climate conditions. Therefore, it is advisable to integrate several boxes with varying locations and aspects across the site.

Bat Sensitive Lighting

Bats are a highly photosensitive species. Alterations to lighting levels on site as a result of the development proposals may stand to negatively impact their established flight paths and foraging grounds on site. Whilst foraging and commuting resources for bats are not formally protected by law, their protection is a material consideration within the planning process. Suitable best practice and mitigation recommendations are detailed below.

Therefore, the below bullet points provide high level recommendations for the design of wildlife friendly lighting on site. These are based guidance provided by the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) and BCT⁷:

- Do not increase lighting levels above the current level on site and reduce where possible;
- Use of low-UV warm-white LED bulbs (< 2,700k) with directional, downward facing and shielded lights which point away from green features such as trees, hedgerows and areas of soft landscaping;
- External lights should be subject to curfew controls where possible with lights on movement sensors to reduce light pollution when not needed;
- Green infrastructure should remain unlit, particularly between April and October, inclusive; and
- Use of buffer planting to block light spillage into valuable areas e.g. grasslands and hedgerows.

Biodiversity Enhancements

The site qualifies for statutory BNG exemption as it is entirely hardstanding. This means a Biodiversity Impact Assessment and the 10% net gain requirement do not apply. However, national and local planning policy still encourages proportionate biodiversity enhancements on redevelopment sites where opportunities exist (Appendix C). Any measures included here would therefore be voluntary good practice rather than required to meet a quantified BNG target.

Potential enhancements suitable for an urban hardstanding site include:

- Enhanced wildflower-friendly landscaping, including the use of native wildflower seed mix. Species could include those listed on the RHS Plants for Pollinators guide;
- Incorporation of bird and bat boxes on the building exterior;
- Installation of invertebrate features within the planters, such as insect hotels and bee posts.

6.0 SUMMARY & CONCLUSION

Greengage was commissioned by Caritas Diocese of Salford to undertake a PEA a site known as Red Door Day Centre in Bury, Greater Manchester in order to establish the ecological value of this site and its potential to support notable and/or legally protected species.

The PEA identified value for a number of notable and protected species and designated sites:

- One statutory designated site (Chesham Woods LNR) within 2km of the site;
- Three non-statutory designated sites within 2km of the site, the nearest being 800m northeast;
- Low suitability for commuting and foraging bats;
- Low suitability for roosting bats.

The potential for the site to support other protected and / or notable species including badger, amphibians, hedgehog, breeding birds is negligible due to unsuitable habitat on-site and within the wider landscape.

No further survey on B2 or B3 is recommended. It is recommended that any new lighting design is modelled (to create a lighting contour plan) to estimate spill levels. This should then be reviewed and approved by an SQE. It is also recommended that if construction has not commenced within 12 months, a further Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) is undertaken in order to ensure there has been no decline in condition of the buildings. The CEMP will provide mitigation measures to ensure that there are no indirect effects during construction of the development on the features outlined on B3.

Key mitigation, compensation and enhancement actions are outlined to support compliance with relevant legislation and policy (see Appendix C). Although the site is exempt from statutory BNG requirements due to its hardstanding baseline, proportionate biodiversity enhancements are still encouraged. Opportunities include:

- Enhanced wildlife-friendly landscaping;
- Potential incorporation of bird and bat boxes; and
- Installation of invertebrate features.

Key actions should be included within EMP and CEMP documents for the site which could be secured through planning condition.

As the site is entirely hardstanding, it qualifies for statutory BNG exemption and is not required to achieve a quantified 10% net gain in biodiversity or submit a BNGA. However, proposals are still encouraged to incorporate proportionate biodiversity enhancements in line with wider national and local policy objectives.

It is generally recognised that ecological survey data is valid for up to 12 months, depending on the site and species present. Therefore, surveys may need to be updated if this time elapses before planning permission submission or if conditions on site change.

