



Bat Emergence & Re-entry Survey

Park View, Uxbridge, UB8 3XG

On Behalf of:

Hillingdon Borough Council

September 2015

© SES 2015

www.ses-eco.co.uk

Author	Ella Barnett GradCIEEM BSc (Hons) and Chris Horley GradCIEEM BSc (Hons)
Technical Review	Sean Crossland ACIEEM BSc BCA
Report Status	Final
Date of Issue	18.09.2015

Ecology, Countryside Management
Professional Service ● Pragmatic Solutions

phone: 01268 711021 email: team@ses-eco.co.uk website: www.ses-eco.co.uk
Address: The Sudbury Stables, Sudbury Road, Downham, Essex, CM11 1LB

Contents

1.0 Introduction and Aims 1

2.0 Methods 1

3.0 Results..... 2

4.0 Findings and Recommendations 2

5.0 Conclusions..... 3

6.0 References 4

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Phase 1 Habitat Map
- Appendix 2: Relevant Legislation
- Appendix 3: Raw Survey Data

1.0 Introduction and Aims

- 1.1** Southern Ecological Solutions Ltd (SES) was commissioned by Hillingdon Borough Council to undertake bat emergence surveys at Park View, Uxbridge, UB8 3XG. The extended phase 1 habitat survey of the site (SES, 2015) identified roosting potential in the main building. The purpose of the emergence surveys were to determine the presence or likely absence of roosting bats in the aforementioned building and to assess if and how the habitats on the site are currently used by local bat populations.
- 1.2** All UK bat species are protected under European and UK law (Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2010; Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981), and some are UK priority Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP) species (see Appendix 2 for more details). Protected and BAP species are a consideration under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), 2012.
- 1.3** The proposed development site is located at the end of Farrier Close in a residential area of Uxbridge. The plot covers an area of approximately 0.36ha and is roughly triangular in shape (see Appendix 1 for the phase 1 habitat map). The site is bordered to the south by Stockley Road, beyond which lies Stockley Country Park. Residential properties and gardens border the site to the north, east and west.
- 1.4** The site is a former day care centre comprising a single-storey main building, two timber sheds, paving slab pathways, tarmac car parking and surrounding gardens. The site is unmanaged and has been used by travellers as a dumping ground. As a consequence, the grassland and ornamental hedges/shrubs are overgrown and there are numerous piles of waste and assorted debris littering the site. The main building and sheds are well-sealed and with no noticeable entry points in the roofs. However, gaps behind the ply boarded windows could be used by crevice roosting species.

2.0 Methods

Desk Study

- 2.1** Records of protected species within 2km of the site were provided by Greenspace Information for Greater London (GiGL) on the 10th August 2015. These records have been used to inform recommendations made in this report.

Bat Emergence Survey

- 2.2** The site is of low value to foraging bats and the sheds on site had no potential to support roosting bats (SES, 2015). The main building on site was valued at being of low value to roosting bats and so a single emergence survey of the building was undertaken, in line with best practice guidelines (Hundt, 2012). Due to the size of the building emergence surveys were carried out on two evenings so that all aspects could be covered. The emergence surveys were carried out by ecologists Chris Horley BSc (Hons) GradCIEEM, Mark Poynter BSc (Hons) and Terry Pankhurst on two evenings; 8th and 9th September 2015.

- 2.3** The survey methodology followed standard guidelines recommended in Bat Surveys: Good Practice Guidelines (Hundt, 2012). Surveys were conducted in optimal weather conditions, with temperatures above 10°C, little or no wind (Beaufort 0-1) and no precipitation. The emergence surveys started approximately 20 minutes before sunset and continued for approximately 2 hours after sunset.
- 2.4** Equipment used included Batbox Duets with Edirol digital recorders. These were used in combination with surveyor observation to record bats on the site. All the recordings were analysed using BatSound software.

3.0 Results

Desk Study

- 3.1** A record for pipistrelle bat species was found approximately 1.7km from site in 2010. It is not known whether this record is of a roost or flying bat.

Emergence Survey

- 3.2** No bats were observed emerging from or re-entering the building on either of the evenings, see Appendix 3 for full results.
- 3.3** Bat activity during the surveys was extremely low with only individual bats recorded/observed at any one time.

4.0 Findings and Recommendations

Roosting bats

- 4.1** It is considered that the main building on site does not support roosting bats as no confirmed roosts were identified during the survey. However, it does exhibit features that could be used by bats and therefore there is the possibility that individual bats (most likely pipistrelles) could potentially use these features in the future. The only bats recorded during the surveys were pipistrelle species. Two surveys were completed on the evening of the 8th and 9th September and only common pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* and soprano pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pygmaeus* bats were encountered. A common pipistrelle was recorded approximately 30 minutes after sunset which indicates that it was not likely to be roosting in close proximity to the site (pipistrelles typically emerge 20-30 minutes after sunset). In addition, a soprano pipistrelle was recorded approximately 10 minutes after sunset which is unusually early, and may indicate that a soprano roost is nearby and in close proximity to the site.
- 4.2** The building is not considered suitable for hibernating bats due to the complete lack of thermally suitable areas. Although the likely absence of roosting bats on the site has been ascertained, the main building has the potential to support roosting bats in the future. As such, it is recommended that if a significant amount of time has passed before these structures are demolished (after March

2017) further surveys are undertaken (such as emergence/re-entry surveys) to re-establish the presence/absence of roosting bats, prior to works commencing.

