

Angela Graham Bat Consultancy Service Limited

Office 47, Bury Business Centre, Kay Street, Bury, Lancs, BL9 6BU

tel - 0161 763 6171, fax - 0161 761 7854, mob - 07710 184142

e-mail : bat.consultancy@talktalk.net Company no. 7492656



Bat Survey Report (preliminary day-time survey):
Tithe Barn,
212 Lower Lane,
Rochdale,
OL16 4PT

OS grid reference:
SD 9115 11384

Commissioned-by:
Emma Pickles

Survey Date: 9/5/23

Report Date: 16/5/23

Table of Contents

1. Summary	page 3
2. Introduction	page 4
3. Bats and the law	page 7
4. Survey	page 8
5. Limitations of the Survey	page 9
6. Findings	page 10
7. Conclusions/Discussion	page 15
8. Recommendations	page 17
9. References	page 17
 Appendix 1 - Angela Graham's Experience	 page 18
Appendix 2 - Criteria used in assessing risk of roosting (in the absence of obvious evidence of roosting)	page 20
Appendix 3 - Recommendations for further survey work when the findings of the preliminary survey were negative	page 21

N.b. Copyright 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 L-shaped barn/stables block which has already been largely converted to form part of the living accommodation associated with the adjoining house; is now to be separated from the house and redeveloped as a new dwelling.

It is in area undergoing increasing development, but currently there is still good bat feeding habitat immediately available.

There was no obvious access for bats to the interiors of the buildings for development. There may be bat access to the house loft but it was not possible to enter it on the day to double-check on the absence of signs of roosting. The concern is that any maternity colony within that loft might be disturbed at a vulnerable stage in its life cycle by work to the adjoining building. The likelihood of such a roost being present is low however. In addition, it appears most if not all work to convert the buildings will be done internally, reducing the risk of disturbance.

The east-facing eaves of what I labelled building 2 in the report, have access available for bats and there appeared to be a few bat droppings on the wall towards eaves-level. The client reports that birds nest there. There was no clear evidence of this on the day but the photographic evidence showed what appeared to be traces of bird whitewash on the wall. This did not appear to be fresh.

Otherwise only the south-facing and north-facing eaves of what I have labelled building 1 appear suitable to allow bat access.

The roofs of all three buildings have slates/stones beneath which there is some access for bats to roost.

Given that bat droppings seemed to be present I've had no choice but assess building 2 as being at high risk of some roosting activity pending the results of further survey work. Building 1 is at moderate risk.

Good Practice Guidelines suggest even low risk buildings should have a bat activity survey (emergence at dusk or to return-to-roost at dawn) when the findings of the initial survey were negative. Those at high risk should have three.

I'm provisionally recommending two surveys of both buildings and the north-facing gable end of the house, but a third is likely to be necessary, at least of building 2.

As bats use buildings in different ways over the course of the season, often changing roost; if more than one survey is necessary it is my usual practice to undertake one in both the first and second half of the accepted bat survey period (May to August/September inclusive) and to separate them by at least a month; leaving enough time for a third before the end of the September if necessary.

The confirmation of roosting would not preclude development but would require an appropriate licence from Natural England if the roost were to be impacted by the work.

Care should be taken when planning any lighting on the site, to ensure any known roosts or potential roosting features are appropriately shielded.

It should be borne in mind that birds' nests are legally protected throughout the nesting process.

2. Introduction

I was asked to assess the importance of this building to bats as part of the planning process, prior to development as a dwelling separate from the currently attached house. Incidentally I comment on any issues discovered with respect to other protected/priority/invasive species and species of conservation concern.

This is an L-shaped barn/stables block which has already been largely converted for residential use in the past, forming part of the living accommodation associated with the adjoining house. It is now to be separated from the house and redeveloped as a new dwelling. Both elements of the building are shown below:



Building as seen from north-east and south-west respectively

The layout of the site - numbering the buildings separately and including the attached house - is shown in Fig. 1 below:



Fig. 1. Buildings as numbered 1 and 2 as attached to house

The property is located between modern housing estates and part of the Kingsway Business Park development:



Fig. 2. 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 two bat European Protected Species licence had been granted for developments involving the common pipistrelle about 1.5kms away and another for both common and soprano pipistrelle about 1.7kms away. There were no others within 2kms. This must be because only roosts licenced under the most recent licencing scheme have been included. More were undoubtedly impacted in the course of undertaking the Kingsway Business Park development.

