

3 2017 07 4 2P

Bat Survey Report

**Startifants Farm
Goose Lane
Chipping
PR3 2QB**

10.09.2017



**Report prepared by:
Dave Anderson
Batworker.co.uk
dave@batworker.co.uk
07894 338290**

Summary

In August 2017 Batworker consultancy was commissioned to undertake a survey of farm buildings at Startifants Farm, Goose Lane, Chipping, PR3 2QB to assess the potential for use by bats and other protected species.

A daytime survey was carried out on 28th June 2017 in order to support plans to redevelop the farm including extending the main farm house and developing barns as residential properties.

Static bat detector monitoring of the barns was carried out and supported by a dawn survey on 24th August.

Evidence was recorded to suggest bats were roosting within both the main farmhouse and stone barn.

Common Pipistrelle were observed and recorded using the main farmhouse building for roosting, a small day roost of brown long eared bats was recorded reentering the barn on the dawn survey.

No evidence of Great Crested Newts were recorded.

No evidence of use by barn owls was recorded.

The surveyor considers survey effort to be reasonable to assess the roost potential of the buildings.

Further survey work will be needed to support an EPS licence application.

The surveyor considers the proposed development and change of use is likely to result in a breach of the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended) therefore the proposed development will require an EPS Licence (EPSL) and suitable mitigation to proceed lawfully.

Introduction

In August 2017 Batworker consultancy was commissioned to undertake a survey of farm buildings at Startifants Farm, Goose Lane, Chipping, PR3 2QB to assess the potential for use by bats and other protected species.

A daytime survey was carried out on 28th June 2017 in order to support plans to redevelop the farm including extending the main farm house and developing barns as residential properties.


Static bat detector monitoring of the barns was carried out and supported by a dawn survey on 24th August.

Survey and Site Assessment

Objectives of the survey

The survey was carried out to determine current usage by bats of the site and to establish status of the bat species using the site prior to development work being carried out.

Survey site location



A central grid reference for the site is SD6245042665

Site/Habitat description



The farm consists of a main farmhouse and a complex of traditional and modern farm buildings.



1 - The main farmhouse is a traditional stone built and partially rendered two storey detached farm house with a double pitch slate roof. A two storey extension is present on the north side of the building.



Gaps behind barge boards were recorded, the roof is in good general condition.



The farmhouse can be considered to be of moderate potential for roosting bats.



2 – A block built and corrugated roofed dairy. Considered to be of low potential for roosting bats.




3 - A traditional stone built and slate roofed barn. Gaps and crevices are present in the external and internal walls. Roof slates are unlined and lifted tiles and missing tiles present. The building can be considered of high potential for roosting bats.





4 and 5 – An agricultural stone built lean to with single pitch corrugated roof used for storage and a modern single skin tractor store. The buildings offer low potential for roosting bats.

Surrounding habitat.



The property is located in a rural position with surrounding habitat dominated by improved and semi improved grassland. Field boundaries have few remnant hedgerows. Chipping brook runs through the centre of the site. The property is located close to a sewage farm.

Overall foraging potential for bats can be considered moderate to high.

Pre Existing data on local bat species

A search of the MAGIC website revealed no EPS licence applications within a 1km radius. The East Lancashire Bat Group database had no recorded roosts within 1km.

The area is notoriously under recorded.

From personal experience of surveying for and researching bats in Lancashire, Yorkshire and Cumbria the following species were considered.

Common Pipistrelle – known to roost on sites where suitable foraging habitat is available.

Soprano Pipistrelle – known to roost on sites where suitable foraging habitat is available.

Whiskered/Brandt's – species often found roosting in buildings close to woodland.

Natterer's – a typical upland bat with foraging bats being recorded high on heather moorland. Often roosting in barns.

Daubenton's – a species commonly associated with aquatic habitats.

Long Eared bat – a woodland species which has been recorded foraging over in bye meadows and rough grassland sites. Often roosting in barns.

Field Survey Methodology

Visual inspection

An inspection was carried out to search for and identify potential feeding perches, roosting opportunities and signs of bat use both internally and externally. The visual inspection focussed on searching for feeding remains and bat droppings both within the building and on external walls. Crevices and other potential roost sites were investigated for smear/grease marks, lack of cobwebs, urine staining.

Equipment used included:

- ! Lupine Pico LED torch
- ! SeeSnake CA 300 video endoscope
- ! Opticron close focusing binoculars

Static Survey

Anabat Express bat detectors were left in buildings identified as having roost potential. They were programmed to record bat activity from dusk until dawn over eleven nights.

Personnel

All surveys were conducted by Dave Anderson MSc, Natural England Science, Education and Conservation bat licence holder (2015-15784-CLS-CLS) a bat surveyor and ecologist with 20 years experience. Activity surveys were assisted by Sharon Anderson

Survey Summary

Survey	Date	Timings
Visual	28.06.2017	2 Hours
Visual	09.08.2017	1 hour
Static Survey	09.08 – 20.08.2017	dusk to dawn
Dawn survey	24.08.2017	3 hours

Survey constraints

Access to all areas of the exterior of the building was possible and good visual inspection at ground level was possible. The survey was carried out at a time of year when presence of bats is at it's most obvious.

