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Summary

In April 2019 Batworker consultancy was commissioned to undertake a survey of Franco’s Restaurant, 244 Preston Road, Alston, Longridge, PR3 3BD to assess the potential for use by bats.

A daytime survey was carried out on 2nd May in order to support plans for an extension to the front of the property.

No evidence was recorded to suggest bats were roosting within the building.

No bats were observed or recorded using the building for roosting.

The building is considered to be of negligible potential for roosting bats.

The surveyor considers survey effort to be reasonable to assess the roost potential of the building and no further survey work is deemed appropriate.

The surveyor does not consider the proposed development and change of use is likely to result in a breach of the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended) therefore the proposed development does not require an EPS Licence (EPSL) to proceed lawfully.
Introduction

In April 2019 Batworker consultancy was commissioned to undertake a survey of Franco's Restaurant, 244 Preston Road, Alston, Longridge, PR3 3BD to assess the potential for use by bats.

A daytime survey was carried out on 2nd May in order to support plans for an extension to the front of the property.

Survey and Site Assessment

Objectives of the survey

The survey was carried out to determine roost potential of the building, current usage by bats, and other protected species, of the site and to establish status of the bat species using the site prior to development work being carried out.

Survey site location

A central grid reference for the site is SD6008235458
Site/Habitat description

The property consists of a brick built single storey detached restaurant with a multi pitched slate roof, a single storey extension with double pitched slate roof is present on the northern aspect. External walls are rendered, well pointed and sealed. The roof has a well pointed ridge with no lifted or missing slates present. Lead flashing where present is close fitting. Loft space is partially insulated with a breathable membrane present below roof slates.

Overall the building offers negligible roosting potential.
Surrounding habitat.

The property is located in a rural position on the edge of Alston. Surrounding habitat consists of semi improved grassland with some remnant hedgerow on field boundaries. Connectivity to the wider landscape is poor.

Overall foraging potential for bats can be considered low.
Pre Existing data on local bat species

A search of the MAGIC website revealed no bat EPS licence applications within a 1km radius.

From personal experience of surveying for and researching bats in Lancashire, Yorkshire and Cumbria, the following species were considered.

Common Pipistrelle — known to roost on sites where suitable foraging habitat is available.

Soprano Pipistrelle — known to roost on sites where suitable foraging habitat is available.

Whiskered/Brandt's — species often found roosting in buildings close to woodland.

Natterer's — a typical upland bat with foraging bats being recorded high on heather moorland. Often roosting in barns.

Daubenton's — a species commonly associated with aquatic habitats.

Long Eared bat — a woodland species which has been recorded foraging over in bye meadows and rough grassland sites. Often roosting in barns.
Field Survey Methodology

Visual inspection

An inspection was carried out to search for and identify potential feeding perches, roosting opportunities and signs of bat use both internally and externally.

The visual inspection focussed on searching for feeding remains and bat droppings both within the building and on external walls. Crevices and other potential roost sites were investigated for smear/grease marks, lack of cobwebs, urine staining.

Equipment used included:

- Lupine Pico LED torch
- SeeSnake CA 300 video endoscope
- Opticron close focusing binoculars

Personnel

All surveys were conducted by Dave Anderson MSc, Natural England Science, Education and Conservation bat licence holder (2015-15784-CLS-CLS) a bat surveyor and ecologist with 20 years experience.

Survey Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Timings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>02.05.2019</td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey constraints

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

Evidence of bat activity such as bat droppings or staining on external walls and surfaces is frequently removed by the action of wind and rain; apparent absence of evidence is therefore evaluated with caution. In many situations it is not possible to inspect every locations where bats are present therefore it should be assumed that an absence of bat evidence does not necessarily equate to evidence that bats are absent.

Some species such as pipistrelle sp bats are opportunistic and it is possible for individuals to be found during works, even where surveys have had negative results during preliminary and activity surveys.
Results

Visual Inspection - Bats

The building was observed to have no potential roost features, in a good state of repair with no obvious crevices. Roost potential was assessed as being negligible.

No evidence of bats – droppings, feeding remains, staining was observed either within the buildings or on external surfaces.

Visual Inspection – Nesting birds / Barn Owl

No evidence of nesting birds was observed.

Evaluation of the results

The building was assessed as offering negligible roost potential and no evidence of use by bats was recorded.

Based on the results of the survey it is considered that development can take place without resulting in a breach of the Habitat Regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suitability</th>
<th>Description Roofing habitats</th>
<th>Commuting and foraging habitats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negligible</td>
<td>Negligible habitat features on site likely to be used by roosting bats.</td>
<td>Negligible habitat features on site likely to be used for commuting or foraging bats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>A structure with one or more potential nest sites that could be used by individual bats congenial with the local microclimate and/or suitable surrounding habitat. Roosting too small or by larger numbers of bats (i.e. unlikely to be suitable for maternity or hibernation).</td>
<td>Habitat that could be used by small numbers of commuting birds but is not very well connected to the surrounding landscape by other habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A tree of sufficient size and age to contain PIRs but without large hollows or huge branches were with only very limited roosting potential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>A structure in that with one or more potential nest sites that could be used by bats due to their size, shelter, vegetation, condition and surrounding habitat but unlikely to support a microclimate that would be suitable for maternity or hibernation.</td>
<td>Dwellings in the wider landscape that could be used by bats for commuting such as areas of trees and woods or isolated buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples include: caves, overhangs, the fur of bats such as overhanging trees, hedgerows, trees of trees and wooded areas.</td>
<td>Suitable areas that could be used by bats for commuting such as areas of trees and woods or isolated buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>A structure or tree with one or more potential nest sites that are already suitable for use by larger numbers of bats on a more regular basis and potentially for longer periods of time due to their site, shelter, protection, condition and surrounding habitat.</td>
<td>Continuous, high-quality habitat that is well connected to the wider landscape that is likely to be used regularly by commuting bats such as overhangers, streams, hedgerows, trees of trees and wooded areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples include: caves, overhangs, the fur of bats such as overhanging trees, hedgerows, trees of trees and wooded areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suitable areas that could be used by bats for commuting such as areas of trees and woods or isolated buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From Bat Survey Guidelines 3rd Edition*
Conclusion

No evidence was recorded to suggest bats were roosting within the building.

No bats were observed or recorded using the building for roosting.

The building is considered to be of negligible potential for roosting bats.

The surveyor considers survey effort to be reasonable to assess the roost potential of the building and no further survey work is deemed appropriate.

The surveyor does not consider the proposed development and change of use is likely to result in a breach of the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended) therefore the proposed development does not require an EPS Licence (EPSL) to proceed lawfully.
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Bats and the Law

Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, principally those relating to powers and penalties, have been amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000
(CRoW Act). The CRoW Act only applies to England and Wales.

Section 9(1)
It is an offence for any person to intentionally kill, injure or take any wild bat.

Section 9(4)(a)
It is an offence to intentionally or recklessly* damage, destroy or obstruct access to any place that a wild bat uses for shelter or protection.
 (*Added by the CRoW Act in England and Wales only)
This is taken to mean all bat roosts whether bats are present or not.

Section 9(4)(b)
It is an offence to intentionally or recklessly* disturb any wild bat while it is occupying a structure or place that it uses for shelter or protection.
 (*Added by the CRoW Act in England and Wales only)

The Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994

Section 39(1)
It is an offence
(a) deliberately to capture or kill any bat
(b) deliberately to disturb any bat
(d) to damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of any bat.
The difference between this legislation and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 is the use of the word 'deliberately' rather than 'intentionally'. Also disturbance of bats can be anywhere, not just at a roost. Damage or destruction of a bat roost does not require the offence to be intentional or deliberate.

Barn Owls and the Law


(1) Subject to the provisions of this Part, if any person intentionally (or recklessly as amended by the CRoW Act, 2000) (a) kills, injures or takes any wild bird; (b) takes, damages or destroys the nest of any wild bird while
that nest is in use or being built; or (c) takes or destroys an egg of any wild bird. he shall be guilty of an offence.

(5) Subject to the provisions of this Part, if any person intentionally- (a) disturbs any wild bird included in Schedule 1 while it is building a nest or is at, on or near a nest containing eggs or young; or (b) disturbs dependent young of such a bird, he shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a special penalty.


Part III Nature conservation and wildlife protection

74 Conservation of biological diversity
(1) It is the duty of (a) any Minister of the Crown (within the meaning of the Ministers of the [1975 c. 26.] Crown Act 1975), (b) any Government department, and (c) the National Assembly for Wales, in carrying out his or its functions, to have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biological diversity in accordance with the Convention.

SCHEDULE 12 AMENDMENTS RELATING TO PART I OF WILDLIFE AND COUNTRYSIDE ACT 1981

1. In section 1(5) of the 1981 Act (offence of intentional disturbance of wild birds) after "intentionally" there is inserted "or recklessly".

The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006)

PART 3, (40): Duty to conserve biodiversity

(1) Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity.

(3) Conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, restoring or enhancing a population or habitat.