BAT PRESENCE/ABSENCE SURVEYS OF:

TREVEAN, HIGHER TOWN, ST MARTIN'S, ISLES OF SCILLY, TR25 0QL

Client: Mr Mark Travers

Our reference: BS30aPAS - 2020

Planning reference: P/20/039

Report date: 13th August 2020

Author: James Faulconbridge MRes, MCIEEM

Report peer reviewed: Darren Mason

Report signed off: Sarah Mason

REPORT ISSUED IN ELECTRONIC FORMAT ONLY

This page is intentionally blank

Contents

Non-	-Technical Summary	4	
1.0	Introduction	5	
1.1	Background	5	
1.2	2 Survey Objectives	5	
2.0	Methodology	6	
2.1	Bat Dusk emergence survey	6	
2.2	2 Equipment	6	
2.3	Surveyor Details	6	
2.4	Survey Limitations	7	
3.0	Results	8	
3.1	Weather conditions, temperatures and timings	8	
3.2	2 Dusk emergence survey results	9	
3.3	B Dawn re-entry survey results	9	
4. E	Evaluation of Results		
5. R	Recommendations and Mitigation		
5.1	Further survey requirements		
5.2	2 EPS Licence requirement		
5.3	Planning Recommendation(s)		
5.4 Mitigation Proposals (Outline)			
Roo	ost Replacement		
Tim	ning of Works		
Ecc	ological Oversight		
Ecc	ological Enhancement E	rror! Bookmark not defined.	
Мо	onitoring		
6. R	References		
APPE	ENDIX A – BAT CONTACTS SURVEY TABLE		
APPE	ENDIX B – LEGISLATION AND LICENSING		
a) l	Legislation		
b) l	Licensing		
c) L	Licence timescales:		
d) 9	Scale of work involved:		
EPS	S Process		

Non-Technical Summary

- A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) and Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) was carried out at Trevean in Higher Town, St Martin's, Isles of Scilly, TR25 0QL to help inform the determination of Planning Application P/20/039. The survey identified bat droppings in the loft of the kitchen, confirmed as common pipistrelle by DNA analysis, and further concluded that the building had Moderate Potential to support roosting bats. Two presence/absence surveys were recommended and the results of these surveys are outlined in this Presence/Absence Survey (PAS) report.
- A dusk survey conducted on 23rd June 2020 and a dawn survey conducted on 10th August 2020 confirmed emergence and re-entry of a single common pipistrelle bat from the roost identified during the building inspections.
- The results confirm the presence of a non-breeding summer roost of a common species within the building at Trevean.
- An impact assessment identifies that the Proposed Works would result in the destruction of this roost and the potential to kill/injure common pipistrelle bat(s) if appropriate measures are not taken to protect this species.
- It is considered that appropriate mitigation measures can be put in place to ensure that the Proposed Works can proceed without negatively impacting the Favourable Conservation Status (FCS) of common pipistrelle bats on St Martin's in the long term. If minded to approve permission, it is recommended that the Decision Notice includes a compliance condition that works should proceed in accordance with the mitigation measures outlined.
- To ensure legislative compliance, it would be necessary for the works to be undertaken under a European Protected Species Mitigation License (EPSML).
- Mitigation measures recommended include appropriate timing of works, provision of a replacement roost and ecological oversight of works.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

A Preliminary Roost Assessment report (dated 17th June 2020) identified that the building under consideration provided Moderate roosting potential for bats. Additional presence/absence surveys were recommended to meet Best Practise Guidance to support a Planning Application. This report outlines the results of these additional surveys.

1.2 Survey Objectives

The objectives of this Presence and Absence Survey (PAS) report, is to provide further ecological information to support the planning proposal by:

- Ascertaining if roosting bats are present at the application site
- Identifying the location of these bat roosts (including exit/entry points)
- Subjecting this information (and the information from the PEA and PRA) to evaluation and impact assessment
- Providing advice on the potential for contravention of legislation/policy
- Providing recommendations on any further actions needed (i.e. further surveys, licensing, mitigation or enhancement).

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Bat Dusk emergence survey

The objective of the emergence and re-entry surveys was to assess the use of the site by bats, specifically to identify any entry/exit locations around the building. Survey effort was concentrated on areas of the site where suitable features or bat field signs were noted from the PRA.