APPENDIX A SITE PLAN AND HABITAT MAP

Figure A.1 Site plan and habitat map

552817 RED DOOR, BURY

Key:

 Site Boundary

HABITATS

 Developed land; sealed surface

 u1e - Built Linear Features

Title: Figure A.1 Site Location Plan and Habitats

Drawn by: EH

Date: 05/12/2025

Reviewed by: AC

Date: 05/12/2025

Project number: 552817

Sources: ESRI World Topo, Google Satellite



APPENDIX B SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Plate B.1 The site, viewed from the northern aspect



Plate B.2 The site, as viewed from the southern aspect



Plate B.3 Mortared wall present around the boundaries of the site



Plate B.4 Building B3 present adjacent to the site boundary, to the east



Plate B.5 Gaps underneath slate roof tiles on B3, facing the site boundary



Plate B.6 Gaps underneath slate roof tiles on B3, facing the site boundary



Plate B.7 The current Caritas building B1 (left) and the church B2 (right)



Plate B.8 Missing mortar on B2, located on the northern aspect facing Badger Street



Plate B.9 Lifted slate roof tile on B2 located on the southern aspect, facing the garden courtyard



APPENDIX C RELEVANT LEGISLATION AND POLICY

C.1 LEGISLATION

Current key legislation relating to ecology includes The Environment Act⁸ Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)⁹; The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2019 ('Habitats & Species Regulations')¹⁰, The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW Act)¹¹, and The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, 2006¹².

The Environment Act, 2021

The Environment Act, 2021 will mandate the requirement for new development in England to deliver a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG), as measured by the agreed metric (the current relevant version being the Natural England metric 4.0), secured through planning condition as standard (as per schedule 14 of the Act). Approach to the delivery of BNG must follow the mitigation hierarchy, with avoidance of impact and on-site compensation/gains prioritised, ahead of the use of offsite biodiversity unit offsets, or the purchase of biodiversity credits.

The Act introduces the condition that no development may begin unless a biodiversity net gain plan has been submitted and approved by the local planning authority (LPA).

The Act also amends requirements of the NERC Act, 2006, adding the need to not just conserve, but enhance biodiversity through planning projects. Furthermore, it introduces the need for the LPA to have regard to relevant local nature recovery strategies and relevant species/protected site conservation strategies, when making their decision.

Under the Act, the enhancements must be maintained for at least 30 years.

The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019

The Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations replace The Conservation (Natural Habitats, etc.) Regulations 1994 (as amended)¹³, and transpose Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and Wild Fauna and Flora ('EU Habitats Directive')¹⁴, and Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the Conservation of Wild Birds ('Birds Directive')¹⁵ into UK law (in conjunction with the Wildlife and Countryside Act).

Regulation 43 and 47 respectively of the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations makes it an offence (subject to exceptions) to deliberately capture, kill, disturb, or trade in the animals listed in Schedule 2 (European protected species of animals), or pick, collect, cut, uproot, destroy, or trade in the plants listed in Schedule 5 (European protected species of plant). Development that would contravene the protection afforded to European protected species requires a derogation (in the form of a licence) from the provisions of the Habitats Directive.

Regulation 63 (1) states: 'A competent authority, before deciding to undertake, or give any consent, permission or other authorisation for, a plan or project which —

(a) is likely to have a significant effect on a European site or a European offshore marine site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects); and

(b) is not directly connected with or necessary to the management of that site;

must make an appropriate assessment of the implications for that site in view of that site's conservation objectives.'

Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) is the principal mechanism for the legislative protection of wildlife in Great Britain. This legislation is the means by which the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats¹⁶ (the 'Bern Convention') and the Birds Directive and EU Habitats Directive are implemented in Great Britain.

The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000

The Wildlife and Countryside Act has been updated by the CROW Act. The CROW Act amends the law relating to nature conservation and protection of wildlife. In relation to threatened species it strengthens the legal protection and adds the word 'reckless' to the offences of damaging, disturbing, or obstructing access to any structure or place a protected species uses for shelter or protection, and disturbing any protected species whilst it is occupying a structure or place it uses for shelter or protection.

The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006

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. Biodiversity Action Plans provide a framework for prioritising conservation actions for biodiversity.

Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act requires the Secretary of State to publish a list of species of flora and fauna and habitats considered to be of principal importance for the purpose of conserving biodiversity. The list, a result of the most comprehensive analysis ever undertaken in the UK, currently contains 1,149 species, including for example, hedgehog (*Erinaceus europaeus*), and 65 habitats that were listed as priorities for conservation action under the now defunct UK Biodiversity Action Plan¹⁷ (UK BAP). Despite the devolution of the UK BAP and succession of the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework¹⁸ (and Biodiversity 2020 strategy¹⁹ in England), as a response to the Convention on Biological Diversity's (CBD's) Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020²⁰ and EU Biodiversity Strategy (EUBS)²¹, this list (now referred to as the list of Species and Habitats of Principal Importance in England) will be used to guide decision-makers such as public bodies, including local and regional authorities, in implementing their duty under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 'to have regard' to the conservation of biodiversity in England, when carrying out their normal functions.

Biodiversity Action Plans

Non-statutory Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) have been prepared on a local and regional scale throughout the UK over the past 15 years. Such plans provide a mechanism for implementing the government's broad strategy for conserving and enhancing the most endangered ('priority') habitats and species in the UK for the next 20 years. As described above the UK BAP was succeeded in England by Biodiversity 2020 although the list of priority habitats and species remains valid as the list of Species of Principal Importance for Nature Conservation.

Regional and local BAPs are still valid however and continue to be updated and produced.

Detail on the relevant BAPs for this site are provided in the main text of this report.

Legislation Relating to Nesting Birds

Nesting birds, with certain exceptions, are protected from intentional killing, destruction of nests and destruction/taking of eggs under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the CROW Act. Any clearance of dense vegetation should therefore be undertaken outside of the nesting bird season, taken to run conservatively from March to August (inclusive), unless an ecologist confirms the absence of active nests prior to clearance.

Legislation Relating to Bats

All UK bats and their roosts are protected by law. Since the first legislation was introduced in 1981, which gave strong legal protection to all bat species and their roosts in England, Scotland and Wales, additional legislation and amendments have been implemented throughout the UK.

Six of the 18 British species of bat have Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) assigned to them, which highlights the importance of specific habitats to species, details of the threats they face and proposes measures to aid in the reduction of population declines.

Although habitats that are important for bats are not legally protected, care should be taken when dealing with the modification or development of an area if aspects of it are deemed important to bats such as flight corridors and foraging areas.

The Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (WCA) was the first legislation to provide protection for all bats and their roosts in England, Scotland and Wales (earlier legislation gave protection to horseshoe bats only.)

All eighteen British bat species are listed in Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 and under Annex IV of the Habitats Directive, 1992 as a European protected species. They are therefore fully protected under Section 9 of the 1981 Act and under Regulation 43 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2019, which transposes the Habitats Directive into UK law. Consequently, it is an offence to:

- Deliberately capture, injure or kill a bat;
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat in its roost or deliberately disturb a group of bats;
- Damage or destroy a bat roosting place (even if bats are not occupying the roost at the time);
- Possess or advertise/sell/exchange a bat (dead or alive) or any part of a bat; and
- Intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a bat roost.

Legislation Relating to Reptiles

All species of reptile native to the UK are protected to some degree under national and/or international legislation, which provides mechanisms to protect the species, their habitats and sites occupied by the species.

Sand lizards and smooth snakes are European protected species and are afforded full protection under Section 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and Regulation 43 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2019. However, these species are rare and highly localised. Their occurrence is not considered as relevant in this instance, as the ranges and specialist habitats of these species do not occur at this site.

The remaining widespread species of native reptiles (adder, grass snake, slow worm and viviparous lizard) are protected under part of Section 9(1) and all of Section 9(5) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. They are protected against intentional killing and injury and against sale, transporting for sale etc. The habitat of these species is not protected. However, in terms of development, disturbing or destroying reptile habitat during the course of development activities while reptiles are present is likely to lead to an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. It is therefore important to identify the presence of these species within a potential development site. If any of these species are confirmed, all reasonable measures must then be taken to ensure the species are removed to avoid the threat of injury or death associated with development activities.

Each species of native reptile has specific habitat requirements but general shared features include a structurally diverse habitat that provides for shelter, basking, foraging and hibernating.

All reptiles are BAP species and as such are also of material consideration in the planning process due to the NPPF.

