

Company no. 7492656

Bat Survey Report (preliminary day-time survey): 2 Station Close, Wilpshire, BB1 9PT

OS grid reference: SD 6873 3191

Commissioned-by: Younis Khan

For: Syrah Mahmood

Survey Date: 21/3/24

Report Date: 27/3/24

Table of Contents

1.	Summary	page 3
2.	Introduction	page 4
3.	Bats and the law	page 6
4.	Survey	page 8
5.	Limitations of the Survey	page 9
6.	Findings	page 9
7.	Conclusions/Discussion	page 14
8.	Recommendations	page 15
9.	References	page 16
Ар	pendix 1 - Angela Graham's Experience	page 17
Ар	pendix 2 - Criteria used in assessing risk of roosting (in the absence obvious evidence of roosting)	of page 19
Ар	pendix 3 - Recommendations for further survey work when the findin of the preliminary survey were negative	gs page 21
Ар	pendix 4 - Examples of available integrated bat boxes	page 22

N.b. Copywrite applies to all my reports and they must not be altered in any way whatsoever by anyone other than myself, or combined with any other report/s, irrespective of who wrote them, without the proposed changes being submitted to me in writing and agreed by me in writing.

1. Summary.

(This summary should be read in conjunction with the conclusions and recommendations.)

This modern, semi-detached house in a semi-rural location, is to be extended to the side and rear.

The roof-lining is of breathable membrane. It has upvc eaves that appear to be completely sealed, though access to the foot of the gable wall wasn't available to allow the best perspective on this to be gained. It is fitted with a dry verge at the gable.

Despite this, both fresh and older bat droppings were found in the loft, so there is no doubt this is an on-going bat roost.

The presence of a bat roost does not preclude development, but requires an appropriate licence from Natural England, as the work cannot be done without directly impacting the roost.

I believe this property is old enough that it probably had wooden boxed eaves originally and a roof-lining of bitumastic felt. The gable end faces south. At that time, so long as there was a gap between the soffit-board and wall, even along part of its length, this would have been a prime location for a pipistrelle, maternity-colony roost.

Sadly, such roosts are being illegally destroyed in ignorance on a daily basis, when properties are re-roofed and/or or wooden boxed eaves are replaced with upvc, closely fitted to the wall, or sealed preventing bat access. Gaps in verge mortar-work where bats could gain access get covered with dry-verges such as these.

Any modernisation work here was done before the current owner acquired the property, but some droppings are on a stored carpet roll, and all stored items belong to the client. Therefore, there is no doubt that bat access is still possible to what was likely to have already been a roost. As the foot of the internal gable wall is quite hard to access, no attempt was made at this visit to lift the upper layer of modern-thickness, insulating material, to check for historic droppings below.

The number of droppings seen was quite small, suggesting use by no more than a small number of bats. On reviewing the photographic evidence, more droppings were seen, and it is possible there are more droppings in obscured locations, including between breathable membrane and roof-tiles. Droppings could also be in the cavity wall and at the wall-head.

If re-roofing eliminated verge mortar-work and the open edges of the roof were then simply covered with the dry-verge, once bats get behind the dry-verge they will have easy access to roost between tiles and felt, as well as on the wall-head and in the cavity wall.

The species involved is almost certainly the common pipistrelle bat, with a lower likelihood of soprano pipistrelle. This can probably be confirmed in the course of bat activity survey work but if not, a sample of droppings already collected can be sent for dna analysis.

Although a roost has already been confirmed here, it isn't possible to get the necessary licence from Natural England without undertaking more work to try to establish

whether or not this is a maternity colony roost, and roughly how many bats and of what species use the roost.

Up to 3 surveys may be needed because common pipistrelles in particular usually change roost frequently and are unpredictable about when they use each roost known to them.

In this case, because young aren't born until June/July, and it's necessary to be as sure as possible that this isn't a maternity colony roost, I recommend one survey in mid-June and another in mid-late July, leaving time for a third in August/September if necessary. These should be undertaken in favourable weather conditions. At least one repeat loft inspection will be necessary also. Further recommendations will be made based on the findings.

The licence can be applied-for when the status of the roost is sufficiently well understood. The type of licence required depends on whether the roost is used by a maternity colony or not.