The survey timings accord with Best Practise Guidance. Dusk surveys commenced 15 minutes before sunset and continued for 1.5h after sunset. Dawn surveys commenced 1.5h before sunrise and continued until 15 minutes after sunrise.

Identification of bat species was undertaken primarily through the use of ultrasound characteristics. To aid identification, flight and habitat characteristics were also noted (where possible) in order to determine the species.

The survey was designed with sufficient surveyors appropriate positioned to ensure that all potential access points to the building could be observed simultaneously.

2.2 Equipment

The following equipment was used for the dusk emergence survey at the site:

• Wildlife Acoustics EchoMeter Touch detector.

Sound recordings were analysed using Kaleidoscope (Wildlife Acoustics) software to confirm surveyors' identification of species.

2.3 Surveyor Details

The survey was undertaken by James Faulconbridge MRes, MCIEEM on behalf of the Isles of Scilly Wildlife Trust. James has twelve years' experience undertaking bat surveys and holds a Natural England WML-A34Level 2 (Class 2 License); registration number: 2015-12724-CLS-CLS which permits him to survey bats using artificial light and endoscopes and capture bats using hand and hand-held static nets.

Additional support was provided by Holly Robbins who has over ten years' experience of bat building inspections and presence/absence surveys. Holly was working under the direction and supervision of the Licenced Bat Worker.

2.4 Survey Limitations

Surveys carried out during a specific season can only provide information on that particular time, as bats are highly mobile in nature and may only use buildings at certain times of the year that favour a particular part of their roosting, maternity and hibernating requirements.

3.0 Results

3.1 Weather conditions, temperatures and timings

Survey Information:	Start and End Times:	Conditions (Start):	Conditions (End):		
Dusk Emergence:	Date: 23.6.20 Start: 21.15 Sunset: 21.34 End: 23.05	Temp: 15°c Wind speed (Beaufort): 2 Cloud cover: 0% High Cloud Rain: None	Temp: 15°c Wind speed (Beaufort): 1 Cloud cover: 10% Cloud Rain: None		
	Surveyors				
	 James Faulconbridge Holly Robbins 	NOTES:			

 Table 01 - Site conditions for dusk emergence survey

Survey Information:	Start and End Times:	Conditions (Start):	Conditions (End):			
Dawn Re- Entry	Date: 10.8.20 Start: 04:45 Sunrise: 06:08 End: 06:15	Temp: 16°c Wind speed (Beaufort): 2 Cloud cover: 50% Cloud Rain: None	Temp: 16°c Wind speed (Beaufort): 2 Cloud cover: 40% Cloud Rain: None			
	Surveyors					
	 James Faulconbridge Holly Robbins 	Notes:				





Figure 01 - Surveyor Positions –the buildings highlighted in yellow and green were under observation during this survey.

3.2 Dusk emergence survey results

The dusk survey confirmed emergence by a common pipistrelle bat from the apex of the gable to the kitchen roof which correlates with the location of the droppings confirmed during the building inspection. The emergence was recorded at 22:10, approximately 36 minutes after sunset.

Throughout the survey period from 21:59 onwards, individual common pipistrelle bats were recorded foraging occasionally within the grounds of the property.

3.3 Dawn re-entry survey results

The dawn survey confirmed re-entry by a common pipistrelle bat from the apex of the gable to the kitchen roof which correlates with the results of the dusk survey and the location of the droppings confirmed during the building inspection. The re-entry was recorded at 05:50, approximately 18 minutes before sunrise.

For a brief period between 05:30 and 05:41, individual common pipistrelle bats were recorded foraging occasionally within the grounds of the property.



Photograph 01 - Confirmed roost location beneath a fascia board at the apex of the kitchen gable.

4. Evaluation of Results

To identify which ecological features are important and which could potentially be affected by the proposed project, their importance needs to be evaluated with regards to geographical context, degree of scarcity or level of protection. The table below outlines those features identified as important, the nature conservation legislation relevant to those features and an assessment of the level of impact from the proposed development on those features.

