The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017

Bats – Method Statement template to support a licence application

The Method Statement will be used to determine the impact of the proposal on the favourable conservation status (FCS) of the species concerned (Regulation 55(9)(b)).
You are strongly advised to refer to the Bat Mitigation Guidelines.
Please use recent photographs to support your application.

Wildlife Licensing
Natural England
Horizon House
Deanery Road
Bristol
BS1 5AH.
T. 020802 61089

Important advice:

The format below must be used. Please enter text below each heading keeping information as concise as possible.

All maps/figures that will become part of any annexed licence granted must be submitted as separate documents (with the site name and date included on the map/figure. See section I for list – all others may be included within the Method Statement document (e.g. survey maps/figures) if preferred).

A separate work schedule must also be submitted on form WML-A13a-E5a&b to accompany the Method Statement.

A Executive summary

Provide an overview (no more than 1 side of A4) of what works are proposed and how the impacts identified will be addressed in order to ensure no detriment to the maintenance of the population at a favourable conservation status.

Considered as being a small-scale development, works will entail the conversion of a traditional farm building at Cresswell Ford Farm, Dilhorne Lane, Dilhorne, Stoke-on-Trent. ST10 2PH (NGR: SJ961429). The structure comprises of a series of dilapidated two-storey and single storey brick-buildings, constructed of red brick with a pitched tiled roof and has an existing footprint of ca. 80m^2.

Phase 2 bat and bird activity surveys were conducted during 2015 reviewed in 2017 and revised in 2019. In the absence of mitigation, the development is likely to result in an offence under Regulation 41, whereby: Damage / destruction of a transitional, summer day roost for a small aggregated population of common pipistrelle (N<8) and Brown long-eared bat (N<5) of low moderate conservation concern is predicted at site level.

In-order to successfully maintain and ensure the 'FCS' of species onsite, the development will be carried out over a single-phase commencing November end 2019 and to be completed by mid-April 2020. Due to the synanthropic nature of both species, individual hibernating bats cannot be fully ruled out.

For the purpose of this licence application the following licence methods are therefore requested:

1) To disturb and destroy an existing Summer day roost for common pipistrelle (N<10) and a transitional day roost for Brown long-eared bat (N<5).

2) Destructive search by soft demolition including taking apart of a bat structure in a controlled and careful manner by hand, or in some instances with the assistance of hand-held tools and machinery, under direct ecological supervision; and

3) Use of standard capture and exclusion methods by Named Ecologist (by hand or static hand net), in the event that individual bats are discovered during works.

Prior to any works commencing 2 x receptor/hibernation box (Schwegler 2F) will be installed onsite for safe-guarding any individual bats encountered during roofing works. Thereafter the following mitigation and enhancement features for roosting bats will be completed well in advance of mid-April 2020:

Roost compensation for BLE: By virtue of the proposed design, retention of a permanent apex box roof

void will be incorporated into the single -storey section to accommodate void-dwelling bats. Dimensions: 14.2m long x 3.6m wide x 1.2m high providing an internal volume in the region of 30.67cubic metres. This volume is considered proportionate for the transient number of brown long-eared bats onsite. Installation of 4No. modified Hog's-back or Half-round ridge ventilator access tiles (with internal mesh removed) will be fitted at equidistant to allow access into the roof void (as per NE Detail 4B). Two additional exterior bat access slots will also be installed 400mm above floor level into the upper apex region on the east and west facing gable end of this section, in-line with existing flight bats.

Roost compensation for common pipistrelle: Similarly, a smaller apex box void will be incorporated into the single-storey section to accommodate crevice-dwelling bats. Dimensions: 9m long x 4.7m wide x 400mm high providing a volume in the region of 10 cubic metres. Installation of 2No. modified Hog's-back or Half-round ridge ventilator access tiles (with internal mesh removed) will be fitted at equidistant to allow access into this apex roof void (as per NE Detail 4B).

Bitumastic F1 under-felt will be used throughout all new roof sections.

In the unlikely event that a significant number of torpid bats are encountered during works that exceeds the allocated number allowed under licence, then ALL works would cease immediately and modification to the Natural England would be sought before works were allowed to continue.

Foraging and commuting habitat A sensitive, low-level lighting scheme will comply to ILP Guidance Notes GN01:2011 for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light, and GN8/18 'Bats and artificial lighting in the UK' to avoid light-spill onsite around roost areas and onto adjacent habitats used by foraging and commuting bats.

Landscaping: All mature trees and hedgerows onsite are to be retained within the redevelopment in accordance to BS 5937:2012 "Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction". NO plant species listed under Schedule 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) will be used.

Considered as being a low impact summer bat roost for two species of bat which are considered as being common and widespread at a National level, no post-monitoring activity surveys are considered once all mitigation features and post-development lighting has been signed off by the named ecologist (August 2020).

B Introduction

B1 Background to activity/development:

Include a brief summary of:

- Why the activity and a licence are necessary (*e.g. bridge structure repairs are required and will affect a known maternity roost of Daubenton's bats, which will be temporarily lost whilst works are being undertaken; renovation works to an office building will result in the permanent loss of three day roosts of common pipistrelle bats; demolition of an existing hospital to be replaced with flats will result in the loss of a brown-long eared bat maternity roost*).

Full planning consent has been obtained from Staffordshire Moorlands District Council for the conversion of an agricultural farm building to form a dwelling at Cresswell Ford Farm, Dilhorne Lane, Dilhorne, Stoke-on-Trent. ST10 2PH (NGR: SJ961429). In the absence of mitigation, the development will result in disturbance and destruction of a summer day roost for common pipistrelle (N<10) and Brown long-eared bat (N<5).

- Include current status of planning permission (if applicable) *e.g. full planning permission with all relevant wildlife conditions discharged; permitted development; demolition with prior notification of demolition issues resolved*. If the proposal is for demolition only of a structure supporting a bat roost/s, please confirm whether there are plans to develop the site in the future and if so when.

Full planning permission approved ref: SMD/2018/0002 (see Folder 5. Supporting information)

B2 Relationship with other nearby development and cumulative impacts

B2.1 Is the current application part of a larger development project? For example, is it part of a phased or multi-plot housing development that will require more than one bat licence? Enter Yes, No or N/A in the text box below. If yes, note a separate ***master plan*** document will be required.

NO

Important Advice: If yes to the above, please note that sections in this Method Statement on impact assessment and mitigation measures must explicitly relate *only* to impacts from the works currently proposed.

A project-wide master plan must detail the overall impact assessment and mitigation and explain where, and why, each of the bat licences will be required. The master plan must be included as a separate document to this application: see http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/WML-G11_tcm6-9930.pdf for details that are to be included in this separate document. The separate master plan is expected to take due regard of the overall project to ensure that in-combination effects are considered, and mitigation and compensation measures are both sufficient and coherent.

If the current development is part of a larger development project, summarise very briefly here how the current application relates to the larger project and how the in-combination effects are considered and mitigation/compensation is sufficient.

N/A

Important Advice: to accompany this Method Statement also include Figure. B2.1 for a Master plan overview - and see section I "Map checklist" at the end of this document.

B2.2 Apart from any mention in B2.1, please inform us of any past or future development or other projects (in the last 5 years or next 5 years) in the vicinity which may have significantly impacted or are likely to significantly impact on the same population/s of bats as this application (e.g. loss of maternity or hibernation roosts). You must make reasonable efforts to establish this, including discussions with your client and the Local Planning Authority – stating below what you undertook. A brief summary of the project/s should be provided including the site name and location, dates and if known the licence reference number(s).

