

Phil Richardson, Bat Consultant

10 Bedford Cottages

Great Brington

Northampton

NN7 4JF

01604 770632 (Tel and fax)

07969 883815

PRichabat@aol.com

Protected Species (Bat & Bird) Report

**Former Elsecar Railway Station
building**

28th June 2011



Summary

No signs of bats were found in the building.
No owls use the building.
No special Protected Species licence will be required.

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This report, on behalf of Mr M Monfredi, sets out the findings of a bat and bird survey at the disused Elsecar railway station building (Grid ref. SE381004)
- 1.2 This is a Victorian station office next to the still-active rail line and abutting Hill Street in Elsecar.
- 1.3 A survey was required due to plans to demolish the building.
- 1.4 Legislation protects bats and their roosting places, and other Protected Species. Advice and licences must be obtained before disturbing bats or damaging their roosts. This report sets out suggested mitigation.

survey. In exposed conditions on large buildings the signs of bat usage such as droppings and urine marks can be obliterated by heavy rain. Occasionally a light scattering of droppings will be recorded in an attic or a semi derelict building, which is considered by the surveyor unsuitable for use as a bat roost. The medium probability of bat interest category can be used based on the surveyor's experience.

Whilst no licence is required for development to a building classified as Medium probability of bat interest, it is often best practice to conduct sensitive roof stripping or architectural salvaging to minimise any possible disturbance

Trees in this category will have holes, cracks and crevices and lose bark suitable for roosting bats but no obvious roost signs such as staining and droppings at entrances.

- ❖ **High probability of bat interest.** This group includes buildings with known roosts or signs of bat occupancy such as droppings and staining at a roost entrance. The description of high probability buildings will also contain an indication as to the time of the year when it will be occupied by bats i.e. Summer – nursery roost. Winter – hibernation

Trees here will contain all the obvious roost features such as holes, cracks and crevices and loose bark but will also contain staining and droppings at the roost entrance or have been identified as a roost via a visual sighting of an exiting bat.

If the building or trees fall in to the high probability group then the area of bat interest should be identified on site with the contractors to ensure that work does not affect the bats roost.

If it is thought the work will have a direct effect on the bat roost and is unavoidable then advice must be sought from the Species Officer for Natural England (formerly English Nature and DEFRA).

4. Mitigation and conclusions

The building is not and has not been used by bats, so no special licence will be required for the works. The building design and construction means that few entry points for bats ever developed. In addition, the adjacent rail line and road would have been disturbing.

A bat emergence survey is not appropriate in this case as there are no suitable crevices for day-roosting bats that could not be surveyed during this survey.

No special bat licence will be required for developing this building.

No barn owls nest in, or other Protected Species use the building, therefore no European Protected Species licence will be required to develop it. No badgers live in the attached land.

Birds are protected when nesting, so either exclude birds by blocking the entry point before nesting, or carry out the works outside the nesting season, usually March to August.

This survey is valid for the time of the survey and gives an indication of the way the bats have, or have not, used the building in the recent past.

2. Extract from *Bat Mitigation Guidelines 2004, English Nature.*

Low

Roost status

Mitigation/compensation requirement (depending on impact)

Feeding perches of common/rarer species

Flexibility over provision of bat-boxes, access to new buildings etc. No conditions about timing or monitoring

Individual bats of common species

Small number of common species. Not a maternity site

Feeding perches of Annex II species

Provision of new roost facilities where possible. Need not be exactly like-for-like, but should be suitable, based on species' requirements. Minimal timing constraints or monitoring requirements

Small numbers of rarer species. Not a maternity site

Hibernation sites for small numbers of common/rarer species

Timing constraints. More or less like-for-like replacement. Bats not to be left without a roost and must be given time to find the replacement. Monitoring for 2 years preferred

Maternity sites of common species

Maternity sites of rarer species

Timing constraints. Like-for-like replacement as a minimum. No destruction of former roost until replacement completed and usage demonstrated. Monitoring for at least 2 years

Significant hibernation sites for rarer/rarest species or all-species assemblages

Sites meeting SSSI guidelines

Oppose interference with existing roosts or seek improved roost provision. Timing constraints. No destruction of former roost until replacement completed and significant usage demonstrated. Monitoring for as long as possible

Maternity sites of rarest species

Conservation significance

High