Ecological	Relevant	Evaluation	Mitigation	Impact Level	
Feature	Legislation	(of importance)	Hierarchy		
Bats	CHSR, W&CA	Local	A, M, C	Medium/High	
The roost is characterised	Impacts to Roost S	ites: The Proposed Wo	orks would lead to	the permanent	
as a non-breeding summer	destruction of the roost site through the removal of the structural features				
roost used by a single	which constitute it. The subsequent replacement of the roof as part of the				
common pipistrelle and is	Proposed Works could restore an equivalent roosting feature in the longer				
therefore of lower	term provided it were designed into the construction; however Continued				
conservation significance.	Ecological Functionality (CEF) could not be argued as there would be a				
This is a relative rather than	timeframe of 1-2 months minimum between destruction and restoration.				
absolute measure of	Impacts to Bats – The Proposed Works could result in the killing/injuring of				
significance compared with the individual common pipistrelle bat if it were present in the roost a				e roost at the	
more substantial roosts of	stantial roosts of time when works were undertaken. Due to the small and isolated natur				
rarer species.	common pipistrelle populations on the Isles of Scilly, this impact should be				
	considered significa	nt.			
	Other impacts – No	o other impacts to habi	itat availability or	connectivity are	
	identified as a result	t of the proposed work	S.		
Key to Legislation and Mitigation Hierarchy					
CHSR – Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 ¹⁰ -					
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2017/1012/made					
W&CA – Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) ¹¹ -					
http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1981/69/contents					
A – Avoid, M – Mitigate, C – Compensate, E – Enhancement					

5. Recommendations and Mitigation

The recommendations in this section are provided as information only and specialist legal advice may be required. If works are delayed for more than one year, then re-assessment may be required.

5.1 Further survey requirements

No further surveys are recommended with regards to the Proposed Development – it is considered that this report, alongside the PRA produced separately, constitute a comprehensive ecological baseline from which to assess the impacts of the Application.

5.2 EPS Licence requirement

It is identified that a European Protected Species Mitigation Licence (EPSML) would be required to legally undertake the Proposed Works as it would result in the destruction of a confirmed bat roost.

The EPSML would be issued by Natural England and cannot be applied for until Planning Permission is granted. The mitigation proposals outlined in Section 5.4 of this report would form the basis for this EPSML application.

5.3 Planning Recommendation(s)

The information gathered here is considered sufficient to support a Planning Application with regards to Protected Species in accordance with relevant Best Practise Guidance.

It is considered that the impacts of the Proposed Works on protected species can be mitigated sufficiently to ensure that the Conservation Status of common pipistrelle on St Martin's is not negatively impacted. The mitigation outlined in Section 5.4 would represent appropriate measures to allow Natural England to grant the EPSML.

If minded to do so, it is recommended that Planning Permission can be granted provided that compliance with the recommendations in Section 5.4 of this document is conditioned. Any Planning Conditions relating to bats should be compliance rather than a pre-commencement condition and should not be required to be discharged. This is because Natural England require all Planning Conditions related to Protected Species to be discharged before they will issue a licence for that application.

It is considered that the mitigation proposals outlined in Section 5.4 of this document provide sufficient information on the strategy to secure the FCS of common pipistrelle bats without the requirement to submit further detail for consideration.

5.4 Mitigation Proposals (Outline)

Roost Replacement

Prior to the commencement of any works affecting the roof structure, a replacement roosting site should be created. This should comprise a bat box using the Kent Bat Box design which would be sited on a retained tree within the gardens of the property. This will secure continued provision of roosting habitat throughout the works period and a location where any bats identified during the works can be placed safely.

Following the completion of works, an additional bat box, using the same Kent Bat Box design, should be placed on the external wall just beneath the apex of the gable end of the new workshop constructed to the south-west of the glasshouse. This would provide a roosting opportunity in an equivalent location to the roost to be removed i.e. a south-west facing gable end of the single-storey building.

The installation of both boxes should be supervised by a Licenced Bat Worker to ensure that the aspect and height of the boxes are appropriate. Provision of this feature would ensure continuity of roosting habitat in both the short-term and the long-term.

Timing of Works

No significant constraints on timing of works are considered necessary due to the status of the roost as a non-breeding summer roost used by an individual bat; however the months of November – February should be avoided where possible as this is when bats enter a time of reduced activity or torpor which makes disturbance impacts more significant.