Please note we are not expecting details of every licence/planning permission issued within the vicinity of the site – we are only concerned with projects that have the potential to significantly impact or have impacted on same population of bats (maternity and hibernation roosts). Note: Natural England is aiming to make available licensing records from the last 5 years publically available.

N/A

Important Advice: locations of other bat mitigation sites that may have significantly impacted or are likely to significantly impact on the same population/s of bats as this application must be shown on Figure B2.2.

C Survey and site assessment (also see section 5 of the Bat Mitigation Guidelines)

C1 Pre-existing information on the bat species at the survey site:

Please undertake a historical data search within a 2km search radius and provide a summary of the results of this search. For example, records from local environmental records centres, local bat groups and previous survey work undertaken at the site is all relevant. Please briefly comment on the results in relation to your project/site

- Should no historical records be found from your search please state this – and specify what searches you undertook.
- Note that you must not include records from National Biodiversity Network (NBN) without first obtaining written permission from the relevant Data Provider.

Staffordshire Wildlife Trust (SWT) show 11 of the 17 resident UK bat species occur in the county, with seven species currently given UK BAP (2007) Priority Status. Staffordshire Ecological data show 46 records of three species of bats recorded within a 2km radius of the site, two of which are considered UK BAP species: Brown long-eared bat and Noctule. A further four/five bat species that are not currently given UK BAP consideration are also recorded within the county with one recorded within a 2km radius of the site: common pipistrelle. Pres-survey data show no evidence of any notable bat roost(s) of conservation concern within the proposed application area or immediate zone of influence.

C2 Status of the bat species: Detail conservation status at the local, county and regional levels. Please complete the following table, justifying your assessment, and add additional lines where necessary. If the status is unknown then please enter 'unknown'.

Species	Conservation status assessment		
	Local	**County**	**Regional**
Common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus*	**Common & widespread**	**Common & Widespread and of least concern**	**Common & Widespread and of least concern**
Brown long-eared bat *Plecotus auritus*	**Common & widespread UK BAP species**	**Common & widespread UK BAP species**	**Common & widespread UK BAP species**

* ***Please note** that you can add more rows to the table: right click in any cell choose Insert > Insert rows below.*

C3 Objectives of the survey to inform this proposal: Please complete the following table, entering 'Yes', 'No' or N/A' to indicate the objective of your survey and provide comments/explanation where necessary:

Survey objective	Yes / No / N-A	Comments
Determine presence / absence of bats	Yes	Phase 2 activity surveys were originally carried out during July & August 2016 (2 x dusk / 1 x dawn). A revised assessment of the site was carried out during August 2019. 2019 survey results supported past findings.
Determine bat usage of site (e.g. maternity, hibernation, night roosts in various structures (specify)).	Yes	Transitional summer day roost for common pipistrelle (N<10) and Brown long-eared bat (N<5) recorded in the building subject to development
Identify foraging, commuting or swarming sites (explain)	Yes	Phase 2 activity surveys identified intermittent commuting and foraging of three species of bat around site: common pipistrelle, brown long-eared bat and Noctule. The two-storey section of the building, with open portals on both gable-ends was seen to be used as a thoroughfare by common pipistrelle.There are a number of standing water-bodies around site providing drinking water and an increase of invertebrate / foraging potential
Other (explain)	N/A	

C4 Site/habitat description: Please provide:

- Brief descriptions of the site, including total size of the development site (ha) (most often within the red line planning boundary) and areas of the site with potential value to bats (ha).

The proposed application area is located in semi-rural green belt, near to the small village of Caverswall and Dilhorne in Stoke-on-Trent (NGR: SJ961429), and considers a former agricultural barn-building comprising of two-story and single storey red brick elevations with pitched and tiled roofs. The building is in a dilapidated state with sections of roof missing and has an existing footprint of ca. 80m^2. A pre-fabricated lean-to is attached onto the south elevation.

The building is set with ca. 1ha gross land-holding area which contains a number of standing water-bodies bodies immediately adjacent to the building on east and western boundaries with scattered trees and continuous linear hedgerows.

Whilst no bat roosts of high conservation status are considered onsite, the structure was found to have a number of alternating internal roost areas for an aggregated colony of common pipistrelle (N<10) inside the two-storey section and intermittent use by brown long-eared bat (N<5) inside the single-storey section. Due to the synanthropic nature of species onsite, the structures may offer some potential for individual over-wintering bats although this was not confirmed.

- Brief descriptions of the structures on site, differentiating between **those surveyed** and **not surveyed**, with an explanation why. Ensure structures are referenced and consistently indicated on relevant figures and tables.

Other than the building subject to development, there are no other structures onsite. All trees within the gross land holding area were deemed as having low potential for roosting bats.

- A description of adjacent areas/offsite habitats, specifying any relevance to bats, including descriptions of habitat/s relevant to bat commuting/foraging behaviour.

Adjacent habitats comprise of open agricultural farmland, a number of additional water-bodies to the NW and intermittent blocks of ancient woodland interconnected by hedgerows. These habitats provide numerous resources for local bat population with excellent connectivity to the wider landscape considered.

- Please also include annotated (cross reference the structures) and dated photographs (showing both internal and external survey areas) as these are very useful as an assessment aid. These can be inserted below or submitted as a separate (referenced) document.

See separate document

C5 Field survey(s):

Surveys must be up to date and have been conducted within the current or most recent optimal season. Surveys must be undertaken in accordance with the most up to date edition of the Bat Conservation Trust (BCT) *Bat Surveys for Professional Ecologists – Good Practice Guidelines* and the *Bat Mitigation Guidelines*.

C5a Justification for surveys that deviate from the best practice guidelines: Please provide full justification below if your surveys deviate from the aforementioned best practice guidelines, confirming how you have obtained a full appreciation of the bat species roosting at the site, and of the type and status of roosts they use on site and in the context of the immediate surrounding area. **Please note that inadequate survey information is likely to cause delays to your licence application and may result in a Further Information Request.**

C5b Please complete the following tables and add additional lines where necessary (*right click in any cell outside the grey box area. Choose Insert > Insert rows below)*. Please enter 'N/A' if the table is not applicable to your survey. Please ensure the information is consistent with Figure **C5b** (showing all buildings, structures and habitats that are within the survey area and distinguishing those that were surveyer and those that were not; indicate where surveyors were located):

Visual inspection

Date of each survey visit **(e.g. format 01/06/13)**	**Structure reference / location**	**Equipment used (e.g binoculars, endoscope)**	**Weather –** ***(Include temps, precipitation, Beaufort wind scale etc)***
01/08/2019	**Cresswell Ford Farm, Dilhorne Lane, Dilhorne, Stoke-on-Trent. ST10 2PH (NGR: SJ961429).**	**1 x ladders** **1 x torch**	**Temp start: 16.7°C** **Temp end: 17.5°C** **Precipitation: NIL** **Wind speed: <1**
Comments (to include # of surveyors used for each visit): 1 x Ecologist (class 2 licence)			

Please provide surveyors names *(including Class Licence registration number if applicable)* and ensure the <u>above</u> table states the number of surveyors used for each survey visit undertaken.

