

320171021P

Bat Survey Report

**Susie Cottage,
Rimington Lane,
Rimington,
Clitheroe BB7 4DT**

07.11.2017



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

Summary

In October 2017 Batworker consultancy was commissioned to undertake a survey of Susie Cottage, Rimington Lane, Rimington, Clitheroe BB7 4DT to assess the potential for use by bats.

A daytime survey was carried out on 7th November 2017 in order to support plans to develop the building as a residential property including extending the building and repair works to the roof.

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 low 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 October 2017 Batworker consultancy was commissioned to undertake a survey of Susie Cottage, Rimington Lane, Rimington, Clitheroe BB7 4DT to assess the potential for use by bats.


A daytime survey was carried out on 7th November 2017 in order to support plans to develop the building as a residential property including extending the building and repair works to the roof.

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 SD80824590

Site/Habitat description

The building is a brick and stone built detached house with a double pitched stone slate roof. External walls are rendered. Roof slates are in good general condition, with no obvious missing or lifted slates. Ridge tiles are pointed and sealed. The building is currently empty and derelict.




No loft spaces are present. Half the roof is unlined, whilst half has a bituminous membrane present. The roof space is heavily cobwebbed.



Overall potential for roosting bats is considered to be low.

Surrounding habitat.



The property is located in a rural position on the edge of Rimington with surrounding habitat dominated by semi improved and improved grassland. Hedgerows are present along field boundaries and to the west of the site a small coppice of deciduous trees is associated with Stopper Lane.

Foraging potential can be considered to be moderate.

Pre Existing data on local bat species

A search of the MAGIC website revealed no EPS licence applications within a 1km radius. A data search of the East Lancashire Bat Group records revealed no records with 1km.

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

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	07.11.2017	1 Hour

Survey constraints

Access to all areas of the interior and 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 still obvious.

Results

Visual Inspection

No suitable crevices, gaps or access points were observed on the exterior of the building. No potential roost features were observed. No grease marks/staining or urine staining were observed.

Loft spaces were heavily cobwebbed. Roof slates were plaster backed.

Evaluation of the results

The construction of the building offers few roosting opportunities. Evidence from the survey suggests no bats are using the roof space within the building and few external potential roost features exist. Given these results it is reasonable to suggest that the building is of low potential for roosting bats.

Conclusion

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 low 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.

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 |
| Bat Workers Manual 3 rd 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 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.

