

SITE NAME:

**Carwash at No. 52 Main Road  
Pinhoe  
Exeter  
Devon  
EX4 9EY**

TITLE:

**Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report  
—  
Desk Study and Protected Species Building Assessment**

FOR:

**Mr L. Sinanaj**

**March 2022**



**Colmer Ecology Ltd  
Unit 8  
Fortescue Court Business Park  
Brampford Speke  
Exeter  
Devon  
EX5 5JN**

**T: 01392 758 325  
E: [mail@colmer-ecology.co.uk](mailto:mail@colmer-ecology.co.uk)  
W: [www.colmer-ecology.co.uk](http://www.colmer-ecology.co.uk)**

**CONTENTS****Page**

<b>Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2 Methodology</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3 Results</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4 Evaluation and Recommendations</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5 Assessment and Ecological Mitigation</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>6 Conclusion</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>14</b>

**Figures**

Figure 1: Annotated photographs – external

Figure 2: Annotated photographs – internal

**Appendices**

Appendix 1: Devon County Council wildlife checklist

<i>Reference: Pinhoe Carwash, Exeter – Stage 1 Report</i>			
<i>Site Surveyed by:</i>	Dr J. Rabineau BSc (Hons) PhD ACIEEM	<i>Position:</i>	Senior Ecologist
	Mr H. Colmer BSc (Hons) Dip MCIEEM FLS	<i>Position:</i>	Director/Associate Ecologist
<i>Report Prepared by:</i>	Mr J. Hawksley BSc (Hons) MSc	<i>Position:</i>	Assistant Ecologist
<i>Report Reviewed by:</i>	Dr J. Rabineau BSc (Hons) PhD ACIEEM	<i>Position:</i>	Senior Ecologist
<i>Date</i>	08/03/2022	<i>Report Issue No:</i>	1 – DRAFT
<i>Date</i>	05/04/2022	<i>Report Issue No:</i>	2 – Final
<i>File Reference: 2022-22_R_Pinhoe Carwash, Exeter – Stage 1 Report</i>			

© The content and layout of this report are subject to copyright owned by Colmer Ecology Ltd. This report may not be copied or used without our prior written agreement for any purpose other than the purpose indicated in this report. This report was prepared by Colmer Ecology Ltd at the instruction of, and for use by, our client named on the front of the report. This report is not to be used by any third part without the written agreement of Colmer Ecology Ltd. We disclaim any responsibility to the client and others in respect of any matters outside the scope of the above. We accept no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to whom this report, or any part thereof, is made known. Any such party relies on the report at their own risk.

## Summary

A preliminary ecological appraisal comprising a biological desk study and a protected species building assessment was undertaken of an existing carwash, carport, shed and associated shops/restaurant in Pinhoe, Exeter, Devon. The proposals were for the partial demolition of the Site, with redevelopment into a retail unit with flats above, a garage, as well as two detached dwellings.

Located in an urban environment in Pinhoe, Exeter, the carwash consisted of a carwash with semi-detached carport and shed, shops and a restaurant with a flat above. The Site was bordered by adjacent properties with ornamental gardens to the north, east and south, with Main Road marking the western boundary. The wider landscape comprised the urban environment of Pinhoe to the north-east of Exeter, with pastoral/arable fields, agricultural complexes and woodlands, connected by mature hedgerows, tree lines and lanes further to north and east.

A thorough internal and external assessment was undertaken, and although no direct evidence of roosting bats was identified, some areas of shop loft could not be inspected, with potential bat roosting features and/or access point noted externally, providing 'Low' bat roost potential. As the presence or likely absence of bats could not be confirmed, a single **further Stage 2 bat roost presence/likely absence survey was recommended**. This Stage 2 survey must be carried out within the optimal survey window of May to August.

During the protected species building assessment, no evidence of breeding birds was recorded.

Based on current Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management guidance, no assessment of ecological impacts was possible at this stage due to the recommendation for further surveys and therefore, no additional ecological enhancements/mitigation were proposed.

This report aims to provide general advice on ecological constraints associated with any development of the site and includes recommendations for further survey. It is not intended that this report should be submitted with a planning application for development of the site, unless supported by the results of further surveys and a detailed assessment of the effects of the proposed development.

This report is valid for a period of 12 months from the date of the survey.