Revised building inspection carried out by Mark Weston Bat surveyor licence ref: 2019-41525-CLS-CLS

Dusk survey

Date of each survey visit (e.g. format 01/06/13)	Start and end times and time of sunset	Structure reference / location	Equipment used (include make of bat detectors and logging equipment)	Weather – *(Include start and end temps, precipitation, Beaufort wind scale etc)*
19/08/2019	Start: 20:10hrs End: 22:35hrs Sunset: 20:26hrs	Cresswell Ford Farm, Dilhorne Lane, Dilhorne, Stoke-on-Trent. ST10 2PH (NGR: SJ961429).	1 x EM Touch Pro 1 x SSF Bat2 1 x EcoObs Batcorder. 1 x NVMT-1 2x24 1 x Venture HC, CB2	Temp start: 16.5°C Temp end: 13.3°C Precipitation: NIL Wind speed: <1
Comments (to include # of surveyors used for each visit): 3				
Comments: 4 x brown long-eared bat were visually seen utilizing the internal compartments of the single-storey section. 7 x common pipistrelle seven bats were recorded emerging via open two pitching holes on east and west gables, whilst two individual c.pip were seen emerging from the external ridge line area.				

Please provide surveyors names *(including Class Licence registration number if applicable)* and ensure the <u>above</u> table states the number of surveyors used for each survey visit undertaken.

Mark Weston BSc (Hons) Natural England licensed bat ecologist (2019-41525-CLS-CLS Level 2) / Ian Myatt (CLS 37098 – Level 1) / and Louise Cox BSc (Hons).

Dawn survey

Date of each survey visit (e.g. format 01/06/13).	Start and end time and time of sunrise	Structure reference / location	Equipment used (include make of bat detectors and logging equipment)	Weather – *(Include start and end temps, precipitation, Beaufort wind scale etc)*
01/08/2019	Start: 03:15hrs End: 05:40hrs Sunrise: 05:26hrs	Cresswell Ford Farm, Dilhorne Lane, Dilhorne, Stoke-on-Trent. ST10 2PH (NGR: SJ961429).	1 x EM Touch Pro 1 x SSF Bat2 1 x EcoObs Batcorder. 1 x NVMT-1 2x24 1 x Venture HC, CB2	Temp start: 16.7°C Temp end: 17.5°C Precipitation: NIL Wind speed: <1
Comments (to include # of surveyors used for each visit): **3**				
Comments: 3 x common pipistrelles were recorded re-entering the building during dawn survey. No BLE.				

Please provide surveyors names *(including Class Licence registration number if applicable)* and ensure the <u>above</u> table states the number of surveyors used for each survey visit undertaken.

Mark Weston BSc (Hons) Natural England licensed bat ecologist (2019-41525-CLS-CLS Level 2) / Ian Myatt (CLS 37098 – Level 1) / and Jack Weston (6yrs experience).

'Other' survey (please specify e.g. trapping, remote, etc)

Date of each survey visit (e.g. format 01/06/13).	Start and end times	Structure reference / location	Equipment used (include make of bat detectors and logging equipment)	Weather – *(Include start and end temps, precipitation, Beaufort wind scale etc)*
Comments (to include # of surveyors used for each visit): **N/A**				

Please provide surveyors names *(including Class Licence registration number if applicable)* and ensure the <u>above</u> table states the number of surveyors used for each survey visit undertaken.

N/A

Please explain any constraints on the survey/s undertaken (time of year, cold weather, refused access, safety issues preventing access etc – justify as necessary and include evidence where required). If access was refused please provide evidence (letter/email) to demonstrate this.

Access constraints prevented a thorough investigation of the first-floor region of the two-storey section

due to health and safety concerns.

Also complete the following:

- If DNA analysis of droppings has been undertaken, please indicate below (Yes, No, N/A) and ensure that **Figure C5b** (if applicable – see below) details the locations where the samples were taken. Where long-eared bats are detected but cannot be identified to species level visually, DNA analysis of any droppings will be needed where grey long-eared bats may be present.

NO – Species identified visually and/or through sonogram analysis (σ = 100%)

- Please confirm that a walk over survey/check has been carried out within 3 months *prior* to application submission by a suitably experienced ecologist to ensure that conditions have not changed since the most recent survey was undertaken. Provide details of any changes to conditions and habitats and/or structures on site since the surveys were undertaken.

Date of walkover survey/check	
Details of any changes to conditions and habitats and/or structures, if there are no changes please insert 'None'	**None**

C6 Survey results: Summarise your findings in the tables below and cross reference to **Figure C6** (which must also include flight lines, access points, dimensions of existing roosts etc). If you did not undertake a specific survey type please add N/A to the relevant table/s. Raw data is to be appended to the Method Statement (including sonograms, DNA analysis results etc).

Roost t*ypes to be referenced as:* *Day, Night, Feeding Perch, Transitional, Satellite, Maternity, Hibernation confirmed, Foraging Area, Commuting Route, Swarming Site, Other*. See end of document for "Definitions" of these roosts.

When completing "**Notes/observations" include** reference *to direct observations, extent and age of droppings, presence of field signs, emergence or re-entry, echolocation analysis. Also include DNA results if applicable and include nil results)*

Visual inspection results

Date (e.g. format 01/06/13)	**Species and numbers**	**Roost type** *(to be consistent with the above listed types)*	**Structure reference** *(consistent with relevant figures and other text)*	**Roost location**	**Access points (include # of them)**	**Dimensions of existing roosts or explanation of where the roost is (as appropriate)**
02/08/2019	**0**	**Not determined during PRA**	**Cresswell Ford Farm, Dilhorne Lane, Dilhorne, Stoke-on-Trent. ST10 2PH (NGR: SJ961429).**	**Not determined during PRA**	**Numerous ingression points for both bats and birds by way of open pitching holes and broken/missing roof sections**	**Not determined during PRA**
Notes/observations: Building remains unchanged since 2017 / minor evidence of fresh droppings / feeding remains in NE single-storey compartment.						

Provide further (brief) comments/explanation if required:

Dusk survey results

Date (e.g. format 01/06/13)	Start and end times	Species and numbers	*Roost type* *(to be consistent with the above listed types)*	Structure reference *(consistent with relevant figures and other text)*	Roost location	Access points (include # of them)	Dimensions of existing roosts or explanation of where the roost is (as appropriate)
19/08/2019	Start: 20:10hrs End: 22:35hrs	Common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* (N<10) Brown long-eared bat *Plecotus auritus* (N<5)	Considered an aggregated and transient summer 'day roost' for both species.	Cresswell Ford Farm building (SJ961429)	CPip roost in two-storey roof section. BLE roost in single-storey roof section	CPip2 x pitching holes in east and west gable-ends – 2 x ridge access points. 1 x Broken roof section / 1 x open portal on south fascia and 2 x ventilation slots on east gable.	CPip roost aggregated to locations in the underside of the two-storey roof void area (9m long x 4.7m wide x 4.2m high) + tiles along ridge line. Individual, aggregated BLE recorded utilizing primarily the two NE compartments of the single-storey section (14.2m long x 3.6m wide x ca.4.2m high

Provide further (brief) comments/explanation if required:

Dawn Survey results

Date (e.g. format 01/06/13)	Start and end times	Species and numbers	Roost type *(to be consistent with the above listed types)*	Structure reference *(consistent with relevant figures and other text)*	Roost location	Access points (include # of them)	Dimensions of existing roosts or explanation of where the roost is (as appropriate)
01/08/2019	Start: 03:15hrs End: 05:40hrs	Common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* (N<10) Brown long-eared bat *Plecotus auritus* (N<5)	Considered as being a loosely aggregated and transient summer 'day roost' for both species.	Cresswell Ford Farm building (SJ961429)	As above.	As above.	As above.
Notes/observations: Revised survey results corroborate with that of 2015 and 2017 activity survey findings.							

