The Company and Contact Information

Established in 2005, Arbtech Consulting Limited provides arboricultural and ecological consultancy services in respect to planning and development, throughout the UK.

The Surveyor

The surveyor and principal author of this report is Jo Gregory BA (Hons), MSc GradIEEM.

Bat Licence Number

England: 20122461.

Wales: 39248.

Scotland: 13660.

The Client

The client is Mrs. Wendy Simpson.

The Site of Proposed Development

The client is preparing a planning application to complete the barn conversion at Bridestones, Fairhead, Grosmont, Whitby, North Yorkshire YO22 5PN.

The Survey Brief

The client has commissioned Arbtech to undertake a scoping bat survey; referring to a method of ecological assessment outlined in the Bat Conservation Trust publication Bat Surveys—Good Practice Guidelines authored by L. Hundt, 2012.

These guidelines state that the aim of the initial assessment bat survey is to observe and catalogue "informing and identifying the type and extent of further bat survey work needed (if any)" (Hundt 2012).

NYM / 2013 / 0 0 1 7 / F L

NYMNPA 13 FEB 2013

Document Production and Approval

Status	Issue	Surveyor	Date
Draft	1	J Gregory	25/01/2013
Draft	2	M O'Connor	28/01/2013
Final	3	J Gregory	28/01/2013

Limitations

Arbtech Consulting Ltd has prepared this report for the sole use of the above named Client or his agents in accordance with our General Terms and Conditions, under which our services are performed. It is expressly stated that no other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of Arbtech Consulting Limited. The assessments made assume that the sites and facilities will continue to be used for their current purpose without significant change. The conclusions recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by third parties. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by Arbtech Consulting Limited.

Copyright

© This report is the copyright of Arbtech Consulting Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

Bibliography

Hundt, L. (2012). Bat Surveys—Good Practice Guidelines, 2nd edition, Bat Conservation Trust, London.

Mitchell-Jones, A.J. (2004). Bat Mitigation Guidelines. English Nature, Peterborough.



The Survey Methodology

NYM / 2013 / 0 0 1 7 / F 6

In order to fully assess the potential value of bat habitat at the site, the surveyor has observed the widely accepted industry best practice standard; set out in the Bat Conservation Trust publication Bat Surveys—Good Practice Guidelines (Hundt 2012).

The survey includes for a thorough internal and external inspection of all buildings (and trees) referred to in the Survey Results section of this report for cracks, holes, cavities and voids in buildings and cracks, fissures and voids in trees.

Inspections are both internal and external, making use of torches, ladders, endoscopes, mirrors, binoculars and cameras where appropriate to do so.

An initial assessment bat survey is performed during daylight hours and provides an opportunity to exclude the need for further survey work, if the following triggers can be confirmed absent from the site of proposed development:

- Bats.
- Evidence of recent bat activity e.g. droppings, prey remains, urine staining.
- Features suitable for roosting.

If bats, evidence of their recent activity and or features suitable for roosting cannot be confirmed absent from the site of proposed development, this report will make recommendations for further survey work and or design mitigation, where this is consistent with the Hundt (2012) and considered appropriate by the surveyor in the context of the proposed development.

Recommendations for further survey work may include "emergence surveys" (Hundt 2012) which enable e.g. apertures through which roosts are accessed, population numbers and species to be identified and quantified. Essentially, the survey is designed so that with confidence, the surveyor can confirm bats to be present, indeterminate or absent.



Data Searches

The author's preparation of this report has been assisted by a search of the National Biodiversity Network Gateway.

No other data searches or desk study has been undertaken.

Date of the Survey

24 January 2013.

Seasonality

This type of assessment can be conducted at any time of year.

Informative

Table 1: Summary of Pertinent Legislation and Planning Policy Relevant to the Protection of Bats in the UK

This table is adapted from Table 2.1 and Section 2.5 of the Bat Surveys—Good Practice Guidelines (Hundt, 2012).

Location of Roost	Transposing EC Habitats Directive	Other Relevant Legislation	Planning Policy
England	Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.		National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF").
Wales	Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.	Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended. Countrywide and Rights of Way Act 2000. Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.	Technical Advice Note ("TAN") 5.
Scotland	Conservation (Natural Habitat & c.) Regulations 1994 as amended.	Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended. The Nature conservation (Scotland) Act 2004.	National Planning Policy Guidance ("NPPG") 14 and Planning Advice Note ("PAN") 60.

Cumulatively, this legislation makes it illegal to:

- Intentionally or deliberately kill, injure or capture bats.
- Deliberately disturb bats, whether at roost or not.

NYM / 2013 / 0 0 1 7 / F L



- Damage, destroy or obstruct access to bat roosts.
- Possess or transport a bat or any part of a bat, unless acquired legally.
- Sell, barter or exchange bats, or any part of a bat.

A bat roost is defined by Hundt (2012) as "the resting place of a bat". Generally however, the word roost is interpreted to mean "any structure or place, which any wild bat uses for shelter or protection."



