

Sarah Brett

From: Emma Broad
Sent: 15 October 2020 10:24
To: Sarah Brett
Subject: RE: P/2020/0560 - Church House, Church Lane, Bowling Bank

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Sarah,

Hope you're well. They are thoroughly terrible reports!!!

The bat survey isn't great, the information is highly edited, there's no information on where the bats were moving to or from, and it looks like they've use insufficient surveyors to cover all of both buildings. Looking at the photos the conclusions are probably right but I would have like more information on where that lesser horseshoe came from etc. as it would not be feeding around that building complex but could have a day roost or feeding perch.

There is no record search contained in the ecological appraisal. Had this have been carried out the author would have picked up on a large number of great crested newt records within 500m of the site. The report identifies a pond within 180m but simply classes it at unsuitable without showing evidence of HSI surveys or historical survey work. The applicant needs to provide amended ecology reports that meet the standards set out in the British Standard. The amended report should include mitigation or avoidance measures for great crested newt.

Emma

From: Sarah Brett
Sent: 14 October 2020 11:22
To: Emma Broad
Subject: P/2020/0560 - Church House, Church Lane, Bowling Bank

Hi Emma,

Please can you take a look at the ecology and bat reports for the above application. It involves the demolition of a former outbuilding (pic below).

Let me know if you have any concerns/comments.

Many thanks

Sarah