Legislation Relating to Dormice

Dormice are given full protection under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended. Protection to the species is also afforded by Regulation 43 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2019, making the hazel dormouse a European Protected Species. These two pieces of legislation operate in parallel, although there are some small differences in scope and wording. Under the provisions of Section 9 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act, it is an offence to:

- Intentionally kill, injure or take a dormouse;
- Possess or control and live or dead specimen or anything derived from a dormouse (unless it can be shown to have been legally acquired);
- Intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy or obstruct access to any structure or place used for shelter or protection by a dormouse; and
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb a dormouse while it is occupying a structure or place which it uses for that purpose.

Regulation 43 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2019 makes it an offence to:

- Deliberately capture or kill a dormouse;
- Deliberately disturb a dormouse;
- Damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of a dormouse; and
- Keep transport, sell or exchange, or offer for sale or exchange a live or dead dormouse or any part of a dormouse.

Legislation Relating to Great Crested Newts

Great crested newts are given full protection under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, as amended. Protection to the species is also afforded by Regulation 43 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2019, making the great crested newt a European Protected Species. These two pieces of legislation operate in parallel, although there are some small

differences in scope and wording. Under the provisions of Section 9 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act, it is an offence to:

- Intentionally kill, injure or take a great crested newt;
- Possess or control and live or dead specimen or anything derived from a great crested newt (unless it can be shown to have been legally acquired);
- Intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy or obstruct access to any structure or place used for shelter or protection by a great crested newt; and
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb a great crested newt while it is occupying a structure or place which it uses for that purpose.

Regulation 43 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2019 makes it an offence to:

- Deliberately capture or kill a great crested newt;
- Deliberately disturb a great crested newt;
- Damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of a great crested newt; and
- Keep transport, sell or exchange, or offer for sale or exchange a live or dead great crested newt or any part of a great crested newt.

Legislation Relating to Natura 2000 Sites and Habitats Directive Annex I/II Species

European Commission Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and Wild Fauna and Flora ('EU Habitats Directive'), and Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the Conservation of Wild Birds ('Birds Directive') form the cornerstones of nature conservation legislation across EU member states. Priority species requiring protection across Europe are listed in the Annexes of these Directives. Regulation 63(1) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2019 and Offshore Marine Conservation Regulations, 2007 (as amended) transpose these directives into UK law and set the basis for the designations of protected sites (known as Natura 2000 sites; Special Areas of Conservation under the Habitat Directive and Special Areas of Protection under the Birds Directive) that are of importance for habitats, species or assemblages listed on the directive Annexes. In the UK Ramsar sites are also offered the same level of protection as SPAs and SACs however the qualifying species for the designation may differ; Ramsar sites being designated specifically as important wetland habitats.

Under article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive, where projects stand to have likely significant effect (in accordance with the European Court of Justice ruling of C-127/02 Waddenzee cockle fishing) upon the integrity of conservation objectives (i.e. conservation status of the qualifying species or habitats) within the designated sites then the Competent Authority must undertake an Appropriate Assessment.

C.2 PLANNING POLICY

National

National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024²² sets out the Government's planning policies for England, including how plans and decisions are expected to apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Chapter 15 of the NPPF focuses on conservation and enhancement of the natural environment, stating plans should 'identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity'.

It goes on to state: 'if significant harm to biodiversity 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'. Alongside this, it acknowledges that planning should be refused where irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland are lost.

Regional

Places for Everyone (Greater Manchester Combined Authority)

Policy JP-S1 Sustainable development

1. To help tackle climate change, development should aim to maximise its economic, social and environmental benefits simultaneously, minimise its adverse impacts, utilise sustainable construction techniques and actively seek opportunities to secure net gains across each of the different objectives.

Policy JP-G6 Urban Green Space

1. To ensure there is an appropriate scale, type, quality and distribution of accessible urban green space that can support a high quality of life and other important green infrastructure functions:
 - a. existing urban green space will be protected and enhanced in balance with other considerations; and
 - b. we will work with developers and other stakeholders to deliver new high quality urban green spaces
2. Development should be designed to support the positive use of nearby green spaces, such as by offering a high-quality setting, providing natural surveillance, and facilitating easy access by walking and cycling.