Natural England require appropriate compensation for the loss of the roost to be made, as a minimum. If the roost turns-out to be of a small number of bats only - not a maternity colony - this can take the form of integrated bat boxes in the extension. The provision to be made will need greater consideration if the roost is of a maternity colony.

2. Introduction

I was asked to assess the importance of this property to bats as part of the planning process, prior to the construction of a two-storey extension to the side and part of the rear.

Incidentally I comment on any issues discovered with respect to other protected/priority/invasive species and species of conservation concern.

This is a modern-style, semi-detached house:



Front (west) and rear elevations

It is in a semi-rural location. It fronts a railway line with a wooded belt about 75m beyond, containing Showley Brook. This links with woodland associated with Knotts Brook about 200m away.



Location of property indicated by red circle

The pipistrelle bat (2 species: *Pipistrellus pipistrellus -* the common pipistrelle, and *Pipistrellus pygmaeus -* the soprano pipistrelle) is common and widespread in the area.

Roosts of these species can occur in any building that provides suitable roosting crevices, with the risk of bat presence increased by close proximity to good bat feeding habitat and commuting routes; for example tree-lines, hedges, woodland, scrub and water courses and bodies. The bats use different roosts at different times of year, sometimes singly and sometimes in large groups of females with dependent young. They can move frequently and unpredictably between the roost sites known to them. The majority of house-holders with a roost of this species are unaware of it.

In summer females gather together each with their single off-spring in, sometimes large, maternity colony groups. Disturbance can cause the abandonment of babies (pups). In autumn when the young are independent, females visit males to mate. In winter the bats hibernate and rousing from hibernation - a slow process - can result in a depletion of fat reserves that may compromise the bats' ability to survive the winter. Females become pregnant in spring when their food (insects) becomes available again.

Pipistrelle bats in particular are extremely small, weighing about 5g (the weight of a 2p coin) so need only the smallest of gaps in order to enter to roost; often making use of external features and wall cavities without leaving signs in the loft/interior.

A search of DEFRA's Magic database discovered that within 2kms, two bat European Protected Species licences had been granted for developments involving common pipistrelles, both about 1500m away.

A data search from the National Biodiversity Network discovered common and soprano pipistrelle bats, and noctule (*Nyctalus noctula*), within 1 km, with no additional species within 2kms. As these findings did not add to my personal expectations, the sources of the records were not examined and have not been acknowledged. There were no bat records within 500m.

Other species likely to occur within 2 kilometres include the brown long-eared (*Plecotus auritus*) - the species most likely to leave evidence of roosting within barns and lofts, the whiskered (*Myotis mystacinus*)/Brandt's (*Myotis brandtii*), which are hard to separate without dna analysis, and Daubenton's (*Myotis daubentonii*), with other species such as the Natterer's (*Myotis nattereri*) possible.

Breeding birds.

Buildings generally can be used by birds of conservation concern (1), such as the house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*), house martin (*Delichon urbicum*), swift (*Apus apus*) and starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*). The house sparrow and starling are both listed in Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) as species "of principal importance for the purpose of conserving biodiversity".

3. Bats and the Law

All British bats and their roosts are legally protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act of 1981 (as amended) and the EC Habitats Directive of 1994 as implemented by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

Where a development will destroy a bat roost, a Low Impact Class Licence or a European Protected Species Licence (Mitigation Licence) is required before the roost can be interfered with in any way. The former applies in cases where only small numbers of common species of bat are using the building within certain parameters. It usually takes approximately 2 weeks for these licences to be issued, whereas the turn-around time for a full European Protected Species Licence is approximately 7 weeks once the application has been submitted. Any licence issued is a legally binding document.

Licences can only be issued providing planning permission has been granted, where applicable.

When a roost is found, both the bat consultant and the planners have to apply the "three tests" required by Natural England. Essentially these are:

- That the development is necessary for the purpose of "preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequence of primary importance for the environment";
- That there is "no satisfactory alternative";
- That the action authorised "will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range".

N.b. The way in which the necessity is assessed includes whether the client has an alternative that it would be reasonable to expect them to adopt.

Necessary mitigation and compensation measures to ensure the favourable conservation status of bats will be maintained, would include appropriate timing and methodology for the work, including details of how the bats will be provided-for in the long term.

Planners are required by the Government to satisfy themselves before granting planning consent that it would be possible for a licence to be obtained if necessary. Accordingly they are obliged to apply the three tests before issuing consent. For this reason enough survey work has to have been undertaken that the planning authority can evaluate whether or not the three tests can be satisfied and what degree of compensation/enhancement is necessary. To avoid delays in obtaining consent it is in the client's best interest to find out sooner rather than later whether any bat roosting issues need to be addressed.

Natural England, the Government body responsible for administering the law relating to bats, have issued guidelines to planners on how to proceed with respect to bats

Outside the planning system, the onus is on developers/members of the public, to have sufficient investigations undertaken to satisfy themselves (and the authorities in the event of a subsequent investigation), that their actions are unlikely to be in contravention of bat legislation.

<u>*N.b.*</u> It should always be remembered that bats often roost in places not anticipated by a lay person, such as modern buildings, trees with cavities, and bridges. Some leave no signs in lofts, as they roost underneath external features such as roof slates, ridges, weather-boarding and cladding.

In the case of a building, tree or other feature not already known to be a bat roost, if bats are found during the course of work, contractors are legally obliged to stop work and seek advice. This should be from an appropriately experienced and licenced bat ecologist.

Breeding birds.

The Wildlife and Countryside Act of 1981 gives protection to the nests of all wild birds whilst being built or in use, including by newly fledged birds that have not left the immediate vicinity of the nest. The bird nesting season is generally considered to be 1st March to 31st July for most species but can extend a number of weeks either side of this depending on the species concerned and weather conditions in that particular year. Natural England cite the nesting season as being 1st March to 31st August.

A consortium of organisations, via their report on "The population status of birds in the UK: Birds of Conservation Concern 5 (2021)" have listed species according to their conservation need based on red, amber, green basis, where red is of the highest conservation concern.

Additional Relevant Legislation and Policy.

Between 1995 and 2010 certain more vulnerable habitats and species were the subject of National or Local Biodiversity Action Plans. This strategy for the protection of biodiversity has been superseded by UK post-2010 Biodiversity Framework, which is largely now implemented at county level. Internationally The Convention on Biodiversity produced a Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. Further to this the EU Biodiversity Strategy was launched in 2011.

Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 lists species "of principal importance for the purpose of conserving biodiversity". The list was

up-dated in 2014 and includes the brown long-eared bat (*Plecotus auritus*), noctule (*Nyctalus noctula*) soprano pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pygmaeus*) and 4 other bat species.

The National Planning Policy Framework of 2012 (2) states that "the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment" by a number of means, including "minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks...."

4. <u>Survey</u>

I made a daytime visit on **21/3/24** to undertake a preliminary survey of the building, assess its likely importance to bats and advise whether or not a precautionary approach or further survey work is needed.

Having been involved with bat survey work for 37 years and consultancy work for 28 years, it is always my objective to carry-out my work in a manner consistent with accepted Good Practice Guidelines (3) and consistent with the code of practice of the CIEEM. I hold Natural England Class Licences CL21 (Annex B) and 18. Amongst other things these cover me to apply for Low Impact Licences for clients and undertake bat survey work. I also have a CL29 Barn Owl Class Licence. My credentials are expanded-upon in Appendix 1. The basic criteria I use for assessing the level of risk of roosting are given in Appendix 2.

As far as possible, I surveyed the building inside and out with the aid of surveyor's ladders, 2 million candle-power torch, camera with 6x optical zoom and binoculars (8x42). Head-torch, 10x 50 binoculars, fibrescope (6 and 13mm heads, extendable to 2m), camera with 18x zoom and mirrors were also available if needed.

I was looking for access to potential roosting places and evidence of their use, such as droppings and staining.

I also take into consideration the surrounding habitat and the range of bat species it appears likely to support, along with the quality of the habitat linkages with the wider area.

The survey was conducted with the needs of different species of bat over the seasons in mind.

Incidentally I comment on any relevant issues discovered with respect to bat feeding habitat and commuting routes, possibly including likely roosting sites nearby, as well as any relevant findings with respect to other protected/invasive species, biodiversity priority species and species of conservation concern.

5. <u>Limitations of the survey</u>

This was a preliminary survey to discover whether there are obvious signs of use by bats and to assess potential for use. If potential exists, usually follow-up work is required at dusk or dawn, possibly at a more appropriate time of year.

The area around the loft hatch was congested and there was a water tank obscuring much of the inner gable apex.

It should be noted that droppings are the sign most frequently found, but they are often deposited in areas that cannot be easily visualised, if at all, and they can turn to powder quite quickly. They are usually soon washed and blown away from exposed external surfaces so evidence of use often doesn't last long and pipistrelle bats in particular can change roosts frequently. However an assessment has been made of potential bat roosting places associated with the exterior of the building.

There are additional limitations to undertaking a bat survey in winter, when bats are hibernating and largely inactive. Droppings from the summer may no longer be evident.

As bats often roost in crevices in winter, and are particularly hard to locate when hibernating, the report will highlight any areas that could be used by bats in winter without their presence necessarily being obvious.

6. Findings

Access to the end, gable wall was quite congested and the apex was obscured by a water tank close to the wall.

However, a few bat droppings were evident on a roll of stored carpet and on the wall:



These droppings looked quite fresh.

It was possible to photograph behind the water tank, revealing more droppings on the truss alongside the gable wall:



These looked older.

A few more were evident on the wall immediately below the apex:



Amongst general debris, a few more were seen on top of the insulating material:



A few bat droppings were collected to allow them to be sent for dna analysis if necessary.

It is possible some of the staining on the breathable membrane, with which the roof is lined, is the result of bats roosting between the tiles and felt:



Possible staining from bat presence above, illustrated in red

Externally, the property is fitted with a dry verge and the eaves are sealed:



Although it wasn't possible to stand next to the wall to visualise and photograph the soffit, due to the presence of the single-storey garage, this seemed to include the gable end, including the gable apex:



Accordingly, it's uncertain how bats are gaining access, but if it's not at the soffit, it's probable there are some gaps where bats can get behind the dry-verge:



Gaps possibly allowing bats access, shown in red

Otherwise, there is bat access behind both flashing and the dry-verge to the singlestorey, attached garage:



There is also access available under hip ridge tiles to the garage:



7. Conclusions/Discussion

Appendix 2 gives an outline of the criteria used in assessing the level of risk of use by bats.

Both fresh and older bat droppings were found in the loft, so there is no doubt this is an on-going bat roost. I believe any re-roofing and alterations at the eaves were done prior to the client taking ownership about a year ago. The stored carpet however belongs to the client.

The presence of a bat roost does not preclude development, but requires an appropriate licence from Natural England, as the work cannot be done without directly impacting the roost.

I believe this property is old enough that it probably had wooden boxed eaves originally and a roof-lining of bitumastic felt. The gable end faces south. At that time, so long as there was a gap between the soffit board and wall, even along part of its length, but especially at the gable apex, this would have been a prime location for a pipistrelle maternity colony roost.

Sadly, such roosts are being illegally destroyed in ignorance on a daily basis, when properties are re-roofed and/or or wooden boxed eaves are replaced with upvc, closely fitted to the wall or sealed, preventing bat access. Gaps in verge mortar-work where bats could gain access get covered with dry-verges such as these.

Any modernisation work here was done before the current owner acquired the property, but all stored items belong to her, so there is no doubt that bat access is still possible, to what was likely to have already been a roost. As the foot of the gable wall is quite hard to access no attempt was made at this visit to lift the upper layer of modern-thickness, insulating material, to check for historic droppings below.

My initial impression was that there were only a few droppings, suggesting use by no more than a small number of bats. On reviewing the photographic evidence, more droppings were seen, and it is possible there are more droppings in obscured locations, including between breathable membrane and roof-tiles. Droppings could also be in the cavity wall and at the wall-head.

If re-roofing eliminated verge mortar-work and the open edges of the roof were then simply covered with the dry-verge, once bats get behind the dry-verge they will have easy access to roost between tiles and felt, as well as on the wall-head and in the cavity wall. Although it seems access behind the dry-verge must be possible, because bats are clearly getting into the loft, the access now may be sufficiently difficult as to deter a maternity colony; but regardless of the findings of bat activity survey work in the warmer months, I think it should be assumed a maternity colony roost was illegally impacted when the modernisation work was done, and the opportunity should be taken at the time of this development to ensure easier access to a suitable roosting site for a maternity colony is provided.

The species involved is almost certainly the common pipistrelle bat, with a lower likelihood of soprano pipistrelle. This can probably be confirmed in the course of bat activity survey work but if not, the droppings collected can be sent for dna analysis.

Good Practice Guidelines suggest bat activity survey work is necessary even when the findings of the day survey were negative. The number of surveys is governed by the level of risk of bats roosting in the property without obvious signs having been left. See Appendix 3.

Although a roost has already been confirmed here, it isn't possible to get the necessary licence from Natural England without undertaking more work to try to establish whether or not this is a maternity colony roost, and roughly how many bats use the roost and of what species.

Up to 3 surveys may be needed because common pipistrelles in particular usually change roost frequently and are unpredictable about when they use each roost known to them.

For this reason, if more than one survey is necessary it is my usual practice to undertake one in both the first and second half of the main accepted bat survey period (May to August inclusive) and to separate them by at least three weeks; allowing time for a third survey before the end of the extended survey season - the end of September - if necessary. This also reduces the chance of missing a pipistrelle mating roost, if present, in the later part of the summer.

In this case, because young aren't born until June/July, and it's necessary to be as sure as possible that this isn't a maternity colony roost, I recommend one survey in mid-June and another in mid-late July, leaving time for a third in August/September if necessary. These should be undertaken in favourable weather conditions. At least one repeat loft inspection will be necessary also. At that time an attempt can be made to lift the new insulating material at the foot of the gable wall, to check for old bat droppings beneath.

The licence can be applied-for when the status of the roost is sufficiently well understood. The type of licence required depends on whether the roost is used by a maternity colony or not.

Natural England require appropriate compensation for the loss of the roost to be made, as a minimum. If the roost turns-out to be of a small number of bats only - not a maternity colony - this can take the form of integrated bat boxes in the extension. See Appendix 4. The provision to be made will need greater consideration if the roost is of a maternity colony.

8. <u>Recommendations</u>

These recommendations should be read in conjunction with the conclusions above.

Have a bat activity survey undertaken around mid-June and another around mid-late July.

Further recommendations will be made based on the findings.

9. <u>References</u>

- 1. Eaton, M. A. et al. (2015). Birds of Conservation Concern 5: the status of all regularly occurring birds in the UK, Channel Islands and Isle of Man. British Birds 114: 723-747.
- 2. Department for Communities and Local Government (2012). National Planning Policy Framework.
- 3. Ed. by Collins, J. (2023). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines Fourth Edition. Bat Conservation Trust.
- 4. Bat Conservation Trust (2018). Guidance Note 8/18: Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK.

© Angela Graham. March 2024.

Appendix 1 - Angela Graham's Experience.

- I hold Natural England Class Licences CL21 (Annex B) Registered Consultant 163 - and CL18 (CL18 (2015 11871 - CLS-CLS). CL21 covers me to apply for Low Impact Class Licences for clients - a more stream-lined system for quickly obtaining a licence from Natural England when a roost of a small number of common bat species will be impacted-upon by the development. CL18 covers me for survey/consultancy/scientific work. I have a supplementary licence to possess up to 10 live/dead bat specimens (20123429). I have a CL29 licence to disturb barn owls.
- I'm a member of The Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management.
- I undertake my work in accordance with the principles outlined in the Bat Conservation Trust's "Good Practice Guidelines".
- I have been involved in bat conservation for over 30 years, initially as a member of the South Lancashire Bat Group from its inception in 1987 and as a volunteer with the Nature Conservancy Council (NCC) - first licenced in 1989. Later, and for many years, I was Co-ordinator/Chair and Trainer for the South Lancashire Bat Group. I trained the people who currently run the group, one of whom has been a Trustee for the Bat Conservation Trust. I was a founder member of the Greater Manchester Bat Group in 2002 and ran the group for 4 years.
- Over the last 27 years I have done increasing numbers of bat surveys on a consultancy basis, firstly part-time then full time from December 2003.
- My experience in applying-for European Protected Species Licences with respect to bats spans over 20 years.
- From 2003 to 2008 I represented the bat groups of the north-west region at national bat worker meetings, hosted by the Bat Conservation Trust.

Other experience includes:

- Attending bat-worker conferences every year since 1988 (mainly England, some in Wales) plus additional symposia on specific topics such as mitigation and woodland bats.
- Helping with winter surveys of underground hibernation sites in Clwyd and north Lancashire.
- Participating in "Bat Detector Workshops" during the 1990s in different areas of the country, concerned with locating bat roosts and feeding sites/commuting routes.
- Sitting on local council "Wildlife Advisory Groups" (WAGs) in the Greater Manchester area from the early 1990s until around 2005.
- Helping local authorities and the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit formulate their Biodiversity Action Plans for bats.
- Administering the bat casework for English Nature (now Natural England) in the South Lancashire and Greater Manchester areas over 1998-2000.
- Assisting with research involving mist netting, harp trapping and radio-tracking.
- Continuing to attend courses run by recognised experts to ensure I stay up-to date both with respect to bat survey-work and conservation, and issues such as health and safety.
- Re-passing the Construction Site (CITB) Operatives test in June 2017.
- Contributing to the Bat Conservation Trust's survey standards guidelines.

Other ecological experience includes:

- Bird watching for fun since 1982 with a general interest in wildlife, ecology and conservation for a similar period.
- Attending short courses and field training with respect to grasses, flowering plants, British mammals including water voles, reptiles and amphibians, non-native invasive plant species, Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveying, National Vegetation Classification, Environmental Impact Assessment and use of GIS.
- Taking part in British Trust for Ornithology breeding bird surveys annually.
- A year-long sandwich placement assisting with badger research, including radiotracking.
- Short periods of voluntary work with the Lancashire Wildlife Trust and Royal Society for Protection of Birds.

Appendix 2 - Personally-devised criteria used in assessing risk of roosting (in the absence of obvious evidence at the preliminary survey).

Risk of roosting	Definition	Suggested Action
Nil	Whole of structure/tree can be seen well enough to be sure there are no roosting opportunities.	No need to consider bats further unless development is delayed and potential roosting places might develop in time.
Minimal/ negligible	All or most of structure/tree can be seen well enough to suggest there are few, if any, places suitable for roosting and the location does not provide easy access to potential feeding grounds.	Although roosting is thought to be unlikely and therefore the development is unlikely to impact on the favourable conservation status of bats, a precautionary approach should be taken in relevant areas at the time of the work. Further survey work needed only if development delayed.
Low	Whole of structure/tree can be seen well enough to know there are no more than a few openings that could be used by an individual bat or two and/or these provide access to the sorts of features that are likely to be suboptimal due to materials and/or conditions within (eg unstable temperature); and/or the location provides limited access to potential feeding grounds.	Although regular roosting is thought to be relatively unlikely and the development is unlikely to impact on the favourable conservation status of bats, a single survey at dusk or dawn in favourable weather conditions would be appropriate to accord with good practice. This would reduce the extent to which the judgement is based on speculation. If the findings were ambiguous e.g. possible bat emergence and/or considerable bat activity around the building, the survey would need repeating.
Moderate/ medium	A small number of openings are present in an area of reasonable habitat, and at least some seem likely to provide access to good conditions for roosting bats, and/or a loft/hay-loft is present that appears to have good qualities for roosting but there were limitations to access or no evidence of bats was found at the time. Cellars may be assessed as potentially being suitable for hibernation in winter,	Further work is needed to better assess the abundance of bat activity in the vicinity and whether or not bats seem to make use of the roosting potential available. To accord with good practice a dusk emergence survey and a dawn return-to- roost survey will be necessary. A second inspection of the interior may also be necessary - if the survey was undertaken in winter for example. As the absence of bats on two occasions wouldn't guarantee absence at other

	but the conditions and/or location aren't optimal.	times, possibly including winter, some precautions would be needed at the time of the work and some roosting potential should be retained/re-created. In the case of cellars and equivalent, inspection in winter is necessary. Some work, for example pointing old stone walls, should be avoided in winter.
High	There is at least one feature that is typical of those favoured by bats for regular roosting and it/they provide access to abundant insect food on-site and/or via good links with the wider natural environment. The feature/s could be suitable for use by a maternity colony, either as a main or satellite roost, or by a territorial male in autumn in the case of pipistrelles, or by individuals or small numbers of bats at any time of year, including winter when hibernating.	The extent to which bats of different species make use of the potential available needs to be investigated by carrying-out at least 3 surveys at dusk and/or dawn spaced over the months of May to September inclusive, possibly extending into April or October if weather conditions are favourable. (Air temperature above 8°C and not more than light rain and/or gentle breeze. I generally plan to do surveys only when the forecast is for 10°C or above.) Maternity colonies have largely disbanded by September, but territorial male pipistrelles may be missed without a survey in September and a lot of smaller roosts are discovered at this time of year. As bats could hibernate unseen in winter and/or roost at other times not covered by the survey work, appropriate precautions would be needed at the time of the work along with maintenance of appropriate potential roosting places.
High - hibernation only	Cave-like places with stable conditions and high humidity, such as cellars can be used for hibernation in winter.	High-risk potential hibernation sites need at least 3 inspections spaced over the winter months as bats will move between sites depending on the weather conditions.

Appendix 3 - Recommendations for further survey work when the findings of the preliminary survey were negative.

N.b. new Good Practice Guidelines were published in late 2023, but the guidance has changed little from that shown below, except to extend the recommended minimum period between surveys to 3 weeks and put more emphasis on the use of infra-red recording equipment.

Bat Conservation Trust Table 7.3 Recommended minimum number of survey visits for presence/absence surveys to give confidence in a High roost suitability Low roost suitability Moderate roost suitability Three separate survey visits. At least one Two separate survey visits. One dusk One survey visit. One dusk emergence or dusk emergence and a separate dawn redawn re-entry survey[®] (structures). emergence and a separate dawn re-entry entry survey. The third visit could be either survey.b dusk or dawn.b No further surveys required (trees). * Structures that have been categorised as low potential can be problematic and the number of surveys required should be judged on a case-by-cose

^a Structures that have been categorised as low potential can be problematic and the number of surveys required should be judged on a case-of-ect basis (see Section 5.2.9). If there is a possibility that quiet calling, late-emerging species are present then a dawn survey may be more approximiting weather conditions are suitable. In some cases, more than one survey may be needed, particularly where there are several buildings in the category.

^b Multiple survey visits should be spread out to sample as much of the recommended survey period (see Table 7.1) as possible; it is recomme surveys are spaced at least two weeks apart, preferably more. A dawn survey immediately after a dusk one is considered only one visit.

Taken from "Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines", 3rd Edition (2)

 Table 7.1
 Recommended timings for presence/absence surveys to give confidence in a negative result for structures

 (also recommended for trees but unlikely to give confidence in a negative result).

low most suitability	High roost suitability	
Low roose surconity	Moderate roost suitability	ingh roost suitaointy
May to August (structures)	May to September ^a with at least one of surveys between May and August ^b	May to September ^a with at least two of
No further surveys required (trees)	Surveys between may and August	Surveys octivicen may and August

September surveys are both weather- and location-dependent. Conditions may become more unsuitable in these months, particularly in more Northerleylatitudes, which may reduce the length of the survey season.

Multiple survey visits should be spread out to sample as much of the recommended survey period as possible; it is recommended that surveys are spaced at least two weeks apart, preferably more, unless there are specific ecological reasons for the surveys to be closer together (for example, a more accurate: count of a maternity colony is required but it is likely that the colony will soon disperse). If there is potential for a maternity colony then consideration should be given to detectability. A survey on 31 August followed by a mid-September survey is unlikely to pick up a maternity colony. An ecologist should use their professional judgement to design the most appropriate survey regime.

Taken from "Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines", 3rd Edition (2)

Appendix 4 – examples of available integrated bat boxes

N.b. An internet search for "integrated bat boxes" will bring up types and suppliers of these boxes but advice from the bat consultant should be sought before they are ordered.

EcoSurv Habibat http://www.habibat.co.uk/category/bat-boxes

"Designed to be built into an exterior wall and is available in a variety of faces to match the building. Standard facings of red or blue brick - ideal for new builds - are normally available from stock, or boxes can be made to your specific requirements with a face of brick, stone, timber, or plain (for rendering). Supplied un-pointed."



Example of Habibat boxes Can also be faced with stone.

<u>Ibstock Ecozone</u> <u>https://www.ibstock.co.uk/product/ecohabitats/bat-box?page=1&</u>





Above: typical unit in situ. Photo © Angela Graham



<u>Cast Stone</u>. <u>https://www.clickcaststone.co.uk/products/cast-stone-ecohabitats/shop/cast-stone-bat-box/</u>



Dimensions: 440 x 100 x 215mm, with a 60 x 55mm aperture.



Above: typical unit of this design in situ. Photo © Angela Graham

<u>Green and Blue Bat Block/Brick</u> https://www.greenandblue.co.uk/products/bat-block-bat-brick



Green and Blue Bat Block/Brick in situ

Schwegler 1FR/2FR

An internet search for Schwegler bat boxes will readily bring up suppliers of these boxes



Schwegler 1FR/2FR