Bat Potential and Habitat Value

Table 2: Bat roost habitat value assessment criteria, adapted from the Bat Surveys—Good Practice Guidelines (Hundt 2012).

Bat Habitat Value	Trigger or Description	
Confirmed Bat Presence	Bats are found to be present during the survey.	
	Evidence of bats is found to be present during the survey.	
	Bats heard 'chattering' inside a roost on a warm day or at dusk.	
Significant Habitat Value	Buildings, trees or other structures with features of particular significance for roosting bats e.g. mines, caves, tunnels, icehouses and cellars.	
	Habitat of high quality for foraging bats e.g. broadleaved woodland, tree-lined watercourses and grazed parkland.	
	Site is connected with the wider landscape by strong linear features that would be used by commuting bats e.g. river and or stream valleys and hedgerows.	
	Site is proximate to known roosts.	
Moderate Habitat Value	Several potential roosts in buildings, trees or other structures.	
	Habitat could be used by foraging bats e.g. trees, shrub, grassland or water.	
	Site is connected with the wider landscape by linear features that could be used by commuting bats e.g. lines of trees and scrub or linked back gardens.	
Low Habitat Value	A small number of potential roosts, most likely less significant roosts.	
	Isolated habitat for foraging e.g. a lone tree or patch of scrub but not parkland.	
	An isolated site not connected by prominent linear features.	
Negligible Habitat Value	No features suitable for roosting, minor foraging or commuting.	

Table 2 (above) presents a scale continuum adapted from Hundt (2012) against which the significance of habitat value and roosting opportunities at the site can be graded. By referring to this continuum and using their expert judgment, surveyors classify features of buildings or trees as representing low, medium or high value as habitat for bats.

NYMNPA

13 FEB 2013

Appendix 1 Plan

Legend Building (B1) Buildings not included in the proposed development Ridge tiles Wooden doors with gaps Skylights Gaps in ties Windows and doorways with wooden Intels Unglazed window Drawn by: JG Signed off by: MOC Scale: Not to scale Reproduced with permission of OS Opendata, 2010 RBTECH



Table 4: The Site Survey Results

Buildings and trees are referred to by number, in accordance with the sketch plan at Appendix I.

Reference Number	Habitat Value	Description of Roosting Features	Confirmation of Bat Presence
romber	Table 2 Refers	Access to Roosting Features	
B1	Moderate Habitat Value	The building is a 'U' shaped former barn which has been partially converted. A large single-storey building built with traditional local stone with a pitched slate roof. The roof of the remaining section to be converted was replaced in 2006. An original king post frame remains and two additional new king post frames have been added. The original king post provides gaps and crevices within the mortice and tenon joints which could be used by smaller crevice dwelling bat species.	No bat droppings were located internally however there are several features within the building which are suitable for roosting bats. The building is located within close proximity to surrounding woodland, and open water (Murk Esk). Three species of bats have been recorded within 1km² of the site.
		The roof structure includes skylights and some gaps are visible between the tiles surrounding the skylights. Some raised tiles are also visible. The roof is felt lined which is tight fitting with the exception of one gap located directly above the walt top on the western elevation providing access to the barn interior.	
		The windows and doors are wood framed and each window and door frame has a wooden lintel above that is built into the stonework and large gaps are present internally which provide ideal roosting places for bats. Gaps in the stonework and wooden lintels are also present externally. The main entrance to the building is a composite stable door on the east elevation and some gaps are visible.	
		A doorway to an additional section of the building on the western side has been blocked up with breeze blocks and again a wooden lintel with a large gap is present. This additional section to the building has an arched main doorway on the western elevation with double wooden doors and gaps are present with daylight visible internally. The window in this section is wood framed but is unglazed providing open access to the building interior.	

Any additional notes:

NYM / 2013 / 0 0 1 7 / F L



Figure 4 Gap in wooden lintel above block up doorway.



Figure 5 Gaps in wooden doors with daylight visible (internal).



Figure 6 Gaps in wooden doors (external).

photos

photos

of the

grand

of the

planni

1 3 FEB 2013

photo of Garage re part of planning

Appendix 2 Photos



Figure 1 Gap in felt lining above wall top.



Figure 2 Gaps in wooden lintel above main entrance (east elevation).



Figure 3 Gap in stone work and wooden lintel (external).

Survey Results

Table 3: The Desk Study Results

Desk Study Records	A study of data from the National Biodiversity Network Gateway for the grid square (NZ80) NZ837049 has informed the preparation of this			
	No other data set has been consulted.	N.		
Notes on the Local Environment	The site is surrounded by open fields in the immediate vicinity. Woodland is located approx. 499m away to the north, approx. 909m to the northeast, approx. 622m to the south, and approx. 573m to the west of the site. A disused quarry is located approx. 722m to the east. Open water (Murk Esk) is located approx. 840m to the west of the site. Further open water (River Esk) is located approx. 1km to the north woodland and other foraging areas.			
	Weather conditions at time of survey:			
	Temperature: 1.1 °C.			
	Cloud Cover: 100%.			
	Precipitation: None.			
	Wind: 0/8.			