Provide further (brief) comments/explanation if required:

'Other' results – please specify.

Date (e.g. format 01/06/13)	**Species and numbers**	**Roost type** *(to be consistent with the above listed types)*	**Structure reference** *(consistent with relevant figures and other text)*	**Roost location**	**Access points (include # of them)**	**Dimensions of existing roosts or explanation of where the roost is (as appropriate)**
Notes/observations: N/A						

Provide further (brief) comments/explanation if required:

C7 Interpretation/evaluation of survey results (also see the Bat Mitigation Guidelines section 5.8 and Figure 4 for conservation significance of roost type): Please complete the following table:

Structure reference *(ensure consistency with other text and Figures)*	**Species**	**Count / estimate of number of individuals**	**Roost location**	**Site status assessment (e.g. maternity, feeding roost, swarming site, hibernation confirmed etc)**	**Conservation significance of roost**
Cresswell Ford Farm building (SJ961429)	2	**Common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* (N<10)**	**Cresswell Ford Farm building (two-storey section).**	**Considered as being a loosely aggregated and transient summer 'day roost'**	**low conservation significance at site level**
		Brown long-eared bat *Plecotus auritus* (N<5)	**Cresswell Ford Farm building Single-storey section.**	**Considered as being a loosely aggregated and transient summer 'day roost'**	**low moderate conservation significance at site level (UK BAP species).**

Provide further (brief) comments / explanation if required:

Important Advice:

Survey maps that must be included in this section of the Method Statement, or as separate documents if preferred, are listed in *section I "Map checklist" at the end of this document.*

Insert survey figures, photographs etc below here if not submitting them as separate documents

D Impact assessment <u>in absence of mitigation or compensation for each species / roost type</u>

(also see section 6 of the Bat Mitigation Guidelines). Where appropriate you must take into consideration cumulative impacts of your proposals on the bat species and populations identified in your survey in each section.

Guidance on quantifying roosts for the purpose of licensing: *To be considered the same roost, the locations need to have the same **functional** and **qualitative** (e.g. physical) characteristics, be used by the **same species** for the **same purpose** (e.g. day roosting) and be within the **same building / structure**. If the physical characteristics are different (e.g. one roost is in external crevices in the wall and the other is in the roof void against internal timbers) then they should be considered different roosts - because they offer bats different roosting opportunities. If the physical characteristics are similar and provide the same functional characteristics, used by the same species for the same purpose (e.g. transitional roost) but with different individual roosting locations within the overall building / structure, that could be considered one transitional roost. If two species are using an area which provides the same characteristics, for the same function, it is still two roosts - as there are two species.*

D1 Initial impacts: The impact/s of activities undertaken on site pre-development and during works must be considered and explained. **Consider disturbance** (such as human presence, noise, vibration, dust, lighting, access obstruction due to scaffolding and plastic sheeting etc), **temporary damage and temporary loss of roosts and injuring/killing.**

E.g. Unsupervised contractor removing roof tiles has the potential to crush 3 common pipistrelle bats using the roof tiles as day roosts. Major negative impact at a site level; Demolition of an extension to a building will take place adjacent to a maternity roost of common pipistrelle bats situated under the soffit board of the retained building. Potential for significant disturbance if demolition works are undertaken during the maternity period through vibration, noise and dust. Medium negative impact on a local level.

In the absence of mitigation, the development will cause a negative impact resulting in damage/destruction of a transient summer 'day roost' for a small population of male common pipistrelle (N<10) and Brown long-eared bat (N<5). Based on this species widespread distribution and population size onsite, the roost is considered as being of low impact at site level.

Confirm number of roosts to be damaged: **2**

D2 Long-term impacts: Consider and explain the impacts of the proposed works on the different species populations at a site, local, regional, and national level**.**

D2.1. Roost modification: e.g. changes to roosts/access points, new entrances (including human access e.g. for servicing/maintenance etc), change in size of roost space, changes in air flow, temperature and humidity, light etc. Please detail the access points into each roost and the type/s of roosts which will be modified.

E.g. Non-mitigated changes to the roof structure, which requires replacing, will lead to the modification of 3 access points into a common pipistrelle maternity roost which will result in bats being unable to enter or exit the roost. Moderate negative impact on a local level.

Renewal of the roof section and sealing-off existing ingress points with new doors and windows, will result in modification and loss of access points into the building for common pipistrelle and brown long-eared bat. Low impact at site level predicted.

Confirm number of roosts to be modified: **2**

D2.2. Roost loss: Loss or deterioration of roosting sites, access points, habitat, etc must be considered. Please detail the access points into each roost and types of roost/s which will be lost.

E.g. Demolition of building reference X in June will lead to the loss of a night roost in the porch used by 1 lesser horseshoe bat and the loss of a maternity brown-long eared bat roost in the loft space. This will lead to the death and/or injury of bats including dependent young and permanent destruction (loss) of both roosts. Moderate negative impact at a site level for lesser horseshoe bats and moderate negative impact at a local level for brown-long eared bats.

The loss of access points will subsequently prevent access into existing roost areas for common pipistrelle (first-floor section of the two-storey building) and for BLE (ground floor-sections in the single-storey section). Re-roofing and conversion of the structure will result in permanent loss of internal roosting. Low impact on a local level predicted.

Confirm number of roosts to be destroyed: **2**

D2.3. Fragmentation and isolation: Will the proposed works results in these impacts? E.g. loss of linear features such as hedges, tree lines, increased lighting, severance of flight lines by roads/rail lines, separation of breeding/hibernation sites from feeding grounds, etc.

E.g. In addition to the removal of common pipistrelle day roosts in trees along the proposed road, removal of hedgerows, shown on Figure D, and the construction of the new road will fragment a significant commuting and foraging route for a lesser horseshoe maternity roost. This may cause a reduction in the long term success of the breeding colony of lesser horseshoes by restricting existing foraging range or killing bats on the road. Potentially major negative impact at a site and local level.

Considered as being a small-scale development, which will retain its existing footprint, no fragmentation and isolation is predicted under the proposed scheme. All mature trees and hedgerows onsite to be retained. Linear features used by commuting and foraging bats will not be affected. Conversely, mitigation will consider a sensitive post-development lighting scheme to minimize sky-glow and prevent any severance potential between adjacent habitats and connectivity to the wider landscape.

D3 Post-development interference impacts: e.g. extra street lighting or other external lighting, use of loft space as storage, increased noise. Please also consider other direct or indirect post development impacts which may include disturbance/ injuring/killing.
E.g. Security lighting being installed will shine on the brown-long eared bat maternity roost access points which may affect emergence patterns and lead to a reduction in foraging times. This may cause a reduction in the long term success of the breeding colony or cause the roost to be abandoned. Moderate to high negative impact at a site and local level.

The proposed application site is identified as a rural area with low district brightness, and categorized as ILP Environmental Zone E2: Subsequently a sensitive, low-level lighting scheme will comply to ILP Guidance Notes GN01:2011 for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light, and GN8/18 'Bats and artificial lighting in the UK', to reduce light spill onto existing roost areas and adjacent habitats.

D4 Predicted scale of impact of this development/activity on species status (also see section 6.5 of the Bat Mitigation Guidelines and the BCT's Bat Survey Good Practice Guidelines): Please complete the following table to explain what this is likely to be at the site, local/county and regional levels for each roost type and species. Add additional lines when necessary

Roost types to be referenced as: Day, Night, Feeding Perch, Transitional, Satellite, Maternity, Hibernation confirmed, Foraging Area, Commuting Route, Swarming Site, Other.