Ecological Oversight

The controlled part-demolition would require the removal and exposure of potential roosting sites which may be used by bats on the identified building(s) under the supervision and direction of a licensed bat worker. Structures would need to be removed by hand and with care.

Structures on the identified building which would potentially need to be removed under supervision of a licensed bat worker would include:

- All roof tiles 1m up from the eaves and the gables on the kitchen building.
- All soffits, barge boards, fascia and flashing where not exposed from the removal of tiles.
- The removal of any other structural features as determined by the licensed bat worker.

Scaffolding would be provided to allow the licensed bat worker full view of the works as required.

Once the above structural features have been removed, the roof would be left exposed for 2 nights to allow any bats present within the loft space to depart following the change in environmental conditions. Once this time has elapsed and the licensed bat worker is satisfied that all potential roosting sites have been exposed, then works can proceed under distance supervision.

If a bat were found to be present during works, it would be captured by the licenced bat worker in a gloved hand and placed in the bat box or allowed to disperse of its own accord.

The full scope of the supervision works would be agreed with all relevant parties to ensure the above objectives are met and that all areas of roof structures are accessible.

Monitoring

Due to the scale of impact identified, it is unlikely that Natural England would expect post-completion monitoring of the mitigation measures.

6. References

- Collins, J. (ed.) (2016). Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists: Good Practice Guidelines (3rd edition).
 The Bat Conservation Trust
- English Nature (EN), (2004., Bat Mitigation Guidelines, English Nature, Peterborough.
- HMSO (1981). The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). London.
- HMSO (2010). The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended). London.
- JNCC, (2004). Bat Worker's Manual, JNCC, Peterborough

APPENDIX A – BAT CONTACTS SURVEY TABLE

Date:	23.6.20 – Dusk emergence survey				
Survey Type:	Time	Species	Record Type	Notes	
Surveyor:	Surveyor 1				
	22:10	Р. рір	Emergence	Common pipistrelle emerged from roost under a fascia board running along the gable of the kitchen roof, just beside the apex.	
Surveyor:	Surveyor 2				
	21.59 – 22.28	P. pip	Foraging	Intermittent foraging in back garden of property	

Date:	10.8.20 – Dawn Re-entry survey			
Survey Type:	Time	Species	Record Type	Notes
Surveyor:	Surveyor 1			
	05:50	P. pip	Re-entry	Common pipistrelle returned to roost under a fascia board running along the gable of the kitchen roof, just beside the apex. No swarming noted – the bat alighted on the granite wall and climbed up into the roost.
Surveyor:	Surveyor 2			
	04:35 – 04:41	P. pip	Foraging	Intermittent foraging in back garden of property

APPENDIX B – LEGISLATION AND LICENSING

a) Legislation

All species of bats receive special protection under UK law making it a criminal offence under Schedule 5 section 9 (4) (b) and (c) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) to *"intentionally or recklessly disturb a bat at a roost"* or *"intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a roost" and under* Regulations 43 (1) and (2) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (The Habitat Regulations) to *"deliberately disturb a bat in a way that would affect its ability to survive, breed or rear young or, affect the local distribution or abundance of the species;* or to *" damage or destroy a roost"* without first having obtained the relevant licence for derogation from The Habitat Regulations from the Statutory Nature Conservation Organisation (the SNCO – Natural England in England).

The word 'roost' is not used in the legislation but is used here for simplicity. The actual wording in law is 'any structure or place which any wild animal...uses for shelter or protection' or 'breeding site or resting place'. Because bats tend to re-use the same roosts after periods of vacancy, legal opinion is that the roost is protected whether, or not the bats are present at the time.

Penalties on conviction of a bat-related crime - the maximum fine is £5,000 per incident or per bat, up to six months in prison, and forfeiture of items used to commit the offence, e.g. vehicles, plant, machinery.

b) Licensing

In order to obtain such a licence (as set out above) the SNCO must apply the requirements of the Regulations and, in particular, the three tests set out in sub-paragraphs 55(2)(e), (9)(a) and (9)(b). These are as follows:

(1) Regulation 55 (2)(e) states that a licence can be granted for the purposes 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 consequences of primary importance for the environment*".