A data search from the National Biodiversity Network discovered only records of common pipistrelle within 1 and 2 kms. There were none within 500m. As these findings did not add to my personal knowledge, the sources of the records were not examined and have not been acknowledged.

The likelihood of any other species frequenting the vicinity of this building is quite low, though it's possible some whiskered (*Myotis mystacinus*)/Brandt's (*Myotis brandtii*) or brown long-eared (*Plecotus auritus*), may be present as the site opposite provides good bat feeding habitat. I understand this too is to be developed however.

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".

Farm buildings in particular are often used by swallows (*Hirundo rustica*) for nesting and can be used by barn owls (*Tyto alba*). The barn owl has special protection as a "Schedule 1" species. These buildings can be used by other birds of conservation concern such as stock doves (*Columba oenas*) and kestrels (*Falco tinnunculus*) as well as more

common species species such as the pied wagtail (*Motacilla alba*) jackdaw (*Corvus monedula*), wren (*Troglodytes troglodytes*), blue tit (*Cyanistes caeruleus*), great it (*Parus major*), robin (*Erithacus rubecula*) and blackbird (*Turdus merula*).

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.

N.b. 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. Survey

I made a daytime visit on **9/5/23** 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 35 years and consultancy work for 26 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.

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. Limitations of the survey

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. See Appendix 3.

As the house is attached to the more southerly element, it had been hoped to inspect the loft but access was not available to the hatch on the day.

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.

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

The buildings have a large, well-stocked garden to the west and a tree-lined lane to the east. Beyond this currently is an overgrown site providing good bat feeding habitat.

The building consists of two elements (see Fig. 1) with lined, vaulted ceilings:



Buildings 1 and 2 respectively (see Fig. 1)

The more northerly - building 2 - is essentially still a barn on two levels.

There was no obvious bat access available to the interior of either element.

House.

It appears that a loft suitable for use by a typical loft-dwelling species of bat, such as the brown long-eared, exists in the house:



Bat access was apparently available at the east-facing wall-head of the house:



It was evident the roof has been lined with breathable membrane.

At/close-to the gable end overlooking building 1, there are a few uneven roof-stones present:



Examples of gaps large enough for bats illustrated in red (house)

The proximity of this gable end to building 1 is shown below:



House (white walls in left of pictures) and building 1

Apart from what has been noted above the house was not included in the survey.

Building 1

'Sparrow-terracing' has been fitted to the northern elevation of building 1 and is currently being used by nesting blue-tits. It can be seen in the second photograph above.

There is access apparently available for bats at the south-facing eaves and probably the north-facing eaves also:



North and south-facing eaves of building 1 respectively

The roof has clearly been lined with breathable membrane

The east-facing eaves of building 1 appear sealed:




It has a roof of stone and there are some potential bat access places present:



Examples of gaps large enough for bats illustrated in red

There was also apparently a gap at the junction between building 1 and the house, on the south side:



Gap illustrated in red


Building 2

The easterly elevation of building 2 appeared to show bat droppings on the wall. It was hard to photograph these well, partly due to the hedge growing alongside the wall. There were clearly also debris and cobwebs present, but I was satisfied that a few bat droppings were there also. An attempt has been made to illustrate this below:



Features thought to be bat droppings illustrated in red

The client mentioned that birds nest at the eaves. At the time I saw no evidence of this, but in the photo below it appears there is some bird white-wash on the wall.



Possible bird white-wash shown in orange; probable bat droppings shown in red

Either way there is certainly access available for bats to roost.