## **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 Colmer Ecology was commissioned by Mr Sinanaj to undertake a preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA) of an existing carwash and associated shops in Pinhoe, Exeter, hereinafter referred to as the Site. The PEA comprised a biological desk study and a protected species building assessment (PSBA).
- 1.2 It is understood that proposals for the Site include the partial demolition of the Site, with redevelopment into a retail unit with flats above, a garage, as well as two detached dwellings.

### **Site Description**

- 1.3 The Site was located in an urban environment in Pinhoe, Exeter at National Grid Reference (NGR) SX 96467 94514 and consisted of a carwash with semi-detached carport and shed, shops and a restaurant with a flat above. The Site was bordered by adjacent properties with ornamental gardens to the north, east and south, with Main Road marking the western boundary. The wider landscape comprised the urban environment of Pinhoe to the north-east of Exeter, with pastoral/arable fields, agricultural complexes and woodlands, connected by mature hedgerows, tree lines and lanes further to north and east.

### **Scope of Surveys**

- 1.4 The objectives were to:
- Carry out a biological desk study within 1 km of the Site;
  - Carry out an internal and external protected species building assessment, specifically for bats and birds; and
  - Establish the need for further surveys.

### **Legislation and Planning Context**

- 1.5 Although it was not the purpose of this report to present legislation and planning context in relation to the proposal, their applicability was explained where appropriate.
- 1.6 The following wildlife legislation and policy were considered:
- The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (as amended) 2017 amended by The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU exit) Regulations 2019;
  - The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (WCA) (as amended);
  - The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CRoW);
  - The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC);
  - National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF);

- Environment Act 2021; and
- The Devon Biodiversity Action Plan.

- 1.7 This report was written as a stand-alone report, with no previous report provided and following the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) guidelines for ecological report writing (2017a). Relevant documents include architectural drawing number 20.94 006 provided by PMR Architecture.

#### **Caveat**

- 1.8 Descriptions of Site conditions and photographs are based on the PEA survey undertaken in February 2022. It should be noted that bats and birds are highly mobile and can be found in buildings/structures at any time of year. Although Colmer Ecology is confident in the survey results provided, we cannot ensure that bats and/or birds will/will not be present in the building/structure at any other time. In addition, assessments of ecological impacts were based on the supplied proposed layout plan supplied by PMR Architecture

#### **Nomenclature**

- 1.9 For ease, common names were used throughout this report, with an initial reference to their Latin name. However, where no common name existed or it was not possible to identify to species level, genus/family names were used.

## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 Biological Desk Study

2.1.1 Following guidance produced by the CIEEM (2017b), records of statutory and non-statutory designated sites, 'Priority Habitat Inventory' areas, ancient woodland and granted European protected species licence (EPSL) applications were reviewed from the government-based website MAGiCMap within a 1 km desk study area based on the central grid reference SX 96467 94514. Colmer Ecology's own biological records, protected species licences and knowledge of local ecological designations were also reviewed. At this stage, a full biological data request to the Devon Biodiversity Record Centre (DBRC) was not considered beneficial based on the size of the development.

### 2.2 Protected Species Building Assessment – Bats

2.2.1 An external and internal daylight PSBA of the Site was carried out on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2022 by Dr J. Rabineau BSc (Hons) PhD ACIEEM<sup>1</sup> (bat class 2 survey licence and registered bat mitigation class [low impact] licence consultant Annex B and D) and Mr H. Colmer BSc (Hons) Dip MCIEEM<sup>2</sup> FLS<sup>3</sup> (accredited agent under bat class survey licence). Inspections were made of the outer aspects of the Site looking for signs of potential bat roosting opportunities, such as raised ridge tiles, hanging or roof slates/tiles, raised timber frames/bargeboards/cladding, lintels, loose masonry and any internal access points. Where possible, ledges and windowpanes were also searched for any signs of bat droppings. Internally, the survey concentrated on looking for potential bat entry points, a search for bat droppings, staining and individual bats themselves. In addition, other signs searched for included discarded insect remains, which are a feature indicative of night roosts and/or feeding perch. Finally, a distinctive smell is sometimes present in large, confined roosts and chattering emitted by bats may also be heard. Inspections were aided by the use of both small and large handheld Cree LED torches, ladders, adjustable mirrors, a Ridgid CA-330 endoscope, close focusing binoculars and a Hikvision handheld thermal imaging camera. Survey methodology followed that suggested within Bat Conservation Trust (BCT), Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists – Good Practice Guidelines 3rd Edition (Collins, 2016).