Species and Numbers (which will be affected at the time works will be undertaken)	**Roost type**	**Predicted scale of impact *(place X in relevant column)***			**Notes** (include impact on roost – damage / destruction /modification etc)
		Site	**County**	**Regional**	
Common pipistrelle	**Summer day roost**	***X***			**Damage/destruction and loss of an transient summer day roost for a small, loosely aggregated colony of common pipistrelle (N<10). High negative impact of low conservation concern predicted at site level.**
Brown long-eared bat	**occasional / day roost**	***X***			**Damage/destruction and loss of an occasional summer day roost for low numbers of BLE (N<5). High negative impact of low moderate conservation concern predicted at site level (UKBAP species considered).**

* ****Please note** that you can add more rows to the table: right click in any cell outside the grey box area. Choose Insert > Insert rows below.*

Provide further comments/explanation as required (this helps understand how the impacts will be mitigated or compensated for when assessing section E):

Based on the presence of small roosting colonies onsite, standard mitigation guidelines for void dwelling bats (brown long-eared bat) and crevice dwelling bats (common pipistrelle) have been applied in this instance, with consideration given to timing of works and roost compensation (see below).

Important Advice:
Please ensure that a separate 'Impact map' is provided (Figure D) which must show all structures or habitats

(clearly referenced) that will be disturbed, damaged or destroyed, detailing where the roosts and access points are etc. Also *see section I "Map checklist" at the end of this document*.

E Mitigation and Compensation (please also see section 7 and 8 of the Bat Mitigation Guidelines)

E1 Please explain why this design was chosen over other potential solutions - set out what other designs were considered and why they were not feasible (*e.g. if the proposal is to construct a new stand-alone roost, explain why it is not possible to retain the roost in the existing structure etc).* The mitigation solution being proposed in the method statement should be the one that delivers the 'need' with the least impact on the bat population.

By virtue of the proposed design, the scheme intends to adapt all newly created, internal 'apex box' regions in the roof void areas as permanent apex box regions for roosting bats, being in approximate alignment to existing roost locations.

In-order to deliver least impact to roosting bats onsite, the development will be undertaken outside the main summer period. Works is scheduled to begin in November 2019 and projected to take approximately 16 weeks, with allowances made for any stochasticity in weather and works. The scheme is intended to be completed by April start 2020, with all bat mitigation features in place by March 2019.

E2.2 Capture and release (if applicable):

Please confirm that you agree to undertake the following procedures for the capture and exclusion of bats, where these are applicable:

a. The use of endoscopes, artificial light from torches, destructive search by soft demolition (see Definitions), temporary obstruction of roost access, temporary or permanent exclusion methods (including installation) and use of static hand held nets must only be undertaken or directly supervised by the Named Ecologist, or an Accredited Agent.

b. Where capture and/or handling of bats are necessary, only the Named Ecologist, Accredited Agent, or an Assistant directly supervised by the Named Ecologist may do so. Capture/handling/exclusion of bats must only be undertaken in conditions suitable for bats to be active.

c. Where bats are discovered and taken (excluding unexpected discoveries during adverse weather conditions) they must either be relocated to an alternative roost (see Definitions) suitable for the species, or where bats are held this must be done safely and bats released on site at dusk in, or adjacent to, suitable foraging/ commuting habitat in safe areas within or directly adjacent to the pre-works habitat.

d. Endoscopes and hand held nets are only to be used to assist with the locating and capture of bats.

e. Temporary and permanent exclusion must be carried out using techniques specified in the most up to date edition of the '*Bat Workers Manual*'. If one-way exclusion devices are to be used, each device must remain in position for a period of at least 5 consecutive days/ nights throughout a spell of suitable weather conditions, or remain longer until these conditions prevail.

f. Prior to destructive works, an inspection using torches and/or an endoscope must be performed internally to search for the presence of bats. If any licensed vesper bat species is found and is accessible, each will be captured by gloved hand or hand-held net, given a health check and then each placed carefully inside a draw-string, calico cloth holding bag or similar for transport. If any licensed horseshoe bat species is found, the capture methods outlined in (h) will only be used after it has been shown that overnight dispersal or exclusion are no longer practicable methods.

g. Following inspection and exclusion operations, the removal of any feature with bat roost potential, will be only performed by hand in suitable weather conditions and under direct ecological supervision. Where applicable, materials will be removed carefully away and not rolled or sprung to avoid potential harm to bats. The undersides of materials will be checked by the Named Ecologist or Accredited Agent for bats that may be clung to them before removal.

h. For sites where the presence of horseshoe species has been confirmed, the following exclusion method will be used: prior to work commencing, the Named Ecologist or Accredited Agent will conduct a thorough internal inspection for the presence of horseshoe bats. Only after the void is shown to be unoccupied will

the destructive search commence, or all apertures into that void be closed and sealed (windows, doors, etc) by use of boarding, sealed tarpaulin or similar.

If a horseshoe bat is encountered, it will be left undisturbed during daylight. After all bats have dispersed overnight, the void will be sealed as described above. If all bats have not emerged, the Named Ecologist will either use torchlight and non-tactile human presence to disturb the bat to encourage it to emerge and disperse, during night only, or through use of a hand held net. Only after all bats have emerged from the building or void will it be sealed.

Yes, I agree / No, I don't agree
Yes

If NO, please provide justification below. Please use this text box to describe any additional information on protocols to be employed if bats are found during works. Non-standard capture and exclusion apparatus must be shown on **Figure E2**.

Should your proposals include capture (taking) please specify numbers of each species that will be affected at the time the works are to be undertaken:

Species	**Expected number of bats to be captured at the time works will be undertaken**. *Note: this may be different to the number of bats using the roost at its optimum time as timings for works will be at a time when bats are least likely to be present*.
Common pipistrelle	**7** (based on the synanthropic nature of species)
Brown long-eared bat	**4** (based on the synanthropic nature of species)

** * Please note that you can add more rows to the table: right click in any cell outside the grey box area. Choose Insert > Insert rows below.*

E3 Bat roost and access point retention, modification and creation: Please detail how all impacts to each species (as identified in sections C and D) will be mitigated. If not applicable to your proposals please state 'N/A' in the relevant text boxes.

Please note that breathable roofing membranes must not be installed into a roof used by bats. If the use of roof membranes is necessary, only Bitumen type 1F felt with a hessian matrix will be permitted under licence:

Yes, I agree

E3.1 Retention of existing roost(s) – *Works may include, for example, maintenance works that result in no material changes to the roost but may cause disturbance or temporary damage e.g. t*emporary *exclusion of a roost to allow investigative and repair works to a bridge*. Provide details of all works including:

- Number and description of roosts to be retained, with an explanation of how they will be retained. Confirm dimensions to be retained.

N/A

- Number of access/entrance points to be retained and how this will be achieved. If enhancements to the roosts will be provided, such as through crevice provision, please detail.

N/A

- Mitigation for any other impacts e.g. new lighting at the site.

See below

E3.2 Modification of existing roost(s) - *Works may include, for example, reduction in roof void height, change of tiles and roof lining (stating the type of membrane that will be used), alteration of access point through replacement of soffits etc.* Please provide the following:

- Dimension details of modified roosts: clearly state what the original roost dimensions were and what the dimensions of the modified roost will be.

