

Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Report

**7 Clayton Grove,
Salesbury,
BB1 9HJ**

26.07.2021



**Report prepared by:
Dave Anderson
Batworker.com**



Summary

In July 2021 Batworker consultancy was commissioned to undertake a survey of 7 Clayton Grove, Salesbury, BB1 9HJ to assess the potential for use by bats and breeding birds.

A daytime survey was carried out on 21st July 2021 to support residential development plans including work to existing roofs.

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 July 2021 Batworker consultancy was commissioned to undertake a survey of 7 Clayton Grove, Salisbury, BB1 9HJ to assess the potential for use by bats and breeding birds.


A daytime survey was carried out on 21st July 2021 to support residential development plans including work to existing roofs.

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 SD6802432902


Site Description

The property consists of a two storey end terraced brick built house with a double pitched slate roof. A single storey extension with a single pitched slate roof is present to the rear of the building.

External walls are well pointed no obvious cavities, cracks, gaps or crevices present. The gables are well sealed. Lead flashing where present is close fitting. Fascia boards are close fitting with no obvious gaps present.

Roof slates are close fitting with no lifted, slipped or missing slates present. The ridge is well sealed.

The building 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) website revealed no EPS licence applications within a 1km radius.

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 by meadows and rough grassland sites. Often roosting in barns.

Habitat



The property is located in an urban position with surrounding habitat a mosaic of improved and semi improved grassland, with remnant hedgerow and deciduous tree cover on field boundaries, and semi natural deciduous woodland cover.

Connectivity to the wider landscape is good. Bat foraging potential is 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

Survey	Date	Timings
Visual	21.07.2021	1 Hour

Survey constraints

Access to all areas of the exterior of the buildings 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 current Covid19 restrictions and IUCN BSG advice to batworkers no internal inspection was carried out, however given the well sealed nature of the building this was not considered a constraint.

Survey Results

Visual Inspection - Bats

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

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

No evidence of roosting bats was observed on the exterior of the buildings.

Visual Inspection – Nesting birds

No evidence of nesting birds was recorded.

Evaluation of the results

No evidence of use by bats was recorded during the survey and the building was assessed as offering negligible roosting potential due to a lack of potential roosting features and the general well maintained and well sealed 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.

Suitability	Description Roosting habitats	Commuting and foraging habitats
Negligible	Negligible habitat features are visible only for the used by roosting bats.	Negligible habitat features are unlikely to be used by commuting or foraging bats.
Low	A structure or tree with one or more potential roosting sites that could be used by bats but only a potential site for roosting. However, more potential roosting sites at purpose designed roosting shelter, protected or unaggregated and there could be the same and the same as the same or it may not be used by a large number of bats. It is unlikely to be used by a large number of bats.	Habitat that could be used by a small number of commuting bats but not by a large number of commuting bats. It is unlikely to be used by a large number of commuting bats.
Medium	A structure or tree with one or more potential roosting sites that could be used by bats but only a potential site for roosting. However, more potential roosting sites at purpose designed roosting shelter, protected or unaggregated and there could be the same and the same as the same or it may not be used by a large number of bats. It is unlikely to be used by a large number of bats.	Habitat that could be used by a small number of commuting bats but not by a large number of commuting bats. It is unlikely to be used by a large number of commuting bats.
High	A structure or tree with one or more potential roosting sites that could be used by bats but only a potential site for roosting. However, more potential roosting sites at purpose designed roosting shelter, protected or unaggregated and there could be the same and the same as the same or it may not be used by a large number of bats. It is unlikely to be used by a large number of bats.	Habitat that could be used by a small number of commuting bats but not by a large number of commuting bats. It is unlikely to be used by a large number of commuting bats.

From Bat Survey Guidelines 3rd Edition

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 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.

Proposed Biodiversity Net Gain

The installation of a Greenwoods Ecohabitats Two Chamber Bat Box or Kent Bat Box within the site would provide roosting potential for the local bat population.

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 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.

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.