2.2.2 The potential of the Site to support roosting bats was based on the presence, number and suitability of potential roost features (PRF). Structures of 'Low' potential were considered to be, *'a structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by individual bats opportunistically...unlikely to be suitable for maternity or hibernation'* (Collins, 2016). Structures of 'Moderate' potential were defined as, *'a structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats...but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation*

<sup>1</sup> Associate Member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (ACIEEM)

<sup>2</sup> Full Member of the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (MCIEEM).

<sup>3</sup> Fellow of the Linnean Society of London (FLS).

*status'* (Collins, 2016). Finally, structures of 'High' potential were defined as, '*structures with one or more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for usage by large numbers of bats...*' (Collins, 2016). Where bats or evidence of bats were found, for example bat droppings or a roosting bat, the Site was considered to be a confirmed roost. Where no suitable features were noted for roosting bats, the Site was considered to offer '*No/Negligible*' potential (Collins, 2016).

## **2.3 Protected Species Building Assessment – Birds**

- 2.3.1 In combination with the survey for bats, the Site was assessed for its suitability to support roosting and breeding birds. This involved specifically looking for evidence of house sparrow *Passer domesticus*, starling *Sturnus vulgaris*, swift *Apus apus* and hirundine species.

## **2.4 Survey Constraints and Best Practice**

### *Protected Species Building Assessment*

- 2.4.1 The PSBA was undertaken at a suitable time of year and under good weather conditions with methodology proposed following industry standards and recommended guidelines. No access was possible into a section of the shop's monopitched roof. In addition, the external north-eastern elevation could not be assessed due to the presence of neighbouring properties. These constraints were taken into consideration during the evaluation.

### **3 Results**

#### **3.1 Biological Desk Study**

##### *Statutory Designated Sites*

- 3.1.1 According to data held on MAGiCMap, the Site was not within any designated sites, although within the impact risk zones of several Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) including Stoke Woods SSSI, Brampford Speke SSSI, and Bonhay Road Cuttings SSSI, as well as approximately 5.4 km north-east of Exe Estuary Ramsar, Special Protection Area (SPA) and SSSI (at its closest), and approximately 9.4 km north-west of East Devon Heaths SPA and East Devon Pebblebed Heaths Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and SSSI (at its closest). The Site was also approximately 4.1 km east of Belvidere Meadow Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and approximately 6.5 km north-east of Barley Valley LNR.

##### *Other Designated Sites/Information*

- 3.1.2 Based on MAGiCMap, two habitats on the Priority Habitat Inventory were noted within the desk study area, including coastal and floodplain grazing marsh and deciduous woodland.
- 3.1.3 The Site was within the consultation zones for great crested newt *Triturus cristatus*. The Site was not within the consultation zone for cirl bunting *Emberiza cirlus* or within the South Hams landscape connectivity or sustenance zones for greater horseshoe *Rhinolophus ferrumequinum*.

##### *Ancient Woodland*

- 3.1.4 No ancient woodlands were noted within the desk study area or Site boundary.

##### *European Protected Species Licence Applications*

- 3.1.5 When reviewing the most recent (2019) Natural England licence update on MAGiCMap, several EPSL applications were noted within the desk study area including one for the destruction of a resting place for common pipistrelle, approximately 725 m south-west of the Site (granted in 2009 and valid until 2011). In addition, a total of ten dormouse *Muscardinus avellanarius* licences were noted within the desk study area, the closest of which was noted approximately 372 m north-east of the Site for the damage and destruction of a resting place (granted in 2021 and valid until 2027).

#### **3.2 Protected Species Building Assessment – Bats**

- 3.2.1 The Site consisted of a carwash with semi-detached carport and shed, shops (comprising the carwash office and barber), and a restaurant with a flat above. Each section was surveyed individually and described below.