Mitigation to maintain and enhance the FCS of common pipistrelle intends to retain a permanent, small, apex box void into the existing two-storey section of the structure to accommodate crevice-dwelling bats. (Dimensions: 9m long x 4.7m wide x 400mm high providing a volume in the region of 10 cubic metres). Installation of 2No. modified Hog's-back or Half-round ridge ventilator access tiles (with internal mesh removed) will be fitted at equidistant to allow access into this apex roof void (as per NE Detail 4B).

Similarly, to maintain and enhance the FCS of brown long-eared onsite mitigation intends to retain a permanent but larger internal apex-box roof void in the single-storey roof section for void-dwelling bats (Dimensions: 14.2m long x 3.6m wide x 1.2m high). Modification will result in a reduction of roof height but considered proportionate for the low, transient number of brown long-eared bats utilizing the site. The modified apex box will be uncluttered with an internal volume in the region of 30.67cubic metres providing an overall increase in void length to further compensate for height reduction.

Installation of 4No. modified Hog's-back or Half-round ridge ventilator access tiles (with internal mesh removed) will be fitted at equidistant to allow access into the roof void (as per NE Detail 4B). Two additional exterior bat access slots will also be installed 400mm above floor level into the upper apex region on the east and west facing gable end of this section, in-line with existing flight lines.

- Dimension details of modified access points: clearly state how the access points are being modified.

Installation of 2No. modified Hog's-back or Half-round ridge ventilator access tiles (with internal mesh removed) will be fitted at equidistant to allow access into this apex roof void of the two-storey section (as per NE Detail 4B).

Installation of 4No. modified Hog's-back or Half-round ridge ventilator access tiles (with internal mesh removed) will be fitted at equidistant to allow access into this apex roof void of the single-storey section (as per NE Detail 4B).

- Details of any other modifications to be made to roosts.

Two additional exterior bat access slots (225mm x 75mmm) will also be installed into the upper apex region of the first-storey section (east and west facing gable ends) ca. 400mm above floor level to provide a fly-through for bats in-line with existing flight lines.

Any timber treatment will be undertaken using chemicals approved by Natural England for use in bat roosts. Pesticides containing the synthetic pyrethroids (permethrin, cypermethrin etc.) and boron compounds (Borester 7, disodium octoborate etc.) are considered as being relatively harmless to bats. Any new timber replacement will be pre-treated by a copper-chrome-arsenic process (such as Tanalith or Celcure). No timber pre-treated by an organic solvent process will be used. Where applicable, the use of any pesticides would only be applied during the period September to April and would not be used during the summer months (1 May to 31 August).

No maintenance / inspection hatches are proposed in either of the two, apex box roof void sections due to confined dimensions. Exterior marine timber ply to be fitted to floor of void sections to exclude bats from the living areas of the property.

- Mitigation for any impacts of lighting on the modified roost/s if appropriate.

The proposed application site is identified as a rural area with low district brightness, and categorized as ILP Environmental Zone E2: Subsequently a sensitive, low-level lighting scheme will comply to ILP Guidance Notes GN01:2011 for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light, and GN8/18 'Bats and artificial lighting in the UK', to prevent any light spill onto existing roost entry points and reduce sky-glow and light-spill to minimize severance of existing commuting and foraging paths around site.

The use of low energy LED lighting and/or low-pressure sodium lamps (SOX) will be used and fitted with

hoods to direct the light below the horizontal plane to minimize light-spill. Any additional security lighting will be less than 200 lumens (150 watts) and placed on a timer setting and faced down to reduce sky glow. Height of any columns around the development will not exceed eight metres.

E3.3 New roost creation (including bat houses, cotes and bat boxes etc).

Note – creation of compensation for high impact cases (e.g. loss of a maternity roost) must be protected in the long term. Any bat boxes or roost structures that are part of a licence proposal which do not show signs of bats must be retained for a minimum of 5 years from date of completion of the development/works. Typically this will be around 5 years for low conservation status roost compensation (e.g. bat boxes) and longer for other significant roosts (e.g. bat houses, lofts etc). The exact time period will be specified in any licence issued. For high conservation status roost loss, the compensation roost/s must still be protected in the long term by another means (such as a s106 agreement), which is particularly important if the structure is likely to change ownership.

E3.3a Please complete the table below for the species and roost types listed. For all other species and roost types please provide information under **E3.3b**.

Species & Roost type for which new roost creation will be provided Select 'yes' for those species impacted or 'N/A' if not applicable to this application	**New roost creation** Compensation should be in line with the *Bat Mitigation Guidelines*. Where compensation is being provided, there should be at least **one compensation feature, suitable for the species concerned, per roost and per species to be impacted**, OR If a proposal impacts more than one bat species and / or roost type then cumulative impacts must be considered when designing the compensation; this should always be in line with the species and / or roost type which will be subject to the greatest impact and ensure that the requirements of all species impacted are met.		
	Compensation Feature	**Quantity**	**Location of Compensation Feature** (as shown on Figure E3)
Common pipistrelle ☒ Yes ☐ N/A *Day roost* *Night roost* *Feeding* *Transitional/Occasional*	☐ Bat box ☐ Integrated bat box/ bat brick/ bat tube ☒ Bat tile (including ridge tile) ☒ Other (specify): retain apex box void ☐ None	1	☒ In same building ☐ In other existing building on site ☐ In new building ☐ Other (specify):
Soprano pipistrelle ☐ Yes ☒ N/A *Day roost* *Night roost* *Feeding* *Transitional/Occasional*	☐ Bat box ☐ Integrated bat box/ bat brick/ bat tube ☐ Bat tile (including ridge tile) ☐ Other (specify): ☐ None		☐ In same building ☐ In other existing building on site ☐ In new building ☐ Other (specify):
Whiskered ☐ Yes ☒ N/A *Day roost* *Night roost* *Feeding* *Transitional/Occasional*	☐ Bat box ☐ Integrated bat box/ bat brick/ bat tube ☐ Bat tile (including ridge tile) ☐ Other (specify): ☐ None		☐ In same building ☐ In other existing building on site ☐ In new building ☐ Other (specify):
Brandt's ☐ Yes ☒ N/A *Day roost* *Night roost* *Feeding* *Transitional/Occasional*	☐ Bat box ☐ Integrated bat box/ bat brick/ bat tube ☐ Bat tile (including ridge tile) ☐ Other (specify): ☐ None		☐ In same building ☐ In other existing building on site ☐ In new building ☐ Other (specify):

Daubenton's ☐ Yes ☒ N/A *Day roost* *Night roost* *Feeding* *Transitional/Occasional*	☐ Bat box ☐ Integrated bat box/ bat brick/ bat tube ☐ Bat tile (including ridge tile) ☐ Other (specify): ☐ None		☐ In same building ☐ In other existing building on site ☐ In new building ☐ Other (specify):
Natterer's ☐ Yes ☒ N/A *Day roost* *Night roost* *Feeding* *Transitional/Occasional*	☐ Bat box ☐ Integrated bat box/ bat brick/ bat tube ☐ Bat tile (including ridge tile) ☐ Other (specify): ☐ None		☐ In same building ☐ In other existing building on site ☐ In new building ☐ Other (specify):
Brown long-eared ☒ Yes ☐ N/A *Day roost* *Night roost* *Feeding* *Transitional/Occasional*	Note: boxes for this species will only be acceptable in certain circumstances, where this is justified on an ecological basis ☐ Bat box, justification ☐ Other (specify): Retain apex box void ☐ None	1	☒ In same building ☐ In other existing building on site ☐ In new building ☐ Other (specify):
Serotine ☐ Yes ☒ N/A *Day roost* *Night roost* *Feeding* *Transitional/Occasional*	Note: bat boxes are not suitable for this species. Compensation should replicate, as closely as possible, the existing roost: ☐ Bat tile ☐ Bat brick ☐ Other (specify):		☐ In same building ☐ In other existing building on site ☐ In new building ☐ Other (specify):
Lesser Horseshoe ☐ Yes ☒ N/A *Day roost* *Transitional/Occasional*	A proportionate number of bat features suitable for the species. The provision of one feature, suitable for the species concerned (eg void) per roost to be impacted will be considered appropriate: Specify:		☐ In same building ☐ In other existing building on site ☐ In new building ☐ Other (specify):

E3.3b For all species and roost types not covered in the above table please provide the following:

- New roost dimension details or features (to include bat tiles/boxes as applicable).

N/A

- Access points and size of access points.

Part roost modification / part creation (See E3.2)

- Location details (including an 8-figure grid reference for bat houses or bat lofts relating to the structure. 8-figure grid references are <u>not</u> required for positions of individual boxes, tiles etc).

Cresswell Ford Farm building (SJ961429)	

- Aspect. Explain how the internal conditions of the roost will be created.

(See E3.2)

- Details of the materials to be used e.g. timber, sarking, felt etc.

(See E3.2)

- Justification for any variation from the original roost and/or deviations from recommendations in the Bat Mitigation Guidelines. (*Diagrams of widely available standard bat box designs are not required; just refer to bat box name and reference number, e.g. Schwegler 1FF*).

N/A

- Mitigation for any impacts of lighting if appropriate.

(See E3.2)

- Structures for access for monitoring / maintenance purposes (if applicable)

N/A

E3.4 Other habitat re-instatement or creation (e.g. retention of existing flight lines, retention or creation of appropriate vegetation around roost entrances where applicable) – please include details of:

- Habitat replacement (following works resulting in temporary impacts) or creation not covered by sections E2 to E3 such as hedgerow/woodland planting or enhancement. State the length of hedgerow planting and areas (ha) of other planting to be provided such as woodland and anticipated establishment period etc.

(See Folder 4. Supp.Info: "Ecological Construction Method Statement" report for the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council)

- Creation of flight lines/routes of connectivity.

- Foraging area enhancements, etc

(See Folder 4. Supp.Info: "Ecological Construction Method Statement" report for the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council)

- Mitigation for any impacts of lighting if appropriate.

(See E3.2)

E3.5 Wider biodiversity gains:
Please indicate if enhancements, over and above what is necessary to mitigate the impact of the activity of the licence proposal, are being provided. Please indicate if enhancements are included to satisfy the requirement of a planning permission, and if so state the relevant planning condition, or other consents in your response below. Please also state if an applicant wishes to provide more than is typically required to mitigate for the impacts. Enter N/A if this is not applicable to your application.

Note: *Any licence granted will only cover mitigation and compensation required to fulfill licensing requirements, but will acknowledge additional biodiversity enhancements*.

Proposed mitigation is considered to be proportionate in terms of compensation for maintaining the Favourable Conservation Status of the roosting bat species onsite, whilst also enhancing the ecological value of the site in accordance to Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) act 2006).

(See Folder 5. Supp.Info: "Ecological Construction Method Statement" report for the Staffordshire Moorlands District Council).

Important Advice:

Scaled maps/plans of mitigation/compensation must be provided as separate maps/figures (also ***see section I "Map checklist" at the end of this document)***:

- **Figure E2** if non-standard capture and exclusion apparatus is proposed please include diagrams/photographs.
- **Figure E3** to show specifications for mitigation / compensation to be provided and annotate where it will be provided. Should the scheme be large or complicated it may be necessary to submit more than one figure.

NOTE: It must be possible to compare these with the survey results plan (**Figure C6**) and 'Impacts' Figure (**D)**.

E4 Post-development site safeguard: Further guidance and explanation on post-development monitoring requirements are included within our 'How to get a licence' document http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/Images/wml-g12_tcm6-4116.pdf. Also see Section 8.7 of the Bat Mitigation Guidelines.

E4.1 Habitat/site management and maintenance: Is any specific post-development habitat management and site maintenance planned? If 'No; state 'N/A'. If 'Yes' include the following:

- The period (years and months) for which habitat management and maintenance will take place. Ensure that this is consistent with the post development works detailed in section **E5b** of the **Work Schedule document, WML-A13-a-E5a&b**.

N/A

- Details of what will be undertaken in terms of site maintenance required to ensure long-term security of the affected population (e.g. maintain, repair or reinstate access points; maintain and repair heaters and /or data loggers; maintain, repair or restore bat feature / bat loft in good condition; repair or replace inspection hatches; management and maintenance of lighting regime, or bat boxes etc).

N/A

- Details of what will be undertaken in terms of habitat management (e.g. planting cover around roost structure, hedgerow management regime, checking establishment of habitat creation; reduction of shade around roosts, woodland management to maintain species and structural diversity etc). Ensure this relates to the relevant map.

N/A

Note – for phased or multi-plot developments a separate habitat management and maintenance plan is required, which must be submitted with the master plan: see guidance on phased developments.

Important Advice:
Please include **Figure E4** as a separate figure to show which structures and habitats will be managed, maintained and monitored post development as part of your proposal – also *see section I "Map checklist" at the end of this document)*.

E4.2 Population monitoring, roost usage etc: This should be in line with the monitoring requirements detailed in the Bat Mitigation Guidelines section 8.7 and Figure 4.

E4.2a Please complete the table below for the species and roost types listed. For all other species and roost types please provide information under E4.2b.

Species	**Roost type**	**Post-development monitoring requirement**
Common pipistrelle **Soprano pipistrelle** **Whiskered** **Brandts** **Daubenton's** **Natterer's** **Brown long-eared**	*Day roost* *Night roost* *Feeding* *Transitional/Occasional*	☒ None. There is no post-development requirement for proposals affecting bat roosts supporting up to any 3 species indicated, of the roost types listed, where they are used by low numbers of each species. ☐ A single presence / absence survey at an appropriate time of year is to be undertaken. This should not take place in the first year following completion of development. Timing (year):

		☐ Other (specify):
Serotine	*Day roost* *Night roost* *Feeding* *Transitional/Occasional*	☐ A single presence / absence survey at an appropriate time of year is to be undertaken. This should not take place in the first year following completion of development. Timing (year): ☐ Other (specify):
Lesser Horseshoe	*Day roost* *Transitional/Occasional*	☐ A single presence or absence survey at an appropriate time of year to be undertaken in year 2 post development plus a check of the condition and suitability of the roost. ☐ Other (specify):

E4.2b For all species and roost types not covered in the above table please include details of:

- Timing – state the years and months post development monitoring or other will be undertaken. Ensure that is consistent with the post development works detailed in section **E5b** of the **Work Schedule document WML-A13-a-E5a&b**.

N/A

- The type of monitoring which will be undertaken – include survey methods and equipment to be used. If it is expected any bats are to be taken or disturbed during this period please state anticipated numbers per species against each licensable activity.

N/A

- Specify which compensation/mitigation measures will be subject to monitoring (as referenced on Figure E4).

N/A

Please note that it will be a requirement of the licence to undertake remedial action should monitoring identify that further management/maintenance is required of any compensation/mitigation provided, to ensure that mitigation/compensation measures are working effectively and are fit for purpose.

Important advice: Please always consider whether any *post development* monitoring effort should be staggered over alternate years in cases where use of the compensation measures may not occur in the same year of provision.