Results

Visual Inspection

The main farmhouse (building 1) and the stone barn (building 3) were identified as having high roost potential. Droppings were observed on the eastern aspect of the farmhouse extension. Scattered droppings typical of foraging bats were recorded in the barn.

Barn Owl

No signs of barn owl were recorded during either visual inspection.

Great Crested Newt

No ponds were recorded within 250m of the property. The brook is unsuitable for great crested newts.

Static Detector

Common pipistrelle bats were recorded foraging in the stone barn close to dusk and immediately before dawn suggesting roost close by.

Dawn Survey

A small number (approx 15) common pipistrelle were observed swarming around the extension of the main farmhouse, this behaviour typical of roosting bats. Bats were observed entering the extension suggesting a roost either within the building or the main farmhouse roof.

Two brown long eared bats were observed entering the stone barn via the open main doors at 30 minutes prior to dawn. Although no observation of the bats entering a roost was made it is assumed the bats are roosting somewhere within the barn interior.

Evaluation of the results

Evidence noted during the visual inspections suggested roosting pipistrelle bats using the main farmhouse extension as a roost. This was confirmed during a dawn survey of the building. Common pipistrelles were observed entering the building just prior to dawn.

A small day roost of brown long eared bats was recorded using the stone barn to roost, although the exact position of roosting bats wasn't identified.

Conclusion

Evidence was recorded to suggest bats were roosting within both the main farmhouse and stone barn.

Common Pipistrelle were observed and recorded using the main farmhouse building for roosting, a small day roost of brown long eared bats was recorded reentering the barn on the dawn survey.

No evidence of Great Crested Newts were recorded.

No evidence of use by barn owls was recorded.

The surveyor considers survey effort to be reasonable to assess the roost potential of the building

Further survey work will be needed to support an EPS licence application.

The surveyor considers the proposed development and change of use is likely to result in a breach of the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended) therefore the proposed development will require an EPS Licence (EPSL) and suitable mitigation to proceed lawfully.

Further Recommendations

In the unlikely event bats are discovered or disturbed during building renovation and development, work must be halted until the bat licence holder can attend the site and give further advice as necessary.

E Bibliography

- | | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Barn Owls and Rural Planning Applications | Barn Owl Trust 2009 |
| Barn Owl Survey Methodology and Techniques for use in Ecological Assessments | Shawyer, C. August 2011 |
| Bat Mitigation Guidelines | Natural England 2006 |
| Bat Survey Guidelines 3rd Edition | Bat Conservation Trust 2016 |

Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, principally those relating to powers and penalties, have been amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CRoW Act). The CRoW Act only applies to England and Wales.

Section 9(1)

It is an offence for any person to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bat.

Section 9(4)(a)

It is an offence to intentionally or recklessly* damage, destroy or obstruct access to any place that a wild bat uses for shelter or protection.

(*Added by the CRoW Act in England and Wales only)

This is taken to mean all bat roosts whether bats are present or not.

Section 9(4)(b)

It is an offence to intentionally or recklessly* disturb any wild bat while it is occupying a structure or place that it uses for shelter or protection.

(*Added by the CRoW Act in England and Wales only)

The Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994

Section 39(1)

It is an offence

(a) deliberately to capture or kill any bat

(b) deliberately to disturb any bat

(d) to damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of any bat.

The difference between this legislation and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 is the use of the word 'deliberately' rather than 'intentionally'. Also disturbance of bats can be anywhere, not just at a roost. Damage or destruction of a bat roost does not require the offence to be intentional or deliberate.

Barn Owls and the Law

Part 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981)

(1) Subject to the provisions of this Part, if any person intentionally (or recklessly as amended by the CRoW Act, 2000) (a) kills, injures or takes any wild bird; (b) takes, damages or destroys the nest of any wild bird while

that nest is in use or being built; or (c) takes or destroys an egg of any wild bird. he shall be guilty of an offence.

(5) Subject to the provisions of this Part, if any person intentionally- (a) disturbs any wild bird included in Schedule 1 while it is building a nest or is at, on or near a nest containing eggs or young; or (b) disturbs dependent

young of such a bird, he shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a special penalty.

Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act (2000)

Part III Nature conservation and wildlife protection

74 Conservation of biological diversity

(1) It is the duty of (a) any Minister of the Crown (within the meaning of the Ministers of the [1975 c. 26.] Crown Act 1975), (b) any Government department, and (c) the National Assembly for Wales, in carrying out his or its functions, to have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biological diversity in accordance with the Convention.

SCHEDULE 12 AMENDMENTS RELATING TO PART I OF WILDLIFE AND COUNTRYSIDE ACT 1981

1. In section 1(5) of the 1981 Act (offence of intentional disturbance of wild birds) after "intentionally" there is inserted "or recklessly".

The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006)

PART 3, (40): Duty to conserve biodiversity

(1) 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.

(3) Conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat.