

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 53(9)(b)).

You are strongly advised to refer to the Bat Mitigation Guidelines.

Please use recent photographs to support your application.

Technical Services
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.

The proposed works comprise demolition of an existing industrial building and construction of new industrial premises on the same site.

In the absence of mitigation this would result in destruction of 1 day roost used by 1 common pipistrelle bat. During the course of demolition works there would also be potential for disturbance of this bat whilst in the roost and also a risk of causing harm to the animal.

The mitigation strategy is based around the following elements, all of which can easily be accommodated within the proposals and project schedule:

- Demolition will take place during the autumn/winter months, thus minimising the likelihood of bats being present at the time of works taking place;
- Careful destructive search of known roost feature under supervision of the named ecologist or accredited agent, thus minimising the risk of causing harm to any bats that may be present at the time of works taking place;
- Bat boxes will be installed on nearby trees to provide replacement roost habitat.

Combined, these actions provide a proportionate approach to mitigating the impacts of the proposals and will maintain the favourable conservation status of bat populations post-development.

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*).

Demolition of an industrial building will result in destruction of a day roost used by a common pipistrelle bat.

- Include the site/project name and provide an OS grid reference to 8 figures (e.g. format AB 12345678).

Unit B, Thornsett Trading Estate, Birch Vale
SK 0141 8689

- 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 consent with all relevant conditions discharged.

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.

n/a

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.

Site check report using www.magic.gov.uk website – no bat EPSLs listed within the last 5 years within 2km radius of Thornsett Trading Estate.

High Peak Borough Council online planning portal – various planning applications within the last 5 years for land and properties within 2km of Thornsett Trading Estate. These included several barn conversions and extensions of existing properties; however, none of the application paperwork indicated that roosting bats were affected.

The planning portal also indicates that Thornsett Trading Estate is an island of built development

surrounded on all sides by green belt land. This green belt land is wholly outside of the areas allocated for development within the 2016 Local Plan (see supporting document titled 'local plan land allocations') and therefore there is no reason to consider it likely that there would be any significant development within the next five years that would affect local bat populations.

Important Advice: locations of other bat mitigation sites in relation to this proposal 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.

- 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.

Desk study information from the local ecological data centre included records of common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle and daubenton's bats in flight within the 2km search radius of the site. Also 10 records of roosts of common pipistrelle and brown long-eared bats. Several of these were within Birch Vale but none from the immediate vicinity of Thornsett Trading Estate. Data from Derbyshire Bat Conservation Group website indicates that 12 bat species have been recorded within the county (common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, Nathusius' pipistrelle, whiskered, Brandt's, Daubenton's, Natterer's, brown long-eared, noctule, Leisler's, serotine and barbastelle).

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	No specific data available; however, considered likely to be common and widespread in local area due to presence of suitable habitat and known status at county and regional level.	Common and widespread in Derbyshire.	Widely distributed through the UK. Populations of common pipistrelle are considered to have increased since 1999. (BCT website, accessed November 2017).

** **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.*

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	
Determine bat usage of site (e.g. maternity, hibernation, night roosts in various structures (specify)).	Yes	
Identify foraging, commuting or swarming sites (explain)	N/A	
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 site comprised a largely disused industrial warehouse with adjacent hardstanding. It dates approximately from the 19th century and is situated within the Thornsett Trading Estate at Birch Vale. The total site area is approximately 0.4ha, the majority of which is taken up by the building. It has very limited value to bats other than occasional crevice features on the building that provide opportunities for day roosting.

- 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.

The building is known as Unit B. It was surveyed both inside and out. Adjacent structures were not surveyed as they are not part of the current proposals and will be retained in their current form.

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

The site within the Thornsett Trading Estate, which is a collection of industrial units approximately 0.6km to the west of the village of Birch Vale.
The immediately adjacent areas to the north, east and south are the wooded valley of the River Sett, with the main river channel to the north and a smaller channel and pool to the south. To the west are other industrial units and hardstanding.
Beyond this, the habitats are mainly open grassland used as sheep pasture with dry stone walls along field boundaries and few scattered trees.

- 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.

Photographs are provided in a separate document included with the supporting information for this application.

C5 Field survey(s):

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:

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)
26/09/2017	Thornsett Works	Binoculars & torch.	Dry day with light wind and good visibility.
Comments (to include # of surveyors used for each visit): 1 surveyor Building surveyed visually from inside and outside, including view across roof structure from taller section of adjacent building.			

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

Hazel Robson MCIEEM (WML-CL18 bat survey level 2, 2015-12600-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)
28/09/2017	Start 1840 Sunset 1855 End 2030	Unit B	Batbox duet and Anabat SD1 for recording	Dry and calm throughout survey. Start: 15.3°C, 50% relative humidity, 1/8 cloud cover. End: 10.9°C, 81% relative humidity, 0/8 cloud cover.