E4.3 Mechanism for ensuring safeguard of mitigation/compensation and post-development management, maintenance and monitoring works:

Please explain what mechanism is in place to ensure safeguard of mitigation/compensation provisions (e.g. Restrictive Covenant, clause to relinquish future development rights in S106 agreement, NERC Act agreement, explicit recognition of site in local planning documents, designation as County Wildlife Site or similar.) The need for this, and the type of mechanism, will vary with the scheme and impact. For substantial impact schemes (e.g. destruction of a significant maternity roost, or important hibernation site), some mechanism is always required. If you offer no specific mechanism, explain how you believe the population will be free of threats as far as can be reasonably determined (**the expectation of the granting of a licence should not be used for this purpose**).

The development will remain under the ownership of the applicant who has read and agreed to the Method Statement proposal. All person(s) using the site will be made aware of the existence of a bat roost onsite. The deeds to the relevant dwellings will incorporate an information sheet about the presence of protected bat species, their conservation status and current legislation.

Explain how all post-development works (management, maintenance (including remedial action) and monitoring, as appropriate) will be ensured? Include a commitment that the monitoring, habitat management and maintenance work will be undertaken. Mechanism/s for ensuring delivery must be in place before applying for a licence (also see Section F).

The applicant will sign the application form to agree that all post development works are ensured and that conditions are met with the planning permission by the local authority.

E5 Timetable of works: Please complete the **work schedule document WML-A13-a-E5a&b found on the 'bat' application form web page and append to your application pack.**

Important Advice: *Please note that from end of March 2014 a separate work schedule is a mandatory requirement to support a new bat licence application when using this template.*

F Declarations

If the mitigation/compensation area/s is/are not owned by the applicant, you must have consent from the relevant land owner(s). You must have also secured details of how any measures to maintain the population in the long term will be achieved (e.g. a legal agreement).

F1 Declaration Statement(s) – You must include the following declarations within your Method Statement and include the appropriate answer (Yes/No/Not applicable):

F1.1 **Re: section E1 -** I confirm that relevant landowner consent/s has/have been granted to accept bats into roosts or access into roosts on land outside the applicant's ownership:

Yes

F2.2 **Re: section E2 -** I confirm that landownership consent/s has/have been granted to allow the creation of the proposed compensation on land outside the applicant's ownership

Yes

F2.3 **Re: section E3** - I confirm that consent/s has/have been granted by the relevant landowner/s for monitoring, management and maintenance purposes on land outside the applicant's ownership

Yes

Comments if applicable:

Important Advice:

Unsecured consents statement:

If you have been unable to secure consents for any of the three declarations please explain why and detail any plans you have in place to obtain the consent(s) or provide details of any right(s) or agreement(s) that will enable the lawful implementation of the proposed mitigation, compensation and monitoring. Failure to provide the appropriate landowner consents means that the Method Statement is unlikely to meet the requirements for the FCS test to be met. It is therefore in your interest to ensure that the appropriate consents have been secured *before* applying for a licence.

G References: List any references cited, and include credits for source information.

H Annexes (supporting documents please append to your application pack)

H1 Pre-existing survey reports;

H2 Raw survey data.

I Check list of figures to be submitted with each Bat Method Statement

With your Method Statement and supporting documents please submit the following maps/figures – see table below. Note that some can be included within the Method Statement itself (if preferred) and others must be submitted individually (i.e. separate documents)**.** Maps/Figures must include the title, site name as referenced on your application form, date and figure reference. If a grid reference is more applicable (e.g. a bat house is being provided please included this). Include a scale bar (appropriate to the situation e.g. 100m on site maps, 1km on location maps) and direction of North etc.

Additional maps, photographs or diagrams should be included where necessary to adequately explain the scheme.

Figure reference	Mandatory as will be included in the annexed licence, if applicable	Mandatory for assessment purpose only, but will not be included in the annexed licence	What it must show (also see details above on site reference, dating and naming).
Figure B2.1	-	Yes, if the application is part of a phased or multi-plot development	**Master plan overview-** note – this is not the same as a master plan document, for which you should follow the guidance as stated in section B2.1.
Figure B2.2	-	Yes, if applicable	**Locations of other nearby bat licensed sites, or sites which will be impacted on by future development.**
Figure C5a	-	Yes	**Location map** at an appropriate scale for the application (often 1:50,000 or 1:25,000)
Figure C5b	-	Yes	**Survey area** showing all buildings, structures and habitats that are within the survey area and distinguishing those that were surveyed and those that were not. Indicate where surveyors were located. Aerial photographs should be provided where possible (ensure you have permission to use copy righted maps). If automated detectors were used or transect routes, ensure that these are indicated as appropriate.
Figure C6	-	Yes	**Survey results -** provide clear, annotated and cross-referenced maps/plans/photographs to show the survey results (access points, location of roosts, flight lines, results of activity surveys where DNA samples were taken etc).Ensure Figure is at a suitable scale to show the results.
Figure D	**Yes**	**-**	**Impacts plan –** map/figure which must show all structures or habitats (clearly referenced) that will be disturbed, damaged or destroyed, detailing where the roosts and access points are.
Figure E2	**Yes** – but only if applicable to the application	**-**	**Non-standard capture and exclusion apparatus.** If these are proposed please include diagrams/photographs.
Figure E3	**Yes**	**-**	**Specifications for mitigation / compensation** (including all dimensions for bat lofts/houses/stand-alone structures and materials to be used etc and 8-figure grid reference). Mitigation / compensation (must show all habitat creation, restoration, boxes). It may be necessary to submit more than 1 figure if the proposal is large or complicated.
Figure E4	**Yes** – when monitoring and maintenance will be included in the	**-**	**Monitoring, management and maintenance map.** Please indicate the specific structures and habitat that are to be managed, maintained and monitored as part of this licence proposal. Ensure that they are

	licence		correctly referenced and are consistent with other parts of the Method Statement and figures.

Definitions of roost types to be included in the application (further detail can also be found in the Bat Mitigation Guidelines and the BCT's "Bat Surveys Good Practice Guidelines"):

.

a. **Day roost**: a place where individual bats, or small groups of males, rest or shelter in the day but are rarely found by night in the summer.

b. **Night roost**: a place where bats rest or shelter in the night but are rarely found in the day. May be used by a single individual on occasion or it could be used regularly by the whole colony.

c. **Feeding roost**: a place where individual bats or a few individuals rest or feed during the night but are rarely present by day.

d. **Transitional / occasional roost**: used by a few individuals or occasionally small groups for generally short periods of time on waking from hibernation or in the period prior to hibernation.

e. **Swarming site**: where large numbers of males and females gather during late summer to autumn. Appear to be important mating sites

f. **Mating sites**: sites where mating takes place from later summer and can continue through winter.

g. **Maternity roost**: where female bats give birth and raise their young to independence.

h. **Hibernation roost**: where bats may be found individually or together during winter. They have a constant cool temperature and high humidity. Sites where hibernating bats have been confirmed by appropriate survey effort should be classed as '**hibernation confirmed**'.

i. **Satellite roost**: an alternative roost found in close proximity to the main nursery colony used by a few individual breeding females to small groups of breeding females throughout the breeding season.

j. Other – please explain what the roost type is if not one of the above (we recognise that roost types are interchangable and not always easy to classify according to the nuances of certain species).

k. An **'alternative roost'** shall include: a purposely installed bat box; an existing roost which will not be impacted by the works; or other new/enhanced roosting opportunities. Any alternative roost must be suitable for the species, within or close to the existing roost and free from additional disturbance or development pressure.