Foraging bats

- 4.3** Bat foraging activity on the site was limited to common and soprano pipistrelles, mainly foraging along the tree line that runs along the eastern boundary, recorded during both evenings. As such, it is evident that the site does provide a foraging area for bats in the locality, but considering the surrounding habitats in the wider area, it is not considered to be of high importance. The moderate to high light levels from residential housing and street lights, coupled with the low suitability of vegetated habitats on site, are likely to be significant factors in accounting for the low levels of bat foraging activity on the site and its boundaries.
- 4.4** Due to the high existing levels of artificial light surrounding the site, a stringent bat sensitive lighting scheme it is not considered necessary to implement into the new development. However, the hedgerow along the eastern site boundary should be shielded as this had bat activity associated with it during both surveys.

5.0 Conclusions

- 5.1** The vast majority of the site is unused by bats. The hedgerow on the eastern boundary is used on an infrequent basis by individual foraging bats and it is recommended that these be retained if possible. However, the removal of these features under the development proposals will not significantly impact upon the foraging resources of local bat populations due to their small size and location.
- 5.2** No roosting bats are present in any of the buildings on the site and the development can proceed without the need for further survey or licensing so long as the structures are demolished by the spring of 2017. After this point in time, further surveys are recommended to determine the roost-status of the buildings.

6.0 References

Department for Communities and Local Government (2012). *National Planning Policy Framework*. London: HMSO, pp. 25-29.

Hundt (2012). *Bat Surveys-Good Practice Guidelines 2nd Edition*. Bat Conservation Trust, London.

SES (2015). *Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey_Park View Farrier Close_Final August 2015*. Unpublished, SES.

Appendix 1: Phase 1 Habitat Map



Appendix 2: Relevant Legislation

This legal interpretation is not provided by trained legal professionals, but is our interpretation of the law and is intended to be a guide.

Bats are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000) and under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. Taken together, these make it an offence to:

- Deliberately capture or intentionally take a bat.
- Deliberately or intentionally kill or injure a bat.
- To be in possession or control of any live or dead wild bat or any part of, or anything derived from a wild bat.
- Damage or destroy a breeding site or resting place of such an animal or intentionally or recklessly damage, destroy or obstruct access to any place that a wild bat uses for shelter or protection.
- Intentionally or recklessly disturb any wild bat while it is occupying a structure or place that it uses for shelter or protection.
- Deliberately disturb any bat, in particular any disturbance which is likely to impair their ability;
 - (i) to survive, breed, reproduce or to rear or nurture their young; or
 - (ii) in the case of hibernating or migratory species, to hibernate or migrate, or to affect significantly the local distribution or abundance of the species to which they belong.

A bat roost may be any structure a bat uses for breeding, resting, shelter or protection. It is important to note that since bats tend to re-use the same roost sites, current legal opinion is that a bat roost is protected whether or not the bats are present at the time.

Appendix 3: Raw Survey Data

See Appendix 1 for Surveyor locations.

Date	Building	Type of survey
8th September 2015	Main building	Dusk

Weather	Sunset	Start	Finish
80% Cloud Cover, Beaufort Scale 1, 15°C	19.29	19.14	21.00

Time	Surveyor 1	Surveyor 2
	Southern and Western Aspect	Southern and Eastern Aspect
19.10		
19.15		
19.20		
19.25		
19.30		
19.35		
19.40	Sunset	Sunset
19.45		
19.50		
19.55		
20.00		
20.05		Soprano pipistrelle, heard not seen, 2 x passes
20.10		Soprano pipistrelle, heard foraging, not seen - 1 x pass
20.15	Common Pipistrelle commuting through, site 1 x pass	
20.20		
20.25		
20.30		Soprano pipistrelle, heard not seen, 1 x pass
20.35		
20.40		
20.45		
20.50		
20.55		
21.00		
21.05		
21.10		

Date	Building	Type of survey
9th September 2015	Main building	Dusk

Weather	Sunset	Start	Finish
50% Cloud Cover, Beaufort Scale 1, 17°C	19.29	19.14	21.00

Time	Surveyor 1	Surveyor 2
	Northern and Western Aspect	Northern and Eastern Aspect
19.10		
19.15		
19.20		
19.25		
19.30		
19.35		
19.40	Sunset	Sunset
19.45		
19.50		Soprano pipistrelle, commuting past along hedgerow, eastern side - 1 x pass
19.55		Soprano pipistrelle, commuting past along hedgerow, eastern side - 1 x pass
20.00		
20.05		Soprano pipistrelle, commuting past along hedgerow, eastern side - 1 x pass
20.10	Common pipistrelle, flying west, foraging - 1 x pass	Common pipistrelle, foraging near surveyor - 2 x passes
20.15		Common pipistrelle, foraging near surveyor - 2 x passes
20.20		Common pipistrelle - 1 x pass
20.25		Common pipistrelle - 1 x pass
20.30		
20.35		Common pipistrelle - 1 x pass
20.40		
20.45		Common pipistrelle - 1 x pass
20.50		Common pipistrelle - 1 x pass
20.55		
21.00		
21.05		
21.10		