In contrast the north-facing, west-facing and south-facing eaves are sealed, including the west-facing eaves of building 1:



The roof of building 2 is of slate and is in generally good condition, but there are some available gaps that would allow bats beneath the slates:



Examples of gaps large enough for bats illustrated in red

7. Conclusions/Discussion

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

There is no obvious access for bats to the interiors of buildings 1 and 2. There may be access to the house loft, which is adjacent to building 1. There was no access available to inspect the house loft on the day to double-check on the absence of signs of roosting. The concern is that any maternity colony within that loft might be disturbed at a vulnerable

stage in its life cycle by work to the adjoining building. The likelihood of such a roost being present is low however. In addition, it appears most if not all work to convert the buildings will be done internally, reducing the risk of disturbance.

The east-facing eaves of building 2 have access available for bats and there appeared to be a few bat droppings on the wall towards eaves level. The client reports that birds nest there. There was no clear evidence of this on the day but the photographic evidence showed what appeared to be traces of bird whitewash on the wall. This did not appear to be fresh.

Otherwise only the south-facing and north-facing eaves of building 1 appear suitable to allow bat access.

The roofs of all three buildings have slates/stones beneath which there is some access for bats to roost.

Although there has been much development in the area, apparently with more planned to the detriment of bat feeding habitat, currently there is immediate access for bats to good bat feeding habitat.

Given that bat droppings seemed to be present I've had no choice but to assess building 2 as being at high risk of some roosting activity; pending the results of further survey work.

Good Practice Guidelines suggest even low risk buildings should have a bat activity survey (emergence at dusk or to return-to-roost at dawn) when the findings of the initial survey were negative. Those at moderate risk should have two and those at high risk three. See Appendix 3.

I'm provisionally recommending two. As bats use buildings in different ways over the course of the season, often changing roost; if more than one survey is necessary it is my usual practice to undertake one in both the first and second half of the accepted bat survey period (May to August/September) inclusive and to separate them by at least a month; leaving enough time for a third before the end of the September if necessary. This also reduces the chance of missing pipistrelle mating roosts, if present, in the later part of the summer. Although surveys can be spaced at two-weekly intervals, this is only acceptable from a good practice perspective if such close spacing can be justified.

The confirmation of roosting would not preclude development but would require an appropriate licence from Natural England if the roost were to be impacted by the work.

Irrespective of the findings of future survey work, because individuals and small numbers of bats change roost frequently so could have been missed at the time of bat activity survey work, it would be good practice to provide alternative roosting places to compensate for any lost to the development. This would accord with the biodiversity objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Care should be taken when planning any lighting on the site, to ensure any known roosts or potential roosting features provided are appropriately shielded. (4)

It should be borne in mind that birds' nests are legally protected throughout the nesting process.

8. Recommendations

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

Have a dusk-emergence-survey undertaken in the first half of the May to August inclusive bat survey season. A second is needed, ideally in the second half of the season, but definitely at least a month after the first.

Further recommendations will be made based on the findings but a third bat activity survey may well be necessary.

9. References

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. (2016). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines - Third Edition. Bat Conservation Trust.
4. Bat Conservation Trust (2018). Guidance Note 8/18: Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK.

© Angela Graham. May 2023.

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 radio-tracking.
- 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.

Bat Conservation Trust

Table 7.3 Recommended minimum number of survey visits 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 roost suitability	Moderate roost suitability	High roost suitability
One survey visit. One dusk emergence or dawn re-entry survey ^a (structures). No further surveys required (trees).	Two separate survey visits. One dusk emergence and a separate dawn re-entry survey. ^b	Three separate survey visits. At least one dusk emergence and a separate dawn re-entry survey. The third visit could be either dusk or dawn. ^b

^a Structures that have been categorised as low potential can be problematic and the number of surveys required should be judged on a case-by-case 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 appropriate providing 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 recommended 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 roost suitability	Moderate roost suitability	High roost suitability
May to August (structures) No further surveys required (trees)	May to September ^a with at least one of surveys between May and August ^b	May to September ^a with at least two of surveys between May and August ^b

September surveys are both weather- and location-dependent. Conditions may become more unsuitable in these months, particularly in more northerly latitudes, 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)