Comments (to include # of surveyors used for each visit):

Team of 4 surveyors, two positioned with a view from ground level and two positioned with a view at roof level from taller section of adjacent building (windows open to aid visibility and ensure effective detection of bat calls)

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

Principal Ecologists Gerard Hawley and Paul Fisher, ecologists Caroline Boffey and Victoria Burton.

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)
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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 above table states the number of surveyors used for each survey visit undertaken.

Dawn survey was not undertaken.

'Other' survey (please specify e.g. hibernation, 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)
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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 above 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.

Survey was commissioned and undertaken at the end of the optimal season for dusk emergence survey to confirm presence/likely absence of roosting bats. Bat maternity roosts begin to disperse at the end of the summer, therefore late season surveys may not provide an accurate count of bats using that type of roost; however, there were very few potential roost features on the building and all were considered to be wholly suitable for anything more than day roosting by individual bats (see bat survey report and also photographs 3 & 8 within the supporting documents) and therefore the late timing not considered to be a constraint in respect of assessing roost status.

Despite the late season, due to a period of mild weather in the weeks prior the survey being undertaken, the survey did achieve its aim of determining presence / likely absence of roosting bats (see results section for further details of roosting activity observed). The roosting activity observed was consistent with the scope of potential roost features identified and therefore the aim of assessing roost status was also achieved and delaying the project until May 2018 to undertaken further survey work would be disproportionate to the scale of impacts that will arise from this project.

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.

n/a

- Please confirm (Yes, No, N/A) that a walk over survey/check has been carried out within 3 months *prior* to application submission 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. If no walk-over survey/check has been undertaken please explain why.

This application is being made within 3 months of the date of the last survey work at the site therefore no further walkover has been made to date.

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, locations of surveyors 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 types to be referenced as: *Day, Night, Feeding Perch, Transitional, Satellite, Maternity, Hibernation, 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	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)
26/09/2017	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/

Notes/observations:

A small number of potential roost features were identified on the exterior of the structure, notably crevices behind loose render on the northern elevation and occasional gaps in the mortar beneath ridge tiles, considered suitable for day roosting by individuals of crevice-dwelling species only. As illustrated on photographs 3 and 8 (see supporting documents) the ridge tiles are fully mortared and therefore gaps where mortar has fallen are discrete crevice features only and do not provide access to any larger cavity along the ridge. These gaps do not provide sufficient space for a maternity roost. Gaps behind loose render were also too small to shelter more than a few individual bats.

The interior of the structure was considered unsuitable for use by loft/barn dwelling species such as brown long-eared or *Myotis* bats.

The structure was not considered to provide suitable conditions for hibernation by any species.

No field signs of bats were found.

Provide further (brief) comments/explanation if required:

n/a

Dusk survey results

Date (e.g. format 01/06/13)	Start and end times	Species	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)
28/09/2017		Common pipistrelle	Day roost	Unit B	Northern wall	Gap behind loose render	Narrow gap behind plate of loose render on northern wall at height of approximately 8m above ground.

Notes/observations:

Echolocation calls of noctule (*Nyctalus noctula*) bats were detected from approximately five minutes after sunset; however, these bats were commuting overhead and did not emerge from the building.

At approximately 20 minutes after sunset a single common pipistrelle bat was seen to emerge from a small crevice on the northern wall where there was loose render attached to the stonework. After this time, common and soprano pipistrelle bats were seen and heard frequently throughout the survey, with a maximum of two individuals seen together at any one time.

Individual brown long-eared bats and a *Myotis* species were also detected several times, but did not emerge from the building.

Provide further (brief) comments/explanation if required:

n/a

Dawn Survey results

Date (e.g. format 01/06/13)	Start and end times	Species	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)
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Notes/observations:

n/a

Provide further (brief) comments/explanation if required:

n/a

'Other' results – please specify.

Date (e.g. format 01/06/13)	Species	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)
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Notes/observations: n/a						

Provide further (brief) comments/explanation if required:

n/a

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	Site status assessment (e.g. hibernation, maternity, feeding roost, swarming site etc)	Conservation significance of roost	Use and importance of the site throughout the year (e.g. used by different species at different times, hibernation potential, etc)
Unit B	Common pipistrelle	1	Day roost	Low	Summer roost only.

Provide further (brief) comments / explanation if required:

The building was found to provide very limited opportunities for roosting bats, with potential roost features comprising occasional small crevice features suitable for day roosting only on the external structure. The building did not provide suitable roost conditions for brown long-eared or *Myotis* bats and there was no evidence of roosting by these species. There were no features that provided sufficient shelter to accommodate the larger numbers of bats that would form a maternity roost for any bat species, and the building was considered unsuitable for hibernation.

A single roost was confirmed behind loose render on a north-facing wall. It was considered likely that this bat could also use the small gaps under ridge tiles as the render provides only minimal shelter as it has been observed on other survey sites that pipistrelle bats often make use of a variety of different day roost sites depending on the weather conditions on any given day.

As the project was commissioned at the end of the 2017 survey season there was opportunity to carry out only one emergence survey. However, due to the nature of the potential roost features present on the building it is considered unlikely that further survey at other times of year would provide different results, other than potentially to confirm transient day roosting beneath ridge tiles (constraints are discussed in further detail in Section C5).

