

# Preliminary Bat Roost Assessment Report

Lynridge,  
Holme Lane,  
Sutton-in-Craven,  
BD20 7LL

31.08.2022



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

## **Summary**

In August 2022 Batworker consultancy was commissioned to undertake a survey of a Lynridge, Holme Lane, Sutton-in-Craven, BD20 7LL to assess the potential for use by bats and breeding birds.

A daytime survey was carried out on 25<sup>th</sup> August 2022 to support residential development plans including 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 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 August 2022 Batworker consultancy was commissioned to undertake a survey of a Lynridge, Holme Lane, Sutton-in-Craven, BD20 7LL to assess the potential for use by bats and breeding birds.

A daytime survey was carried out on 25<sup>th</sup> August 2022 to support residential development plans including works to the roof.

## 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 SE0057244334

## Site Description

The property consists of a semi detached house with a hipped slate roof. External walls are rendered and pebble dashed with no cracks, crevices or cavities present. Soffits are close fitting and well sealed.

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

The property can be considered to offer negligible 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 EPS licence application within a 1km radius.

EPSM2010-1787      SE00584400    Destruction of a common pipistrelle breeding place.

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, often associated with lowland woodland, but 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 typically 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 in a mosaic of improved, semi improved and amenity grassland, scattered mature deciduous tree cover, and semi natural riparian 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:

- ! Exposure Diablo 1300 lumen 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	25.08.2022	1 Hour

### **Survey constraints**

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

## **Survey Results**

### **Visual Inspection - Bats**

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

No evidence (in the form of scattered droppings, urine splashing, feeding remains or grease marking) to suggest use by bats was recorded despite numerous undisturbed horizontal surfaces being present at a time of year when such evidence should be present.

### **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 building was assessed as offering negligible roosting potential.

Given the lack of roosting potential it is considered that the development proposals do not risk negative impacts on 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 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, contact Natural England where necessary, 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.