Bat Scoping Survey Report

27 St Peters Close,
Clayton le Dale,
BB1 9HH

19.09.2018

Report prepared by:
Dave Anderson
Batworker.com
dave@batworker.com
07894 338290

Summary

In September 2018 Batworker consultancy was commissioned to undertake a survey of 27 St Peters Close, Clayton le Dale, BB1 9HH to assess the potential for use by bats.

A daytime survey was carried out on 14th September 2018 in order to support plans to extend the property.

No birds were observed using the building for nesting.

No evidence was recorded to suggest bats were roosting within the building.

No bats were observed or recorded using the building for roosting.

The building is considered to be of negligible potential for roosting bats.

The surveyor considers survey effort to be reasonable to assess the roost potential of the building and no further survey work is deemed appropriate.

The surveyor does not consider 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 does not require an EPS Licence (EPSL) to proceed lawfully.

Introduction

In September 2018 Batworker consultancy was commissioned to undertake a survey of 27 St Peters Close, Clayton le Dale, BB1 9HH to assess the potential for use by bats.

A daytime survey was carried out on 14th September 2018 in order to support plans to extend the property.

Survey and Site Assessment

Objectives of the survey

The survey was carried out to determine current usage by bats, and other protected species, 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 SD6791532772

Site/Habitat description

The property consists of a semi detached dormer bungalow with a double pitch tiled roof. A single storey extension is located at the rear of the property with double pitched slate roof.vExterior walls are rendered and pebble dashed. Roof tiles are close fitting and ridge tiles are well sealed. Soffits and bargeboards are close fitting where present.

The loft space is insulated and roof tiles are lined with a breathable membrane.

Overall the building offers negligible roosting opportunities.

Surrounding habitat.

The property is located on the rural edge of Clayton le Dale. To the south of the property habitat is dominated by semi improved grassland with some hedgerows present on field boundaries. Connectivity to the wider landscape is good.

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

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 held no records within 1km.

From personal experience of surveying for and researching bats in Lancashire, Yorkshire and Cumbria, and Calderdale in particular, 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

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.

Survey Summary

Survey	Date	Timings
Visual	14.09.2018	1 Hour

Survey constraints

Access to all areas of the interior and exterior of the buildings at ground level and good visual inspection at ground level was possible.

Results

Visual Inspection - Bats

No suitable roost features were recorded on the building, the building is in a good state of repair with no obvious potential roost features.. A search of loft spaces recorded no bat droppings or feeding remains. No staining, urine splashing or droppings were recorded externally.

Visual Inspection – Nesting birds

No nesting birds were observed during the survey.

Evaluation of the results

No recent signs of bats were recorded within the building or on exterior walls, a search for scattered droppings typical of bats returning to roost found no evidence, despite a period of good weather in the preceding two weeks.

Taking the results of both the survey and the well sealed nature of the building it is considered to have negligible roost potential.

Suitability	Description Roosting habitats	Commuting and foraging habitats
Negligible	Negligible habitat features on site likely to be used by roosting bats.	Negligible habitat features on site likely to be used by commuting or foraging bats.
Low	A structure with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by individual bats opportunistically. However, these potential roost sites do not provide enough space, shelter, protection, appropriate conditions[1] and/or suitable surrounding habitat to be used on a regular basis or by larger numbers of bats (i.e. unlikely to be suitable for maternity or hibernation[1]). A tree of sufficient size and age to contain PRFs but with none seen from the ground or features seen with only very limited roosting potential[2]	Habitat that could be used by small numbers of commuting bats such as a gappy hedgerow or unvegetated stream, but isolated, i.e. not very well connected to the surrounding landscape by other habitat. Suitable, but isolated habitat that could be used by small numbers of foraging bats such as a lone tree (not in a parkland situation) or a patch of scrub.
Moderate	A structure or tree with one or more potential roost sites that could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions[1] and surrounding habitat but unlikely to support a roost of high conservation status (with respect to roost type only – the assessments in this table are made irrespective of species conservation status, which is established after presence is confirmed).	Continuous habitat connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for commuting such as lines of trees and scrub or linked back gardens. Habitat that is connected to the wider landscape that could be used by bats for foraging such as trees, scrub, grassland or water.
High	A structure or tree with one or more potential roost sites that are obviously suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis and potentially for longer periods of time due to their size, shelter, protection, conditions[1] and surrounding habitat.	Continuous, high-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by commuting bats such as river valleys, streams, hedgerows, lines of trees and woodland edge. High-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by foraging bats such as broadleaved woodland, tree-lined watercourses and grazed parkland. Site is close to and connected to known roosts.

From Bat Survey Guidelines 3rd Edition

Conclusion

No birds were observed using the building for nesting.

No evidence was recorded to suggest bats were roosting within the building.

No bats were observed or recorded using the building for roosting.

The building is considered to be of negligible potential for roosting bats.

The surveyor considers survey effort to be reasonable to assess the roost potential of the building and no further survey work is deemed appropriate.

The surveyor does not consider 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 does not require an EPS Licence (EPSL) to proceed lawfully.

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
Bat Workers Manual 3rd Edition	JNCC 2004

Bats and the Law

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 ofó (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.