- 3.2.2 Shed: The shed was a small building with very tight shiplap cladding that afforded no roosting cavities/access points for bats. Access was possible at the top of the wall at the north-eastern elevation, with an approximately 10 cm high cavity that was likely too wide for roosting bats. Windows were of PVCu construction and the roof of corrugated metal. No evidence of bats was noted inside the shed.
- 3.2.3 Carport: The carport was semi-detached to the shops and of tight exposed brick construction, with a blocked-up hole noted adjacent to a window at the rear. A fascia board was present only at the north-western, south-western and south-eastern elevations and generally tight, although raised along the south-eastern elevation, but filled with cobwebs and detritus. Windows were of aluminium finish and tightly fitted, affording no access points/roosting cavities for bats. Large, tight metal shutter doors were situated at the north-eastern elevation, affording no feature suitable for roosting bats. The roof was flat with tight bitumen felt lining. Internally, the carport was of exposed brick with an exposed partial metal and wooden truss. No evidence of bats was noted at the carport.
- 3.2.4 Shops and restaurant – external: The shops and restaurant were situated to the west of the carport. A porch was situated at the main shop entrance (north-eastern elevation) and lined with poorly fitted breathable membrane, although no cavities were noted between membrane and cladding. Access was noted at the verges of the porch, which were slightly raised. Above the porch, cladding was capped with a batten but open at the apex, affording access to the cavity behind. Cladding below the porch was slightly raised, affording access for roosting bats, although no evidence of use by bats was noted, likely due to high levels of lighting and human activity.
- 3.2.5 A monopitched length of roof lined the western elevation of the shops/restaurant, with access noted at the top of the wall plate and with breathable membrane visible behind. At the southern end of the monopitched roof, the top of the wall plate was partially lined with a willow screen (associated with the porch of the restaurant) although access was still possible at the top of the wall plate. Access was also noted at the verges of the monopitched roof section, which was overall constructed of very tight modern slate, with a single tightly fitted Velux window noted. The ridge/join was capped with tightly fitted overhanging bitumen felt. The remainder of the roof was flat with tight bitumen felt lining.
- 3.2.6 The remainder of the shop/restaurant was of tight brick construction no feature suitable for roosting bats. A fascia board was present at the south-eastern elevation of the shops and generally tight, although raised at the join to a small extension at the rear (behind the pizza restaurant). The extension was of corrugated metal construction throughout with access at

the top of the wall plate that was blocked in with plastic. A bitumen felt ridge was noted and generally tight.

3.2.7 Shops and restaurant – internal: Internally, the only loft space was the monopitched section of roof that comprised eaves storage at the western elevation of the Site. The eaves space was approximately 1.6 m high and 1 m wide and accessed via a small hatch in the wall. Breathable membrane was fitted throughout and a dividing wall was noted at the western end, with no access to the other side (inaccessible section of loft space). The top of the wall plate was exposed throughout, and access was noted at the verges. No droppings were noted on the floor or walls for bats, mice or rats. A separate mezzanine floor was noted over the shop/carport and used for stored belongings and as a workshop. The truss, metal roof and brick walls were all exposed. With no evidence of bats noted.

3.2.8 Car wash: The car wash comprised an old petrol station canopy of corrugated metal. Some access points were noted at an overhang, forming possible cavities, although unlikely to provide potential for roosting bats.

### **3.3 Protected Species Building Assessment – Birds**

3.3.1 At the time of the survey, no evidence of current or past breeding birds was noted within the Site, although potential was noted at the old petrol station canopy and flat roofs, particularly for gull *Larus* species.

### **3.4 Habitats**

3.4.1 Habitats surrounding the Site largely comprised hardstanding. Due to the small size of the Site, it was not considered necessary to provide a colour coded phase 1 habitat survey plan.

## **4 Evaluation and Recommendations**

### **4.1 Summary**

- 4.1.1 The current proposals for the Site the partial demolition of the Site, with redevelopment into a retail unit with flats above, a garage, as well as two detached dwellings. In order to evaluate impacts on biodiversity and protected species and the need or otherwise for further surveys, the location, the proposed development and likely level of works have been reviewed (where possible) against current standing advice and legislation. In addition, professional judgment has also been used.

### **4.2 Biological Desk Study**

- 4.2.1 The Site was within the impact risk zones of several SSSI and within 10 km of a SAC, SPA and Ramsar. These designated sites were classified for their habitats, geology and associated flora and fauna and any development in close proximity to these sites may have a detrimental impact on their ecological functionalities. This may result from the development activities themselves, or increased visitors and subsequent pressure on ecological resources of species linked to the designated sites.
- 4.2.2 The Local Planning Authority (LPA) or '*competent authority*' will need to review the proposed development against each citation and/or impact risk zone criteria to ascertain whether the proposed development is likely to have a significant effect on these designations. The LPA will be required to consider the development alone, but also in conjunction with other proposals or local plans. In determining impacts on these designations, the location, nature of the proposal and plans for the Site will all be assessed. If the proposed development was considered likely to have significant impact on the Ramsar, SPA and SAC, the LPA/competent authority will be required to conduct a formal assessment of the ecological implications of the proposed works. Generally termed a Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA), the proposed works may require a formal screening to the LPA for any likely significant effects (alone or in combination with other projects).
- 4.2.3 Natural England suggests, '*Where these effects cannot be excluded, assessing them in more detail through an appropriate assessment (AA) is required to ascertain whether an adverse effect on the integrity of the site can be ruled out. Where such an adverse effect on the site cannot be ruled out, and no alternative solutions can be identified, then the project can only then proceed if there are imperative reasons of over-riding public interest and if the necessary compensatory measures can be secured*'. (Natural England). It should be noted that the proposed works are small scale, and it is considered that the proposed works are unlikely to impact these designated sites.

- 4.2.4 It should be noted that the proposed development will be largely within the existing footprint of the Site, which was considered to be of limited ecological value in its current state. Ecological impacts from the proposed works were considered to be negligible. However, it must be stressed that it is up for the LPA to determine the needs of otherwise for an HRA.

### 4.3 Impact Assessment – Bats

- 4.3.1 Bats are fully protected and listed under Schedule 2 of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (as amended) 2017 amended by The Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU exit) Regulations 2019, Schedule 5 of the WCA (as amended) 1981 and listed under Section 41 (S41) of the NERC Act (2006) as well as included in the CRowW (2000). All UK bat species are also listed under Appendix II of the Bern Convention (with the exception of common pipistrelle, which is on Appendix III) and Appendix II of the Bonn Convention. In addition, greater horseshoe, lesser horseshoe *Rhinolophus hipposideros*, Bechstein's *Myotis bechsteinii*, noctule *Nyctalus noctula*, soprano pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pygmaeus*, brown long-eared *Plecotus auritus* and barbastelle *Barbastella barbastellus* are also listed as UKBAP.
- 4.3.2 The protection afforded to bats is such that the animals and their roosts (used for rest or shelter) are legally protected. It is a criminal offence to deliberately take, 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 place used by bats for breeding or resting (even if bats are not present), possess or advertise/sell/exchange a bat of a species found in the wild (dead or alive), whole or any part of a bat, as well as intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a bat roost. Important populations of greater and lesser horseshoes, Bechstein's and barbastelle require the designation of SAC.
- 4.3.3 Therefore, unlicensed works that may cause disturbance, killing, injury or blocking access to a place of rest and shelter has the potential to cause an offence. Following the withdrawal of Planning Policy Statement 9 (PPS9): Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, the NPPF was published as its replacement in 2012. Circular ODPM 06/2005: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation – Statutory Obligations and their impact within the Planning System, was a guidance document that accompanied PPS9, and is still valid in its interpretation by local planning authorities on the impact a development may have on protected species. Circular 06/2005 states that the presence of a protected species is a '*material consideration when a planning authority is considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat*' (ODPM 06/2005).

4.3.4 Although no evidence of bats was recorded, some areas of the shop loft could not be fully surveyed with suitable bat features and/or access points noted externally/internally. In addition, some potential was noted behind a fascia board (southern elevation of shop), as well as between wall and wooden cladding (northern elevation of shop). The Site was therefore considered to provide 'Low' potential for roosting bats i.e., *'a structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by individual bats opportunistically...unlikely to be suitable for maternity or hibernation'* (Collins, 2016). As the presence/likely absence of bats could not be confirmed, a **further Stage 2 bat presence/likely absence survey was recommended**. The survey will consist of a single bat emergence survey within the optimal **survey window of May – August** to confirm a negative for bats. If no bats were recorded emerging, suitable survey effort would have been conducted and the Site would not be considered a bat roost. However, if bat(s) were recorded emerging **further Stage 2 bat roost characterisation surveys will be required** comprising an additional two emergence surveys (or one emergence and a pre-dawn re-entry depending on conditions) to characterise the roost. These further bat surveys will be necessary to classify the bat roosts(s), provide suitable mitigation and determine whether the favourable conservation status of the bat species roosting on Site will be maintained based on the development proposals.

4.3.5 The further surveys were required in order to provide adequate information for the LPA to have due regard for protected species at the planning application stage. It should be noted, further presence/likely absence surveys cannot be conditioned (BSI, 2013). Any further Stage 2 bat survey must follow the most recent BCT guidelines (Collins, 2016 at the time of writing).

#### **4.4 Impact Assessment – Birds**

4.4.1 Under Section 1 of the WAC (as amended) 1981, wild birds (with exceptions) are protected from being killed, injured or captured, while their nests and eggs are protected from being damaged, destroyed or taken while in use. At the time of the survey, no evidence of past or current breeding birds was noted on Site.

## **5 Assessment and Ecological Mitigation**

- 5.1 Based on current CIEEM (2017b) PEA report writing guidelines, where further surveys are proposed and not yet completed, no assessments of ecological impacts are possible. Therefore, at this stage no additional ecological enhancements/mitigation were proposed as Stage 2 survey information is outstanding. When the recommended further surveys are completed (bat surveys in this case) and impacts fully assessed, an ecological impact assessment (EcIA) report must be provided to accompany any planning application. This EcIA must provide all recommended further survey results, impact assessment and bat mitigation/compensation design.
- 5.2 Although no further surveys were necessary for birds, locations of any undetected bird nests may be recorded during the further bat surveys. The results will be updated within the EcIA report, with impact assessment and evaluation of mitigation for birds provided where necessary.

## **6 Conclusion**

- 6.1 A PEA was carried out at an existing carwash and associated shops in Pinhoe Exeter, Devon, to assess impacts from the proposed development. During the survey, 'Low' potential for roosting bats was noted with a further Stage 2 bat presence/likely absence survey recommended. If no bats were recorded emerging from the shop, suitable survey effort would have been conducted and the Site would not be considered a bat roost. However, if bat(s) were recorded emerging, further bat roost characterisation surveys will be required comprising an additional two emergence surveys (or one emergence and one pre-dawn re-entry depending on conditions) to characterise the roost, provide suitable mitigation and determine whether the favourable conservation status of the bat species roosting on Site will be maintained based on the development proposals. Results of any further Stage 2 survey(s) must be presented in an EclA report, which will then accompany any planning application.
- 6.2 Although no evidence of breeding birds was recorded at the time of the survey, the locations of undetected bird nests may be recorded during the further Stage 2 bat surveys, with suitable mitigation, compensation and/or enhancements also presented and incorporated into the EclA report.
- 6.3 This report is valid for a period of 12 months from the date of the survey.

## References

British Standards Institution (BSI) BS42020:2013, 2013. Biodiversity – Code of Practice for Planning and Development. London, UK.

Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, 2017a. Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing (2<sup>nd</sup> edn). Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.

Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, 2017b. Guidelines for Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (2<sup>nd</sup> edn). Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management, Winchester.

Collins, J. (ed.), 2016. Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3<sup>rd</sup> edn). The Bat Conservation Trust, London.

ODPM Circular 06/2005, 2005. Biodiversity and geological conservation - statutory obligations and their impact within the planning system.

### Websites:

MAGiCMap. [www.magic.defra.gov.uk](http://www.magic.defra.gov.uk)

Natural England. <https://designatedsites.naturalengland.org.uk>

NPPF, 2021.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>



## Figures

Figure 1: Annotated photographs – external

Car port and shop front with shed visible on left – note raised fascia at car port filled with cobweb and detritus



Photo taken on 22/02/2022

Monopitched roof section along western elevation – note area of raised cladding



Photo taken on 22/02/2022

Southern elevation with exposed brick – access to monopitched loft space at verge



Photo taken on 22/02/2022

Courtyard view (back of restaurant, shop and car port) – note raised fascia with cavity (highlighted)



Photo taken on 22/02/2022

Carwash area with old petrol station canopy



Photo taken on 22/02/2022

Raised cavity between brick wall and cladding at northern elevation of shop – access at the apex



Photo taken on 22/02/2022



Figure 2: Annotated photographs – internal

Eaves roof space, inside south-western elevation monopitched roof – note, breathable membrane lining



Internal wall divide inside eave space (external access at verge)



Access over top of the wall plate at porch



Internal access stairs to mezzanine area



Mezzanine floor used as workshop/store area – exposed flat roof



Car port interior with wooden roof structure and exposed brick walls



## Appendices

## Appendix 1

## Appendix 1 – Wildlife Checklist

### A.1 Protected and priority species (relates to question 13a in the planning application form).

A tick or cross must be placed in all boxes in column two (shaded) and then, where there is a tick, all other boxes in that row. Where species are present please email this form to Devon Biodiversity Records Centre – DBRC@dbrc.org.uk.