Policy JP-G8 A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity

1. Achieving a major net enhancement of biodiversity value and improving access to nature are key priorities for this Plan and central components of the wider approach to green infrastructure and the natural environment.

2. If our overall aims of a major net enhancement of biodiversity value and improved access to nature are to be achieved then all new development will have to play its part, each delivering a net gain in biodiversity. This could involve the protection and improvement of existing habitats, the creation of new ones, and/or the strengthening of connections between them. The Defra metric (DEFRA 3.0 or later) will be applied to new development proposals to calculate and demonstrate a measurable net gain in biodiversity of no less than 10%.
3. Through local planning and associated activities a net enhancement of biodiversity resources will be sought, including, where relevant, by:
 - a. Increasing the quality, quantity, extent and diversity of habitats, particularly priority habitats identified in national or local biodiversity action plans and those that support priority species;
 - b. Protecting sites designated for their nature conservation and/or geological importance, with the highest level of protection given to international and then national designations;
 - c. Facilitating greater access to nature, particularly within urban areas;
4. Development will be expected to:
 - a. Follow the mitigation hierarchy of:
 - i. Avoiding significant harm to biodiversity, particularly where it is irreplaceable, through consideration of alternative sites with less harmful impacts, then
 - ii. Adequately mitigating any harm to biodiversity, then
 - iii. Adequately compensating for any remaining harm to biodiversity.
 - b. Achieve a measurable net gain in biodiversity of no less than 10%.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Butcher, B., Carey, P., Edmonds, R., Norton, L. and Treweek, J. (2020) *The UK Habitat Classification User Manual Version*
- ² CIEEM (2017); *Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal*, 2nd Edition. Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.
- ³ BSI (2013); *British Standard 42020:2013: Biodiversity — Code of practice for planning and development*, BSI Standards Publication
- ⁴ MAGIC (2019); *Interactive Map*. (Partnership project involving six government organisations: Defra (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs); English Heritage; Natural England; Environment Agency; Forestry Commission; Department for Communities and Local Government). Available at: www.magic.gov.uk.
- ⁵ Collins, J. (ed.) (2023) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (4th edn)*. The Bat Conservation Trust, London
- ⁶ English Nature, (2004); *Bat Mitigation Guidelines*. English Nature.
- ⁷ Institution of Lighting Professionals and Bat Conservation Trust (2023), *Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK; Bats and the Built Environment Series*.
- ⁸ GOV.UK. (2021). *Environment Act 2021*. Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2021/30/contents/enacted>
- ⁹ HM Government, (1981); *Part I and Part II of Wildlife and Countryside Act (as amended)*. HMSO
- ¹⁰ HM Government, (2019); *The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019*. Statutory Instrument 2019 no. 579
- ¹¹ HM Government, (2000); *The Countryside and Rights of Way Act*. HMSO
- ¹² HM Government, (2006); *Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006*. HMSO
- ¹³ HM Government, (1994); *The Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations*. HMSO
- ¹⁴ CEC (Council of the European Communities), (1992); *Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora*
- ¹⁵ The European Parliament And Of The Council, (30 November 2009); *Directive 2009/147/EC On The Conservation Of Wild Birds (Codified Version)*
- ¹⁶ CEC (Council of the European Communities), (1979); *Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern, 19.IX.1979)*. EC
- ¹⁷ UK Biodiversity Action Plan (2007). *UKBAP Priority Species and Habitats*. <https://jncc.gov.uk/our-work/uk-bap-priority-species/>
- ¹⁸ JNCC and Defra (on behalf of the Four Countries' Biodiversity Group) (2012). *UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework*. July 2012. Available from: <http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-6189>
- ¹⁹ Defra (2011). *Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services*
- ²⁰ Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (2010). *Decision X/2 Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including Aichi Biodiversity Targets*. Available at <https://www.cbd.int/decision/cop/?id=12268>
- ²¹ European Commission (2012). *Our life insurance, our natural capital: an EU biodiversity strategy to 2020* European Parliament resolution of 20 April 2012 on our life insurance, our natural capital: an EU biodiversity strategy to 2020 (2011/2307(INI))
- ²² GOV.UK. (2024). *National Planning Policy Framework*. [online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>