(2) Regulation 55 (9)(a) states that the appropriate authority (the SNCO) shall not grant a licence unless they are satisfied "*that there is no satisfactory alternative*".

(3) Regulation 55 (9)(b) states that the appropriate authority (the SNCO) shall not grant a licence unless they are satisfied "*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.*"

The licence would permit an otherwise unlawful activity to take place, and it requires of the licencee measures to ensure that negative impacts are prevented, reduced or offset, and that the favourable conservation status of the bats is maintained. **Once a licence is granted, failure to comply with its contents, including its attached Method Statement is a Criminal Offence with fines of a maximum of £5,000 per infringement.** A licensed bat consultant must be appointed to assist in the preparation and the delivery of the mitigation proposals that ensure the species protection requirements (Favourable Conservation Status 'FCS' test) can be met.

Additional information on the tests is available from the Natural England website. <u>http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4727870517673984?category=12002</u>

The ecologist is responsible for providing evidence to meet Test 3. The evidence to satisfy tests 2 and 3 is submitted on a part of the license application called the Reasoned Statement. The Reasoned Statement must be filled in by the client or their agent. Applicants often approach planning consultants, architects or similar for advice regarding completion of the Reasoned Statement.

• Permissions

The development must have **full permission** before the licence application will be registered including any ecology-related conditions or reserved matters that can be discharged before the date of application.

• Further bat surveys

If a full active bat season is going to pass between the granting of planning permission and the licence application period, Natural England will require **update survey(s)** (March-Aug) prior to application submission. The number of surveys required will vary by site depending on the size and complexity of the site as well as the species and roost types present.

• Land ownership

If mitigation, compensation or monitoring is anticipated to be on land not owned by the applicant, then written consent from the landowner will be required by Natural England. Responsibility for management and maintenance must also be agreed.

• Commitments

Applications should not give any commitments to undertake licensed works (or actions relating to the licence) that cannot be delivered.

• Multi-phased projects

If a plan is phased, Natural England will require a Master Plan with all mitigation and timetables included on it.

c) Licence timescales:

• Licensing decision

The licence application pack can take anywhere from **2 to 3 weeks** to produce and Natural England allow themselves **30 working days** from the date of receipt to respond to applications, a window which can be extended if further information is requested by themselves. It is important that clients, developers, contractors, agents, etc. keep this in mind when designing work timetables. Occasionally, further information will be requested by NE, which can result in additional delays; therefore application as soon as possible is advised.

• Timing of works

In most cases, the works most likely to affect bats (bat exclusion work, soft strip, re-roofing, ecologist-advised timber treatment, etc.) will normally be timed to avoid the hibernation and maternity periods. Thus, these works tend to be timed for either the **September-October period** or the **March-April period**. This means licence application is normally completed 3 months prior to these periods and cannot be submitted any earlier.

• Other Timing

All timescales are weather-dependent (e.g. 5 days post-exclusion period extended due to inclement weather) and also may be impacted by other aspects of the project not related to ecology. In some situations license periods can be extended, but this involves more work and is not guaranteed as they must ensure that Test 3 is still met.

d) Scale of work involved:

- Mitigation Production and submission of the license application pack as well as the completion of the
 licensed works themselves are time intensive and involve inspections, exclusions, site induction and other
 works requiring onsite supervision such as bat roost creation, soft strip and other necessary checks under
 the terms of the license. Costs for materials and equipment including bat boxes, exclusion materials,
 lifts/scaffolding to carry out soft strips, roost construction materials, etc. needs to be considered. Costs can
 vary considerably by project, but the applicant should ensure provision for all aspects of the licensed works
 is well-budgeted.
- Monitoring Most mitigation schemes require some sort of post-development monitoring, the type and extent of which would be confirmed in the license method statement. A contract with the ecologist for all survey, mitigation and post-development monitoring surveys needs to be agreed for this at the application stage.

EPS Process



25 WML-G12 – EPS Mitigation Licensing – How to get a licence – Version December 2013

EPS application procedure flowchart (updated December 2011). Taken from WML-G12-EPS Mitigation Licensing How to get a licence Version December 2013