The mitigation proposed (see Section E) is consistent with currently accepted standards for the roost type observed at the site. Based on the fact that they are suitable for day roosting only by individuals in summer, mitigation for any other bat species using these features would be identical.

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 in absence of mitigation or compensation for each species / roost type
(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.

- 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, mechanical demolition of the building will result in destruction of a day roost used by one common pipistrelle bat.

If the bat is present at the time of works there is also the potential for the bat to be injured or killed. Negative impact at site level.

- 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.

n/a

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.

A day roost used by one common pipistrelle bat will be lost.

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.

n/a

- 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.

n/a

- 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, Foraging Area, Commuting Route, Swarming Site, Other.

Species & #s (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	Day roost	X			Destruction of roost.

****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):

n/a

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 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.

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 proposed mitigation is to take actions to minimise risk of harm to bats, and to provide replacement roost habitat in the form of bat boxes.

Bat boxes would be required as construction phase roost habitat and as common pipistrelles are known to readily adopt boxes and only a single individual is affected by the demolition this was also considered to be adequate long-term roost provision, proportionate to the scale of impacts.

E2 Capture and exclusion (If not applicable to your proposals please state 'N/A' in the relevant text boxes):
Include details on:

- The methods proposed - to include timings, effort, methods (please clearly state what will be used, e.g. use of endoscopes, one way excluders, capture by hand (and state in which referenced structures), disturbance by noise or light, destructive search by soft demolition etc) and equipment to be employed.

Careful destructive search of loose render on northern wall. Also ridge tiles with gaps in the mortar will be removed by hand. This work will be carried out under supervision of the named ecologist or accredited agent.

Torch and endoscope will be used where appropriate (at the ecologist's discretion) to investigate roost features immediately prior to their dismantling.

Any bats captured will be moved by hand.

This work will be undertaken during the winter months when bats are considered likely to be absent.

- 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. Note: *this may be different in many cases 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.*

It is considered likely that the bat will be absent when works take place; however, if the weather is still relatively mild then 1 common pipistrelle could be encountered.

- Weather conditions during which licensed activities will be carried out, release sites, care of bats, unexpected discovery of bats, what would be done with any injured bats found etc.

Destructive searches will be carried out on a dry day to avoid exposing any bats to harsh weather conditions that may compromise their welfare.

Any bats captured will be examined by the named ecologist / accredited agent and provided they appear to be healthy and unharmed they will be transferred to a batbox on a nearby tree.

Any bats that appear to be injured or in poor condition will be transferred to a local bat carer for rehabilitation and then returned to the site at a later date.

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.

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. temporary 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.

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.

n/a

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.*

Provide the following:

- Dimension details of modified roosts or access points ensuring that it is clear what the original dimensions were and what the dimensions of the modified roost will be.

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

- Scale drawings of the modified roost and bat access points, orientation, location (including an 8-figure grid reference for the modified roost) – to be submitted as a Figure E2 – see below.

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 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.

Provide the following:

- New roost dimension details or features (to include bat tiles/boxes as applicable).
- Access points and size of access points.
- Location details (including an 8-figure grid reference for bat houses or bat lofts relating to the structure. 8-figure grid references are not required for positions of individual boxes, tiles etc).
- Aspect. Explain how the internal conditions of the roost will be created.
- Details of the materials to be used e.g. timber, sarking, felt etc.
- 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*).
- Mitigation for any impacts of lighting if appropriate.
- Structures for access for monitoring / maintenance purposes (if applicable)

Three bat boxes will be installed on trees to the north of the existing roost location.

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.

n/a

- Creation of flight lines/routes of connectivity.

n/a

Foraging area enhancements, etc

n/a

- Mitigation for any impacts of lighting if appropriate.

n/a

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.

n/a

Important Advice:

Scaled maps/plans of mitigation/compensation must be provided as separate maps/figures (also **see section 1 "Map checklist" at the end of this document**):

- **Figure E2a** to show the locations and structures where all capture and exclusion activities will be undertaken (ensure this is clearly labelled and consistent with other mandatory maps/figures).
- **Figure E2b** 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 1 "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, and, where required, should 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 include a commitment to undertake remedial action in your Method Statement 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).

n/a

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).

n/a

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:

N/A

- 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

N/A

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

N/A

Comments if applicable:

n/a

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 to show impacts and where licensable works will take place: clearly indicate areas of structures and habitats to be impacted by the works (damage, destruction (to include habitat types if applicable), and temporary impacts, disturbance.
Figure E2a	Yes	-	Locations and structures where all capture and exclusion activities will be undertaken (ensure this is clearly labelled and consistent with other mandatory maps/figures).
Figure E2b	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. Any temporary features to be used to relocate bats into during capture/exclusion must also be shown and annotated accordingly.
Figure E4	Yes – when monitoring and maintenance will be included in the licence	-	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 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.
- 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 interchangeable and not always easy to classify according to the nuances of certain species).