**Location:** Carwash at Pinhoe, Exeter

**Grid reference for centre of site (6 digit):** SX 96467 94514

**Planning Application reference:** Not known

**Name of surveyor and consultancy:** Dr J. Rabineau & Mr H. Colmer of Colmer Ecology Ltd

**Date that surveys carried out:** 22/02/2022

**Sent to DBRC:** To be sent once project is in public domain as per terms and conditions

Species - terrestrial, intertidal, marine	Walkover shows that suitable habitat present and reasonably likely that the species will be found? <u>Tick or cross</u>	Detailed survey needed to clarify impacts and mitigation requirements?	Detailed survey carried out and included?	Species Present or Assumed to be present on site <u>Indicate with P or A and name the species</u>	Impact on species? Unknown – Stage 2 surveys required	Detailed Conservation Action Statement included? Sets out actions needed in relation to avoidance / mitigation / compensation / enhancement	EPS offence committed? Three tests met?	Grid reference for specific location of species (if required for large sites)
Bats (roost)	✓	✓	X – Stage 2 surveys required	Unknown – Stage 2 surveys required	Unknown – Stage 2 surveys required	N/A	N/A	
Bats (flight line / foraging habitat)	X							
Dormice	X							
Otters	X							
Great crested newts (*check consultation zone)	X – Within consultation zone but no suitable habitat on Site							
Cirl buntings (*check consultation zone)	X							
Barn owls	X							
Other Schedule 1 birds	X							
Breeding birds	✓	✓ - PSBA only	✓ - PSBA only	X	X	N/A	N/A	
Reptiles	X							
Native crayfish	X							
Water voles	X							
Badgers	X							
Other protected species	X							
UK BAP Priority species	X							
Devon BAP key species	X							
Invasive species	X							

## A.2 Designations / important habitats / sites of geological importance (relates to questions 13 b & c in the planning application form)

A tick or cross must be placed in all boxes in column two and then, where there is a tick, all other boxes in that row.

Designation	Within site or potential impact. <u>Tick or cross</u>	Name of site / habitat	Detailed Conservation Action Statement included in report?	Habitat balance sheet included (showing area of habitats lost, gained and overall net gain)	Relevant organisation consulted & response included in the application?
<b>Terrestrial, intertidal, marine</b>					
<b>Statutory designations</b>					
European designations – Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and RAMSAR site or within Greater Horseshoe consultation zone	✓	Within 6 km of Exe Estuary Ramsar, Special SPA and SSSI  Within 10 km of East Devon Heaths SPA and East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SAC and SSSI	N/A	N/A	
Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs)	✓ - Within IRZ	Stoke Woods SSSI, Bramford Speke SSSI, Bonhay Road Cuttings SSSI, Exe Estuary SSSI and East Devon Pebblebed Heaths SSSI	N/A	N/A	
Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) ( <i>not before 2012</i> )	X				
Local Nature Reserve (LNR)	✓ - Within 7 km	Belvidere Meadows LNR and Barley Valley LNR	N/A	N/A	
<b>Non statutory wildlife designations</b>					
County Wildlife Site (CWS)	Unknown				
Ancient woodland	X				
Ancient trees	X				
Special verge	X				
UK BAP Priority habitat	X				
Local Biodiversity Network (mapped by Devon Wildlife Trust / through Green Infrastructure work)	Unknown				
<b>Non statutory geological designation</b>					
County Geological Site (CGS or RIGS)	Unknown				



Colmer Ecology Ltd | Unit 8 – Fortescue Court Business Park | Brampford Speke | Exeter |  
Devon | EX5 5JN

T: 01392 758 325

E: [mail@colmer-ecology.co.uk](mailto:mail@colmer-ecology.co.uk)

W: [www.colmer-ecology.co.uk](http://www.colmer-ecology.co.uk)

Colmer Ecology Ltd Registered in England: No 7876750  
Registered Office: Unit 8 – Fortescue Court Business Park | Brampford Speke | Exeter | EX5 5JN