

# Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Report

**Automotive Tools,  
Hambleton View,  
Read,  
Burnley,  
BB12 7PD**

**28.01.2021**



**Report prepared by:  
Dave Anderson  
Batworker.com  
[Dave@Batworker.com](mailto:Dave@Batworker.com)  
07894 338290**

## **Summary**

In January 2021 Batworker consultancy was commissioned to undertake a survey of Automotive Tools, Hambledon View, Read, Burnley, BB12 7PD to assess the potential for use by bats and breeding birds.

A daytime survey was carried out on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2021 to support plans to develop the property.

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

**No bats were observed or recorded using the buildings for roosting.**

**The buildings are considered to be of negligible potential for roosting bats.**

**The surveyor considers survey effort to be reasonable to assess the roost potential of the buildings 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 January 2021 Batworker consultancy was commissioned to undertake a survey of Automotive Tools, Hambledon View, Read, Burnley, BB12 7PD to assess the potential for use by bats and breeding birds.


A daytime survey was carried out on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2021 to support plans to develop the property.

## Survey and Site Assessment

### Objectives of the survey

The survey was carried out to determine roost potential of the building, 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 SD7678534473

## Site/Habitat description

The property consists of a complex of a modern block and corrugated metal built light industrial building with a double pitched corrugated metal roof, a single storey block built garage with corrugated metal roof is located to the western facade with a single storey stone built workshop with double pitched slate roof beyond. External walls are well pointed with no obvious cracks, gaps or crevices present. Roof slates are generally close fitting with no slipped, lifted or missing tiles present, lead flashing where present is close fitting. Ridge tiles are pointed and well sealed. Eaves and gable ends are pointed and well sealed.

The building is generally well maintained, well sealed and can be considered to offer negligible roosting bat potential.



## **Pre Existing data on local bat species**

A search of the MAGIC ([www.magic.gov.uk](http://www.magic.gov.uk)) website revealed one bat EPS licence application within a 1km radius.

2015-10582-EPS-MIT      Common pipistrelle and whiskered bat non breeding roost.

The East Lancashire Bat Group hold no records within 1km of the site.

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.

## Habitat



The property is located in an urban position with surrounding habitat dominated by a mosaic of mature domestic gardens with some tree cover and improved and semi improved grassland with remnant hedgerow and scattered trees along field boundaries. Connectivity to the wider landscape is moderate.

Bat foraging potential can be considered low to moderate.

## **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 over 20 years experience.

### **Survey Summary**

<b>Survey</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Timings</b>
Visual	28.01.2021	1 Hour

### **Survey constraints**

Access to all areas of the exterior of the building was possible and good visual inspection at ground level was possible. Evidence of bat activity such as bat droppings or staining on external walls and surfaces is frequently removed by the action of wind and rain; apparent absence of evidence is therefore evaluated with caution.

In many situations it is not possible to inspect every locations where bats are present therefore it should be assumed that an absence of bat evidence does not necessarily equate to evidence that bats are absent. Some species such as pipistrelle sp bats are opportunistic and it is possible for individuals to be found during works, even where surveys have had negative results during preliminary and activity surveys.

Due to Covid19 restrictions and IUCN BSG guidance, no internal inspections were carried out.

## Survey Results

### Visual Inspection - Bats

The property is well maintained, well sealed and was assessed as offering negligible roosting potential with no obvious gaps or crevices suitable for roosting bats.

No physical evidence of bats, grease marks or urine splashing was recorded on or within the building despite suitable horizontal surfaces being present and undisturbed.

### Visual Inspection – Nesting birds

No evidence of nesting birds was observed.

### Evaluation of the results

No evidence of use by bats was recorded during the survey and the buildings were assessed as offering negligible roosting potential due to a lack of potential roosting features and the well maintained nature of the property.

Given the lack of roosting potential it is considered that the development proposals do not risk negative impacts on roosting bats. A precautionary method statement has been recommended, given survey constraints, to provide reasonable avoidance measures.

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 <sup>5</sup> 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 <sup>6</sup> ).  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 <sup>6</sup> .	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 <sup>5</sup> 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 <sup>5</sup> 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 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition*

## **Conclusion**

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

**No bats were observed or recorded using the buildings for roosting.**

**The buildings are considered to be of negligible potential for roosting bats.**

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

## **Precautionary Method Statement**

The overall purpose of the Method Statement is to ensure that bats and their roosts are fully protected to ensure the 'favourable conservation status of the species'. The Method statement is designed to minimise or remove any potential disturbance to roosting bats and to ensure the continuing ecological functionality of the site.

### **No work should commence without contractors receiving a toolbox talk.**

All contractors and project managers should be made aware of the legal protection afforded all species of bats in the UK and procedures should be in place to mitigate for the potential impact on bats before any building work is undertaken.

Roof slates should be removed by hand where possible as necessary. In the unlikely event of bats or their roosts being exposed or vulnerable to harm, suspend further work in that area. Cover the exposed bats to reduce any further risk of harm and seek advice immediately.

### **A copy of the Method Statement should be available to site / project managers in advance of any works being carried out.**

The existence of a Method Statement helps to establish a defence against prosecution for intentional (WCA), deliberate (Habitat Regulations.) or reckless (WCA) disturbance of bats, nesting birds or damage to roosts. A Method Statement is normally required by the local planning authority to ensure that procedures are in place before the development works are carried out.

### **All work should take place under the supervision of the ecologist.**

### **No post development monitoring is considered necessary.**

### **Accidental exposure of bats - EMERGENCY ADVICE**

In the unlikely event of bats or their roosts being exposed or vulnerable to harm, suspend further work in that area. Cover the exposed bats to reduce any further risk of harm and seek advice immediately. Call Dave Anderson (Batworker) on 07894 338290 (mobile); a site visit will be arranged to assess the situation and recover any bats / safely remove them from site.

## **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 <sup>rd</sup> 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.

## **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.